



BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANNUAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022

JULY 15, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Statement from the Inspector General.....	3
II.	Providing a Return on Your Investment.....	5
III.	The Ethics Commission.....	6
IV.	Inspector General.....	9
V.	Goals for Fiscal Year 2023.....	17
VI.	Contact the Office.....	17

I. Statement from the Inspector General

It is an honor for me to present the third annual report of the Office of the Inspector General (“the Office”). The report details our efforts during fiscal year 2022, which covers the time period July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022. This report is required under Section 3-14-111 of the Baltimore County Code and its purpose is to summarize the work of the Office during the preceding fiscal year. The accomplishments highlighted in this report demonstrate the Office’s ongoing commitment to increasing accountability and oversight in the operations of the Baltimore County government.

The Office had quite a busy year. In the fall, we hired our third employee – an administrative assistant who provides support to both the ethics and inspector general components of the Office. In addition, the Office hosted three interns from two local law schools at various times throughout the fiscal year. The interns worked on a variety of projects, conducted research, observed interviews, and helped to draft reports. My Deputy and I attended the Inspector General Institute sponsored by the Association of Inspectors General (AIG) this past year. The Institute is a week-long course comprised of instruction and case studies presented by various experts in the Inspector General (IG) community. The course culminates in a final exam consisting of 100 questions. I am happy to report we both passed and are now certified by the AIG as members of the IG community.

Between the ethics and inspector general work, this fiscal year has been our busiest to date. The Office presided over improvements to the online financial disclosure program as well as the online ethics training course. The Office addressed 197 ethics inquiries, processed over 300 lobbying-related compliance documents, and handled over 500 financial disclosure statements. Because of our efforts, nearly all of the financial disclosures are now filed online, which is significantly more efficient. The Office has seen a significant increase in the number of IG complaints, which has resulted in a greater number of IG investigations and public reports. During fiscal year 2022, the Office received 155 IG complaints, opened 15 IG investigations, and issued 11 IG reports on a variety of topics, 10 of which were made available to the public. Included in my goals for fiscal year 2023 are implementing an online lobbying program and an internal case management system, both of which should improve efficiencies within the Office’s ethics and IG programs respectively.

It is imperative that as the workload of the Office grows, the Office has adequate staffing to fulfill its mission, which includes: addressing ethics inquiries and IG complaints in a timely manner, conducting thorough investigations, issuing comprehensive reports, performing outreach within the County, providing training to employees, and ensuring Baltimore County is in compliance with the public ethics laws. Therefore, I am extremely grateful to the County Executive and County Council for including three new positions in the Office’s budget for fiscal year 2023. These positions include two new investigators who will work on IG investigations and an attorney who will assist me in overseeing the County’s ethics program. These new positions will greatly assist our current team with managing the increased workload the Office has experienced this past fiscal year. It is my belief that these new positions will increase the Office’s capacity to offer ethics-related training, conduct IG investigations, and produce quality reports, all of which should translate into a greater cost savings to the citizens of Baltimore County along with

greater transparency and accountability within Baltimore County government.

In the coming fiscal year, the Office looks forward to working closely with the Blue Ribbon Commission on Ethics and Accountability to help ensure the Office is following industry standards and utilizing best practices when it comes to its ethics and IG programs. This should also help to ensure that the Office remains independent from outside influences and adheres to its mission, all while providing the citizens of Baltimore County with a proper return on their investment.

While I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of the Office this past year, there is a lot more work to be done. It is my privilege to be the independent watchdog for Baltimore County, and I look forward to continuing to work on your behalf in the coming fiscal year.

Respectfully,

Kelly Madigan

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General

II. Providing a Return on Your Investment

For fiscal year 2022, the Office had a total budget of \$353,994. Approximately 95% of the budget was dedicated to the payment of salaries for the Office’s three full-time employees. The remaining funds were spent on a variety of items including software programs, office supplies, and AIG membership fees. Based on Baltimore County’s population of 847,000,¹ the cost to operate the Office was approximately \$0.42 per County resident which is cheaper than the current price for a Forever Stamp from the United States Postal Service.

