

# Kickback Tie Denied By Maryland Official

By Bill Richards

Washington Post Staff Writer

TOWSON, Md., June 5—Baltimore County Executive Dale Anderson denied today that he is the "other man" linked anonymously by his former chief aide to a growing kickback scandal in the county.

Anderson's administrative officer, William E. Fornoff, pleaded guilty Monday to a tax law violation and said he had admitted to a federal grand jury investigating Baltimore County contracts that he acted as courier for cash kickbacks between local contractors and "another official" in the county since 1967.

"I am not that other man," Anderson declared at a news conference in the Baltimore County office building here. He said Fornoff's resignation from his job and his subsequent disclosure of the kickback scheme Monday left him "shocked and disturbed" at first and then "somewhat broken-hearted."

Thus far in the five-month old federal probe of the county finances, Anderson and



DALE ANDERSON  
... 'I'm not other man'

Fornoff are the only county officials who have formally been notified by the grand jury that they are under investigation.

Sources familiar with the investigation indicated yesterday

See ANDERSON, A14, Col. 1

*Indicted area businessman sold stock to Anderson.*  
Page C1.

and businesses doing work with the county.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Russell T. Baker Jr. said this week that Fornoff had received money in cash on many occasions since 1967. The payments were made, Baker said, "on behalf of various businesses that had contracts with Baltimore County or wished to acquire such contracts in the future, or both."

Sources close to the investigation said yesterday that the list of firms being considered for indictment by the grand

## ANDERSON, From A1

day that as many as eight businessmen, who did more than \$1,000-a-year in county business between 1969 and 1971, face possible indictments with more federal grand jury indictments probable as the investigation continues.

Fornoff, 56, who was in charge of the day-to-day management of the county's \$238 million annual budget before his resignation, has not publicly revealed who he was alluding to in his revelation of the kickback operation.

His lawyer, Stephen H. Sachs, said yesterday that Fornoff did reveal the man's name to the federal investigators but would not make that name known publicly at present.

"When the government calls him to testify, I'm sure the name will come out," Sachs said.

During his news conference, Anderson said he would like to tell all that he knew about the investigation but said his knowledge of "the proper procedures of jurisprudence" kept him from talking about the grand jury proceeding.

"As much as I'd like to reveal to the people of the county what little I know, I must remain silent at the present time," he said.

Since he resigned, Fornoff has not returned to his office, which is located next to Anderson's in the county office

building. Anderson said he had not spoken to his former aide this week.

Fornoff served under four county executives, including Anderson, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew—who was Baltimore county executive during the years preceding Anderson from 1962-66—Christian A. Kahl and Michael J. Birmingham.

A spokesman for the U.S. attorney's office, which is conducting the investigation for the grand jury, declined to comment on whether Agnew would be questioned on possible kickbacks during the period before Anderson assumed office.

The spokesman also declined to say whether Fornoff had revealed any kickback activity prior to Anderson that might involve Agnew's county organization.

"It would be totally inappropriate for this office to discuss in any way what witnesses have been telling us during the course of an investigation," said the spokesman.

"It would not be inappropriate for us to point out," he said, "that federal criminal statutes run out after five years for general offenses and six years for tax offenses."

During its investigation the grand jury has subpoenaed 120 filing cabinets filled with county records for the period between 1969 and 1971 and called for the additional records of about 100 contractors

jury is presently between eight and 10 with the probability that more will be indicted in the future.

All of these companies are either architectural or engineering firms that did more than \$1,000 worth of business with the county during the fiscal years 1969, 1970 and 1971.

A number of the firms also do business in other counties in the state but thus far the investigation by the grand jury has been confined to Baltimore County, according to the source.