

directed towards the land not towards such people or entities. An analogy drawn from the doctrine of standing provides support for our view that the effect on persons outside the county is too remote and speculative to result in House Bill 1785 being held a public general law. While a Baltimore County paper-hanger wishing to do business in Baltimore City would clearly have had standing to challenge the law involved in the Dasch case, a person seeking construction employment or permanent employment in connection with the development of one of the facilities prohibited by House Bill 1785 would certainly lack standing to challenge the bill whether he was from Anne Arundel County or not. Owners of property adjoining a proposed site for such a facility would have standing to challenge a zoning ordinance or other law allowing its construction, but it is at best questionable whether they would have standing to challenge a law prohibiting its construction - and this would be so whether their adjoining land was located within or without the county. The only person or persons who would have standing to challenge House Bill 1785 would be persons either owning land located within the county or persons with contractual rights to utilize Anne Arundel County land. While such persons might well be from outside Anne Arundel County, their standing to challenge the law would turn on their ownership of or interest in Anne Arundel County land. We believe that a strong argument can be made in the area of land use that any law which is aimed solely at the land within a single county and which does not clearly involve the protection of some significant State natural resource or other State interest must be viewed in a somewhat different light than laws which regulate directly the activities of people.

As indicated above, we recognize that oil refineries and other uses covered by House Bill 1785 (or the absence thereof) may have an impact beyond their immediate surroundings and may be of concern to persons outside of the county. While an argument could certainly be made that this impact and this concern would justify characterizing House Bill 1785 as a public general law, we do not think such an argument would prevail. Our conclusion is considerably reinforced by the limited time period for which the bill would be effective (and its correspondingly limited impact); and our view of the inappropriateness of this legislation is further reinforced by the actions recently taken by the Anne Arundel County Council to control the very same type of use.**

Finally, we should note that House Bill 1785 purports to amend Article 66B of the Annotated Code, an Article which contains a provision (Section 7.03) that "[a]nything contained in this Article shall not apply to