

LAND OCCUPIERS OF THE PROPOSED NEW DISTRICT;

(5) THE PROBABLE EXPENSE OF CARRYING ON EROSION CONTROL OPERATIONS WITHIN ANY DISTRICT; AND

(6) OTHER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE DETERMINATION, HAVING DUE REGARD TO THE LEGISLATIVE DETERMINATIONS SET FORTH IN §8-102. HOWEVER, NO DISTRICT OR DISTRICTS MAY BE DIVIDED OR COMBINED, OR BOTH, IF A MAJORITY OF LAND OCCUPIERS VOTE AGAINST EITHER THE PARTICULAR DIVISION OR COMBINATION WHICH IS SUBMITTED TO THEIR VOTE.

(F) COMMITTEE SHALL RECORD DETERMINATION; CERTIFY APPROVAL.

IF THE COMMITTEE DETERMINES THAT THE DIVISION OR COMBINATION, OR BOTH, IS NOT ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE, IT SHALL RECORD THE DETERMINATION AND DENY THE PETITION. IF THE COMMITTEE DETERMINES THAT THE DIVISION OR COMBINATION, OR BOTH, IS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE, IT SHALL RECORD THE DETERMINATION AND PROCEED WITH THE DIVISION OR COMBINATION, OR BOTH.

REVISOR'S NOTE: This section presently appears as Art. 66C, §102(a), (b), and (c) of the Code. The last phrase of subsection (a) is proposed for deletion because no provisions of the present subheading sets forth the requirements for a petition to organize a district. Chapter 752, Acts of 1969, repealed a prior section (§92) of Art. 66C which provided for the creation of soil conservation districts and established the appropriate procedures for petitioning. Under the present statutes, districts may only be divided or combined; the creation of new districts apparently is not permitted.

New language derived from the last sentence of §102(c) is added in the second sentence of subsection (e). The present provision in subsection (e) that requires the Committee to determine whether division or combination is administratively "practicable" is proposed for deletion because the words "feasible" and "practicable" are synonymous. The word "feasible" is used throughout this Article instead of "practicable" because "practicable" is often confused with "practical".