

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

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

The Home Rule City Act permits a city with a population of one million or more to issue general obligation bonds for any purposes allowed under Michigan laws and also allows a city of more than one million population to provide a procedure by ordinance to finance special assessments for contracts with private contractors for snow removal, mosquito abatement, and security services. However, it is estimated that Detroit, the only Michigan city that has had a population in excess of one million, may fall short of that number in the next census. In addition, Public Act 58 of 1998 recodified the Michigan Liquor Control Act and renamed it as the Michigan Liquor Control Code of 1998. Technical amendments have been offered that would lower the population figures in the act to 750,000 to accommodate the possible decrease in Detroit's population, and to update references to the Michigan Liquor Control Act to reflect the title change.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The bill would amend the Home Rule City Act to decrease the population requirement for cities from one million to 750,000 for contracting with private contractors for certain city services by ordinance and for issuing general obligation bonds and other evidences of debt. The bill would also amend the act to revise and update references to the Michigan Liquor Control Code of 1998.

MCL 117.4l, 117.5i, and 117.35a

HOME RULE CITY ACT AMENDMENTS

House Bill 6260 with committee amendment First Analysis (12-2-98)

Sponsor: Rep. Ilona Varga Committee: Regulatory Affairs

Fiscal information is not available.

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The amendments are technical in nature and so would not represent a change in policy. In light of the impending decrease in Detroit's population in the 2000 census, it only makes sense to adjust those provisions of law pertaining to Detroit so that the laws may continue to be enforced as intended.

POSITIONS:

There are no positions on the bill.

Analyst: S. Stutzky

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

[■]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.