

Informational - HB0200 – Improper Wording

Nelda Fink

MD District 32

I'm not in favor nor opposed to this bill. And I will pass along my comments to the appropriate committee chair as soon as I determine who that is.

The wording on the bill is atrocious. Poor wording leads to confusion in execution / implementation as well as in judgment in a court system.

There is no such thing as a sub-subparagraph. The proper way to address the paragraph is using its full identifier **ONLY!** Otherwise you will have to go through all the legislation and add sub-sub-paragraph to all the paragraphs and that will be a ridiculous and unnecessary action at the expense of the taxpayer.

In the bill, lines 9 – 11 read:

(iii) 1. A. Except as provided in [subsubparagraph 2] SUBSUBSUBPARAGRAPH B of this [subparagraph] SUBSUBPARAGRAPH, if a local school system has at least 40 eligible schools, the county board may, on behalf ...

It should instead read:

(iii) 1. A. Except as provided in [subsubparagraph 2] PARAGRAPH (c) (1) (iii) 1.B of this [subparagraph] ARTICLE, if a local school system has at least 40 eligible schools, the county board may, on behalf ...

This wording is now clear and concise and will not be confusing to the reader or the implementer or the judge.

Please let me know who I can pass this along to for future bill editing.

Thank you.

IMPROVE THE WORDING of THIS BILL!

Nelda Fink