In return for their investment in the Office, Baltimore County residents received IG reports on a wide range of issues. In September 2021, the Office issued a report detailing monies owed to the County from several recreation councils, nature councils, and other entities participating in the County’s Group Leadership Program. In November 2021, the Office issued a report detailing its investigation into an allegation that a member of County Council had moved their primary residence to an address outside of their councilmanic district and therefore, the councilmember could no longer lawfully represent their district. A supplement to this report was issued a few months later. In January 2022, the Office issued a report concerning deficiencies in the County’s employment background program as it relates to civilian or “general” employees. Also in January 2022, the Office issued a report regarding the improper waiving of millions of dollars in development-related securities and fees by the County during the course of the Metro Centre at Owings Mills project. In April 2022, the Office issued a report addressing an allegation that a member of County Council had violated the County’s Electronic Communications Policy by comingling campaign solicitations with a County email address. In May 2022, the Office issued a report about a Property Management employee sharing certain bid-related information between on-call plumbing contractors. A few days later, the Office issued a report addressing an allegation that a County employee, who is an attorney, was operating a law practice on County time using County resources. Also in May 2022, the Office issued a report explaining how over 800 County employees were inadvertently excluded from a 2% cost of living adjustment that went into effect in January 2022. At the end of May 2022, the Office issued its final public report for fiscal year 2022, which detailed concerns about the legitimacy of the Minority Business Enterprise status of one of the County’s on-call plumbing contractors.

In addition, the taxpayers of Baltimore County helped to ensure that County employees and members of the County’s various boards and commissions received expanded ethics training and that improvements were made to the County’s online financial disclosure program. All of this took place for less than what it would cost each County resident to purchase a Forever Stamp from the United States Postal Service.



¹ See <https://www.baltimorecountymd.gov/departments/economicdev/meet-baltimore-county/stats-and-figures/county-demographics.html>

III. The Ethics Commission

One of the Office’s two primary functions is to manage the daily ethics work on behalf of the Baltimore County Ethics Commission (“the Commission”). The Commission is tasked with administering the public ethics laws for the County. This includes overseeing ethics education for all employees and certain members of boards and commissions, providing ethics advice to County employees as needed, ensuring compliance with financial disclosure requirements, investigating all ethics complaints, and managing the registration and activity filings for lobbyists. During fiscal year 2022, the Commission held fifteen virtual and in-person meetings.

The following charts summarize performance measures for the Commission for the last three fiscal and calendar years:

Performance Measures by Fiscal Year	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Number of ethics inquiries (i.e. requests for ethics advice)	71 ²	221	197
Number of ethics-related complaints, allegations of ethics violations and/or investigations	7	2	12
Number of formal opinions or waivers issued	1	2	10

Performance Measures by Calendar Year	2020	2021	As of 06/30/22
Number of registered lobbyists	39	40	26
Number of registered lobbied matters	120	126	156
Number of lobbyist activity reports	120	125	155

² Because ethics inquiries only started being tracked on January 3, 2020, this number only represents a portion of the ethics inquiries for fiscal year 2020.

A. Ethics Commission Highlights

In fiscal year 2022, the Office processed 197 ethics inquiries for the Commission. These inquiries can be broken down as follows: 87 inquiries pertaining to financial disclosures; 12 inquiries related to lobbying activities; and 98 inquiries about gifts, conflicts of interest, and other ethics-related topics. Additionally, the Office processed and reviewed over 300 lobbying-related documents and over 500 financial disclosure statements for the Commission. Over the past two years, the Office has achieved a 99% compliance rate with regard to financial disclosure filings. Also during fiscal year 2022, the Commission received 12 ethics-related complaints. Of the complaints, 10 were addressed and closed and two are still pending.

B. Summary of Recent Ethics Advisory Opinions

In fiscal year 2022, the Commission issued 10 written advisory opinions on a variety of ethics-related topics. Summaries of the opinions are listed below.³

- 21-001 - A representative from Green@Work asked the Commission for permission to allow Green@Work committee members, who are County employees, to solicit gifts from local businesses. The Commission declined to grant an exemption that would permit such solicitations.
- 21-002 - A representative of the Department of Recreation and Parks asked if it was permissible under the Baltimore County Ethics Code (“the Ethics Code”) to receive baseball tickets in connection with a Department-sponsored baseball outing for youth participants as part of its community recreation program. The Commission found that the receipt of these tickets was permissible under the Ethics Code.
- 21-003 - The Commission received complaints pertaining to a councilmanic residency issue and determined the public ethics laws were not applicable and dismissed the complaints accordingly.
- 21-004 - A Baltimore County employee, who works as a medical doctor at the Baltimore County Reproductive Sexual Health Clinics, asked if they were permitted under the Ethics Code to be compensated for teaching an occasional training course, outside of their Baltimore County employment, on behalf of a birth control implant manufacturer. The Commission found that the proposed payment would violate the honorarium provision of the Ethics Code.
- 21-005 - A former employee inquired as to the permissible scope of employment for their new role with a private company when considering their prior employment with the County. After analyzing the term “participated significantly” in the

³ All of the opinions are available to read in their entirety on the Ethics Commission website, which can be found at <https://www.baltimorecountymd.gov/boards-commissions/ethics>.

context of the employee's new position, the Commission ruled that the former employee was not permitted under the Ethics Code to participate in the contract.

