

Olds Plaza Building, 10th Floor Lansing, Michigan 48909 Phone: 517/373-6466

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

In 1970, Iron County conveyed for \$1.00 a parcel of land to the Department of State Police (DSP) with the expressed intention that the DSP would build a new police post on the site. The DSP decided several years ago instead to renovate the existing post in Iron River, and has subsequently declared the land as surplus. As the land sits adjacent to a county park and a county hospital, the county has expressed an interest in reclaiming the property and using it for public purposes. Legislation has been proposed to convey the land back to Iron County.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The bill would authorize the Department of State Police to convey a parcel of land in Bates Township, Iron County, to the county for \$1.00. The conveyance would be by quitclaim deed approved by the attorney general, and any revenue received under the bill would have to be credited to the general fund.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

According to the Department of Management and Budget, the bill would not have a fiscal impact on the state, except to relieve the state of concerns over liability issues. (6-13-97)

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The land in question originally belonged to Iron County, and was only conveyed to the state because the state had expressed an intention to build a new police post. The land was conveyed for \$1.00 and the county retained the mineral rights. Since the Department of State Police decided to renovate the existing police post in Iron River several years ago instead of building a new post, there really is no reason for the state to keep the property. It is only fair that the land be conveyed back to the county. Reportedly, the county is considering using the land for some kind of public use purpose, such as expanding the county park on one side of the property, or to expand the county hospital, which is also adjacent to the property.

IRON COUNTY CONVEYANCE

House Bill 4814 as introduced First Analysis (6-17-97)

Sponsor: Rep. Paul Tesanovich Committee: Regulatory Affairs

POSITIONS:

The Department of Management and Budget supports the bill. (6-13-97)

Analyst: S. Stutzky

[■] This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.