



Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

BILL ANALYSIS



Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986  
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 1266 (as reported without amendment)  
Sponsor: Senator Michael D. Bishop  
Committee: Local, Urban and State Affairs

Date Completed: 10-21-04

## **RATIONALE**

In Oakland County, where 43 lake improvement boards have been formed to provide for the improvement of lakes or adjacent wetlands, there have been concerns among some local governments that they are not adequately represented on the boards, and that conflicts between representatives of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and other board members are impeding the boards' work. Additionally, language in the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act governing lake improvement boards requires that the county drain commissioner serve on each board in a county. Some people have suggested that local government representation on the boards should be increased; the requirement that a DEQ member serve on each board be deleted; and the drain commissioner allowed to designate someone to serve on the board in his or her place.

## **CONTENT**

**The bill would amend Part 309 (Inlake Lake Improvement) of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act to do the following:**

- Revise the membership of a lake improvement board.**
- Establish a process for the dissolution of a lake board.**
- Provide for record-keeping responsibilities for a lake board.**
- Include administrative expenses in the cost of a lake improvement project.**

Under Part 309, the governing body of a local unit of government containing all or

part of a public inland lake, may provide for the improvement of the lake or adjacent wetland upon its own motion or by petition of two-thirds of the owners of land abutting the lake. The governing body then must set up a lake board to proceed with improving the lake or to void the project. When instructed by the local governing body, the lake board must determine the scope of the project and establish a special assessment district, including all parcels of land and local units that will be benefited by the lake improvement.

Currently, a lake board consists of a member of the county board of commissioners appointed by the board's chairperson for each county affected by the lake improvement project; a representative from each local unit of government affected by the project, other than a county, appointed by the legislative body; the county drain commissioner, or a member of the county road commission in a county not having a drain commissioner; and a representative of the DEQ. Under the bill, a second representative from each local government would be appointed to the lake board; the county drain commissioner would be allowed to appoint a designee to the board; and a representative of the DEQ would not serve on the board.

A lake board could be dissolved by the governing body of any local unit of government in which all or part of the public inland lake was situated, upon its own motion or by petition of two-thirds of the freeholders owning land abutting the lake, if the local governing body determined that the lake board was no longer necessary for the improvement of the lake or adjacent

wetlands because the reasons for the lake board no longer existed. The lake board could only be dissolved if all outstanding indebtedness and expenses were paid in full and any excess funds had been refunded based on the last approved assessment roll.

Before dissolution of a lake board, the local governing body would have to hold a public hearing, and notice of the hearing would have to be published twice in a newspaper of general circulation in each local unit of government that was affected. The first notice would have to be published at least 10 days before the date of the public hearing.

The Act requires a lake board to elect a chairperson and a secretary. Under the bill, the secretary would have to be one of the representatives from the local units of government. The secretary would have to attend meetings of the lake board and would have to keep a record of the proceedings and perform other duties delegated by the lake board.

The treasurer for the local unit of government affected most by the project would have to keep the financial records and sign all vouchers for expenditures approved by the lake board. All other records of the lake board would have to be transmitted to the clerk for a local unit of government. The clerk would have to maintain all records for the lake board. A local unit of government could charge a lake board for the cost of maintaining records and the administration of financial affairs of the lake board, which would be an expense to the special assessment district.

A lake board would have to meet at least once a year to establish a budget for improvements, services, or other expenditures approved by the board. A lake board could retain an attorney to advise the board in the proper performance of its duties. The attorney would have to represent the board in actions brought by or against it.

Currently, within 10 days after the letting of contracts or immediately after an appeal has been decided, a lake board must compute the entire cost of a project, including all preliminary costs and engineering and inspection costs incurred and all of the following:

- The fees and expenses of special commissioners.
- The compensation to be paid the board.
- The contracts for dredging or other work to be done on the project.
- The estimated cost of an appeal if the apportionment made by the lake board is not sustained.
- The estimated cost of inspection.
- The cost of publishing all notices required.
- All costs of the circuit court.
- Attorney fees for legal services in connection with the project.
- Interest on bonds for the first year, if bonds are to be issued.

The bill would add to this list any other costs necessary for the administration of lake board proceedings, including compensation of county or local representatives serving on the lake board, record compilation and retention, and State, county, or local government professional staff services.

MCL 324.30903 et al.

## **ARGUMENTS**

*(Please note: The arguments contained in this analysis originate from sources outside the Senate Fiscal Agency. The Senate Fiscal Agency neither supports nor opposes legislation.)*

### **Supporting Argument**

Lake improvement boards are usually formed for projects that affect only one or two local governments. By increasing the number of representatives from each local government on a board from one to two, the bill would ensure that they had a greater say in the board's decisions. Additionally, permitting the drain commissioner to appoint a designee would free the commissioner from having to serve on dozens of separate boards in counties with a large number of them. Finally, the bill would delete the requirement that a representative of the DEQ serve on each board, thus eliminating a major cause of friction on many boards.

Additionally, the bill would improve the record-keeping of the lake boards by clarifying which local government officials would be responsible for that task. Currently, there is no uniformity among the individual boards as to the person

responsible for their records, and records are kept by both local and county officials.

### **Opposing Argument**

The bill would require local clerks and treasurers to take on record-keeping responsibilities for the lake improvement boards. There is some concern, however, about whether small township and village governments would be able to handle the additional paperwork. Although the bill would address the situation in Oakland County, where most local governments are well staffed and have good record-keeping capabilities, many of Michigan's smaller villages and townships might not have the capacity to perform the additional record-keeping responsibilities.

Legislative Analyst: J.P. Finet

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State government.

The bill would allow the local unit of government responsible for maintaining records for a lake board to recover its costs by charging them to the lake board, which could include them as a cost of a lake improvement project.

Fiscal Analyst: Jessica Runnels

A0304s1266a

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.