- 21-006 - A current employee asked if it would be permitted under the Ethics Code to serve on the board of directors for a private ecosystem restoration company located in Harford County and receive compensation for their service. The majority opinion of the Commission determined that the Ethics Code permitted the employee's service on the board with the understanding that there may be times when the employee would need to recuse themselves from participating in certain matters. One of the Commissioners, in a dissenting opinion, believed the Ethics Code did not allow for this employee to serve as a member of the board as it was a conflict of interest.
- 21-007 - The Commission responded to an inquiry seeking an interpretation of §7-1-304 of the Ethics Code as it pertains to the members of the County Board of Appeals who are attorneys in private practice. The inquiry consisted of the following questions: does §7-1-304(a)(3)(ii) prohibit members of the County Board of Appeals from assisting or representing a party in a proceeding before an administrative law judge in the Office of Administrative Hearings, and if so, does "contingent compensation" refer solely to contingency fee arrangements and are members permitted to be compensated on an hourly or flat fee basis. The Commission answered the first question about assisting or representing in the negative, and therefore, the questions about compensation did not need to be addressed.
- 21-008 - A current employee inquired as to whether they could serve as an unpaid advisory board member on a company's customer council. This request was based on the fact that the company's product and related service is directly related to the employee's position with the County. The Commission opined that the employee's service on the customer council was permitted under the Ethics Code but reminded the employee about their obligation of confidentiality with respect to their employment.
- 21-009 & 22-001 - The Commission issued two separate advisory opinions in response to an inquiry made by an employee as to whether the employee would be permitted under the Ethics Code to serve in an unpaid capacity on the board of a certain non-profit affiliate of a for-profit entity that contractually supplies software to the County. The software is utilized by the County's Minority, Women, Disadvantaged and Small Business Programs and the employee is the Manager of the Programs. The Commission ultimately determined that it did not have sufficient information to make a decision on the inquiry as presented, and thus, denied the request (21-009). Subsequently, the employee asked for clarification of the opinion, and the Commission issued a second advisory opinion (22-001).

IV. Inspector General

The Office's other primary function is to provide increased accountability and oversight in the operations of the County government by investigating fraud, abuse, and illegal acts. This is accomplished by conducting investigations, mostly in response to complaints, and when appropriate, publishing reports with findings to the County Executive, County Council, other County stakeholders, and the public.

A. The Office's Jurisdiction

The Office is only permitted to get involved in matters that fall within its jurisdiction. Determining jurisdiction is a two-step process. First, the Office assesses whether a complaint concerns Baltimore County government personnel or resources. The Office's jurisdiction extends to vendors, contractors, and other companies that conduct business with Baltimore County government. The Office does not have jurisdiction over any of the following, which are often the subject of complaints received by the Office: Baltimore County Public Schools, state and federal government programs, private attorneys, family law matters, property disputes, or businesses that are simply based in Baltimore County. Second, the Office evaluates if the complaint involves an allegation of fraud, abuse,⁴ or an illegal act; or if its investigation in response to the complaint could result in increased efficiency, accountability, or integrity within County government.

B. The Business Process

The Office responds to complaints from County employees and the public. Complaints are received by the Office in a variety of ways: telephone calls, emails, letters, in-person meetings, and through the Office's online complaint form. The individual filing the complaint has the option to request anonymity. All complaints filed with the Office are carefully assessed to determine whether the complaint falls under the Office's jurisdiction, as described in the prior section. This year, the Office received 155 complaints compared to 83 complaints in fiscal year 2021 – an increase of 87%. Of the complaints received, 132 were either closed due to lack of sufficient predication or referred out to other County agencies (internal referrals) or external agencies because they were outside of the Office's jurisdiction.


