(H) MAY PROVIDE, BY LAW, FOR LIMITATIONS ON ELIGIBILITY FOR A LOCAL SUPPLEMENT GRANTED UNDER THIS SECTION IN ADDITION TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBILITY UNDER § 9–104 OF THIS TITLE.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect June 1, 1991 and shall be applicable to all taxable years beginning after June 30, 1991.

May 24, 1991

The Honorable Thomas V. Mike Miller President of the Senate State House Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed Senate Bill 251.

Senate Bill 251 prohibits the duplication of 10 or more individual pages of any printed materials by photocopying or printing unless the materials use both sides of each sheet of paper. The Secretary of a State agency, President of the Senate of Maryland, Speaker of the House of Delegates, Director of Fiscal Services, or Director of Legislative Reference may authorize duplication of materials on one side of each sheet by providing written authorization that cites specific reasons for single-sided duplication.

The intent of this legislation is laudable and I commend the sponsors for their efforts to preserve our resources and encourage office efficiency through the conservation of paper. I believe that it is the responsibility of State government to provide an example for the citizens of this State to follow in this area.

I am concerned, however, that Senate Bill 251 does not establish a practical mechanism for achieving this goal. The Director of State Energy Programs, Gary Thorpe, has advised me that this legislation creates a cumbersome, bureaucratic, and costly procedure for obtaining reasonable exceptions to the two-sided duplication requirements. Exceptions can only be granted by the Secretary of an agency by written authorization that cites specific reasons for single-sided duplication. The bill does not permit a Secretary of a large agency to delegate this authority to other officials in the agency who may be responsible for energy conservation policies. This procedure may also be impractical in situations where copying is being done in an emergency or unplanned basis.

In addition, I am advised that the limitation of the two-sided duplication requirement to 10 pages or more may exempt a significant percentage of reproduced material. It is actually my hope that the policy should extend, on a routine basis, to documents of less than 10 pages. The legislation also does not address the need of State agencies to purchase or lease photocopying machines with duplex capability.

I support the intent of this legislation but I believe State agencies should be given the flexibility to develop and implement workable mechanisms for reducing paper