

Assembly of Maryland heretofore passed authorizing the County to borrow money are hereby continued to the extent that the powers contained in such Acts have not been exercised, and nothing contained in this Act may be construed to impair, in any way, the validity of any bonds that may have been issued by the County under the authority of any said Acts, and the validity of the bonds is hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved. This Act, being necessary for the welfare of the inhabitants of Calvert County, shall be liberally construed to effect the purposes hereof. All Acts and parts of Acts inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SECTION 10. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect June 1, 1994.

May 26, 1994

The Honorable Casper R. Taylor, Jr.
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed House Bill 590.

House Bill 590 would increase the maximum limit of moving expenses that the State may pay a person who is displaced from a business or farm operation as a result of an eminent domain proceeding. In future years, the bill would require the Maryland Department of Transportation to increase or decrease the maximum limits to reflect rates of inflation or deflation.

As the power of eminent domain has evolved, the federal government has recognized the need to reimburse owners, not only for the property taken, but also for the expenses incurred in moving or relocating a business. The federal relocation guidelines are outlined in the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. Traditionally, State law has mirrored the federal law, and that system has served both the State and property owners well.

House Bill 590 would create significant differences between the federal and the State relocation provisions resulting in inequitable treatment of property owners. For instance, if the federal government, through eminent domain, took a person's business or farm, the maximum limit for relocation expenses would be \$20,000. However, if the State took the same property, the person would be entitled to a maximum amount of \$23,785.

The State does not have a sound policy reason for creating inequities between property taken by eminent domain for projects utilizing federal funds as opposed to projects that are solely State funded. In this instance, the most prudent course of action would be to have State reimbursement procedures continue to mirror those set forth by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance Act.

For these reasons, I have vetoed House Bill 590.