If it is determined that the Office has jurisdiction over the complaint, a preliminary investigation is performed in an effort to validate the information. Whenever possible, the person making the complaint is interviewed so credibility and motivation can be assessed. Based on the results of a preliminary investigation, a determination is made to either convert the complaint to a full investigation or to administratively close the complaint. During fiscal year 2022, the Office

⁴ The Office interprets "abuse" as the use or expenditure of County resources carelessly, extravagantly, or for a purpose that is not in the best interest of the County government or the citizens of Baltimore County, to include incurring unnecessary costs resulting from inefficient or ineffective practices, systems, or controls; or the making of decisions or choices in one's capacity as a County employee that are excessive, improper, unethical, or that are otherwise detrimental to the County government or the citizens of Baltimore County.

converted 13 complaints to full investigations, which equates to about 8% of the total complaints received, or 9% when excluding the 10 complaints that are still pending as of June 30, 2022.

The Office conducts its investigations in accordance with a Policies and Procedures Manual (“the Manual”) that was drafted and adopted during fiscal year 2021 and updated in fiscal year 2022. The Manual incorporates aspects of the AIG’s Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General also known as *The Green Book*. At the conclusion of an investigation, allegations that have been substantiated are published by the Office in a report. Initially, the report is distributed to the Administration, and when appropriate the County Council and other stakeholders, for review and a response. In some cases, the Office will issue a reply to that response. Subsequently, these documents are combined and published by the Office on its website. For fiscal year 2022, the Office published 10 of these reports. In addition, the Office produced a report that was not distributed to the public as it pertained to a sensitive, personnel-specific matter.


The following illustration depicts the business process of the Office from the receipt of the complaint to the publishing of a report:



C. Statistics on Complaints

The following charts summarize the complaint data for the Office for fiscal year 2022:


Total Complaints Received	Referred to an Internal Agency	Referred to an External Agency	Referred to an Internal and External Agency (Dual Referral)	Closed for Insufficient Predication	Complaints Converted to Investigations	Complaints Still Being Addressed (Pending)
155	36	57	2	37	13	10



D. Statistics on Number and Types of Investigations

The following charts provide statistics on the Office’s investigations for fiscal year 2022:


No. of Active Investigations as of 07/01/2021	No. of Investigations Opened During FY 2022	No. of Investigations Closed During FY 2022	No. of Active Investigations as of 06/30/2022
12	15	18	9



E. Statistics on Sources of Investigations

The following charts show the sources of the Office’s investigations for fiscal year 2022:

Baltimore County Employee	Baltimore County Council Member	Law Enforcement Partner	Private Citizen	Anonymous	OIG - Generated
6	0	0	5	2	2



As seen in the above charts, there are occasions in which the Office, during the course of its work, becomes aware of information that is unrelated to an existing investigation but appears to be evidence of fraud, abuse, or an illegal act within the Office’s jurisdiction. In those instances, the Office will open an “OIG-Generated” investigation.

F. External Reports

During fiscal year 2022, the Office issued 10 public reports covering a wide range of topics. Brief summaries of these reports are listed below.⁵

Report 21-002

In September 2021, the Office issued Report 21-002 regarding monies owed to the County from several recreation councils, nature councils, and other entities participating in the Group Leadership Program (“the Program”). The Office received a complaint that the Program had accumulated deficit balances totaling over \$300,000. Further, the complaint raised concerns that the County was limited in its ability to collect these outstanding funds and historically had not done so. The Office’s investigation revealed that as of July 9, 2021, 18 of the entities participating in the Program owed the County \$139,021.63. About three months earlier, as detailed in the report, the total deficit balance had been as high as \$420,353.13. While the investigation revealed the County was aware of the monies owed, there was no formal plan in place to enforce collection of these outstanding funds. The investigation also revealed there were additional concerns associated with the Program that were contributing to the deficit balances and potentially creating other financial issues for the County. The Office recommended updating the Directives guiding the

⁵ Copies of all of the public reports are available at www.baltimorecountymd.gov/departments/inspectorgeneral/.

Program as well as increased communication among all levels of participants in the Program. The Office also recommended a decision be made as to whether participants in the Program should remain as Baltimore County employees or transition to independent contractors.

Reports 22-005 & 22-005-1

In November 2021 and January 2022, the Office issued Reports 22-005 and 22-005-1 respectively regarding allegations that a member of County Council (“the Councilmember”) moved their primary residence to an address outside of their councilmanic district and therefore, the Councilmember could no longer lawfully represent their district. The Office’s investigation revealed, based on the plain language of the County Charter, the Councilmember’s move was a violation of Article II, Section 202(c) of the Charter. However, because the Charter does not contain any enforcement provisions pertaining to technical or substantive violations of County Council residency requirements, the Office referred the matter to the County’s Office of Law for an opinion. The Office also recommended that County Council consider updating the Charter to include enforcement procedures to address violations of the Charter. In Report 22-005-1, the Office asked the Office of Law for an update on its interpretation of the Charter. In April 2022, the Office of Law issued a formal opinion on the matter.

Report 20-015

In January 2022, the Office issued Report 20-015 detailing concerns about the County’s policies and procedures regarding criminal background checks for civilian or “general” employees. The report detailed various deficiencies in the policies and procedures that were creating vulnerabilities for the County. The report made the following recommendations: all prospective employees should be queried in the appropriate law enforcement databases for outstanding warrants in addition to criminal histories, applicants should be queried in a publicly-available database such as Maryland Judiciary Case Search to identify potential financial issues, the County should consider updating checks for certain classifications of general employees on a scheduled basis based on their assigned duties and responsibilities, the County should formally adopt the Baltimore County Arrest and Conviction Policy which was in draft status, consider updating the Employment Background Program to include annual checks of randomly selected employees as a way to help ensure that employees report criminal activity, continue to focus on reducing the backlog of background checks, and prioritize the outstanding background checks based on the nature and sensitivity of the positions being filled.

Report 20-013

In January 2022, the Office issued Report 20-013 which detailed the improper waiver of development-related fees by the County for the Metro Centre at Owings Mills development project (“the Project”). The Office’s investigation found that from 2005 to 2010, the County appropriately collected performance securities, inspection fees, permit fees, and other development-related fees (collectively “Securities and Fees”) on the Project in accordance with the County Code and the Project’s legal documents. However, beginning in 2011 when Arnold Jablon became the Director of the County’s Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI), Securities and Fees associated with the Project generally stopped being collected at his direction. Based on the size

and scope of the Project, the total Securities and Fees waived by Jablon were estimated to be in the millions of dollars. According to the County Code, performance securities cannot be waived, and the County Administrative Officer (CAO) has sole authority to establish or change fees. In the case of the Project, the Office found no evidence that the CAO authorized a waiver of fees until a letter dated September 21, 2021 was issued by the CAO to the Project's developer. There were also no references in any of the Project's legal documents to support the waiving of Securities and Fees. The Office's investigation also uncovered that as Securities and Fees were being waived on the Project, Jablon was receiving certain benefits from the Project's developer.

Report 22-008

In April 2022, the Office issued Report 22-008 concerning a member of County Council violating the County's Electronic Communications Policy by co-mingling campaign solicitations with a County email address. The investigation showed that between approximately April 2021 and January 2022, the Councilmember caused at least 40 emails containing campaign solicitations to be sent to constituents through a third-party email marketing service. The Councilmember used one of their County email addresses in the "from" line for all 40 of the emails. On two occasions, constituents replied to the emails indicating they intended to make donations to the Councilmember's campaign. Those replies traveled over the County's email servers. Because the Councilmember's email address, which is the property of the County, was used in the "from" line of the emails in question, those emails were violations of the County's Electronic Communications Policy. Further, because the Councilmember's email address was in the "from" line, any replies to those emails containing campaign-related materials were sent over the County's servers, thereby, causing additional violations of the Policy. When questioned about the emails, the Councilmember told the Office that the inclusion of any campaign solicitations in any emails involving the Councilmember's County email address was done inadvertently. The Office made a recommendation that the County's legislative branch adopt a formal set of policies and procedures addressing the requirement that there be a strict delineation between a member's County-related duties and the member's campaign-related activities.

Reports 20-002-1 & 20-002-2

In May 2022, the Office issued Reports 20-002-1 and 20-002-2. The reports were both related to an investigation into one of the County's on-call plumbing companies. The Office had received a complaint that alleged there were two companies holding master agreements for Tier 2 on-call plumbing projects (i.e. projects valued at \$5,000 or more), and one of those companies was receiving preferential treatment in that it was getting assigned to a disproportionate number of the jobs. Based on the investigation conducted, the Office was not able to substantiate the allegation that one of the Tier 2 on-call plumbing companies had received preferential treatment over the other company. However, during the course of the investigation, the Office identified a separate issue concerning the handling of proposals for on-call plumbing work within the Property Management Division of the Office of Budget and Finance. As detailed in Report 20-002-1, the Office found that on two occasions, a Property Management employee had shared bid-related information submitted by one Tier 2 on-call plumbing company with another Tier 2 plumbing company before the bid solicitation period closed. This was a violation of the County's policies and procedures relating to the handling of bids as set forth in the County's Purchasing Manual.

The Office also found that while the County has formal policies and procedures addressing procurement matters, Property Management does not have such policies and procedures as they pertain to the handling of bid solicitations and proposals for on-call contractors. In the report, the Office recommended that the County have Property Management incorporate the relevant sections from the Purchasing Manual into its own policies and procedures and increase opportunities for procurement training for employees whose duties and responsibilities include procurement-related activities.

In Report 20-002-2, the Office detailed its concerns that a plumbing company doing business with the County (“Company A”), which is certified as a Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) by the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, may not be meeting the requirements set forth by those entities for maintaining its MBE status. Specifically, the Office had concerns that the owner of Company A was not actively engaged in the operations and decision-making of Company A as required under the MBE regulations. Further, the Office had concerns that a second plumbing company doing business with the County (“Company B”), which is majority-owned, may have played a role in assisting Company A with its operations by supplying personnel, bookkeeping services, and other resources for an unknown period of time in violation of the MBE regulations. For the past several years, both Company A and Company B have had master agreements with the County for on-call plumbing services, and at times, Company B used Company A to meet the County’s minority contracting goals on projects. Based on the limited scope of the Office’s investigation, it was unclear whether that assistance was still ongoing. Accordingly, the Office referred the matter to the City of Baltimore’s Minority and Women’s Business Opportunity Office and the Maryland Department of Transportation for whatever follow up those agencies deemed necessary based on the findings set forth in the Office’s report.

Report 22-004

Also in May 2022, the Office released Report 22-004, which detailed the investigation into a complaint that a County employee (“the Employee”), who is an attorney who has provided legal services on behalf of the County, was operating a private law practice on County time using County resources. The Office was able to substantiate that on occasion, the Employee used County resources to prepare, store, and facilitate the transmission of documents and related information pertaining to their private law practice. However, the Office was not able to substantiate that the Employee performed services related to their private law practice on County time. The Office made a recommendation that the County develop a plan to increase awareness among employees that they have a duty not to misuse County resources, including the computer system and its related elements as detailed in the Electronic Communications Policy.

Report 22-011

Finally, the Office issued Report 22-011 in May 2022, which summarized the Office’s investigation into a complaint that certain clerical employees within the County’s Department of Recreation and Parks had been unfairly excluded from the 2% cost of living adjustment (COLA) that was effective in January 2022. As a result of the investigation, the Office determined that approximately 838 employees, assigned to various County agencies including the Department of Recreation of Parks, did not receive the 2% COLA that was effective in January 2022 (“the

Affected Employees”). Further, the Office discovered that the reason the Affected Employees did not receive the 2% COLA was because they are non-merit employees who follow Pay Schedule VI whose job classifications are specifically tied to pay grades. The Office recommended that the Administration devise a plan to address how the Affected Employees could be made whole for the 2% COLA they should have received beginning in January 2022.

V. Goals for Fiscal Year 2023

The Office has established several goals for fiscal year 2023. The Office intends to create an online system for the filing of lobbyist registrations and lobbying activity reports. The Office believes that such a system would be consistent with what other jurisdictions use to track and monitor lobbyist-related data, and it would help to ensure that all registered lobbyists who conduct business in the County comply with the applicable rules and regulations. The Office would also like to implement a complaint and case management program tailored specifically for the IG component of the Office. To date, the Office has used Microsoft programs Word and Excel to track and document complaint and case-related activities respectively. Because acquiring investigation-specific software from a third party has been too cost prohibitive, the Office began working with the Office of Information Technology (OIT) in the past fiscal year to design an in-house program tailored to the needs of the Office. In the coming fiscal year, the Office looks forward to continuing its work with OIT to get both of these projects finalized. The Office is also excited to add additional personnel to the Office. In fiscal year 2023, the Office anticipates hiring an attorney to assist with the ethics component of the Office and two investigators to work on IG-related matters. Finally, the Office intends to continue its outreach efforts into the Baltimore County community to expand awareness of the Office’s mission and function within the County government.

VI. Contact the Office


Please contact the Office using one of the methods below if you have any questions about this report, the Office and its mission, or if you have a complaint that could be addressed by our Office. We look forward to hearing from you.

Tip Line: 410-887-6500

Email: inspectorgeneral@baltimorecountymd.gov

Website: www.baltimorecountymd.gov/departments/inspectorgeneral/

***Mail: Office of the Inspector General
400 Washington Avenue, T-105
Towson, Maryland 21204***



Contact the Office of the
Inspector General Tip Line:

410-887-6500

InspectorGeneral@BaltimoreCountyMD.gov

