

Legislative Analysis



SOS OFFICE LOCATIONS

Mitchell Bean, Director
Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 5686 (Substitute H-3)
Sponsor: Rep. Kathy Angerer
Committee: Government Operations

Complete to 2-2-10

A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 5686 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE

The bill would amend the section of the Michigan Vehicle Code that specifies where the Secretary of State must maintain offices.

The bill would require that the Secretary of State maintain any office in existence and operating on December 1, 2009 that was located in a city or township with a population of 10,000 or more.

Currently, Section 205 of the Vehicle Code requires the Secretary of State to maintain an office in the Capitol complex and other places in the state as considered necessary to carry out the powers and duties of the office. The code also requires that at least one office be established in each county. In counties with a population of under 300,000, the code requires one office be established in each city with a population of 10,000 or more, although the city requirement does not apply within a radius of five miles from a county office location, nor to contiguous cities with a combined population of 10,000 or more. This language remains in place.

MCL 257.205

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

According to committee testimony on an earlier version of the bill, the proposed legislation would prevent the Secretary of State from closing an office in Bedford Township in Monroe County, a township with a population of about 30,000 (larger than the city of Monroe). As amended on the House floor, the bill now would also appear to prevent the proposed merger of the Lansing and East Lansing SOS offices. It could apply elsewhere in the future. The provision only applies to the preservation of existing offices and does not require the opening of any new offices.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The bill provides that the Secretary of State shall maintain an office in a city or township with a population of 10,000 or more that was in existence on December 1, 2009. It is unclear how many branch offices would fall under this provision, but the Secretary of State would no longer realize the savings from each branch office scheduled for closure that would now be required to be maintained under this provision.

POSITIONS:

A representative of Bedford Township testified in support of an earlier version of the bill. (12-15-09)

The Department of State testified in opposition to an earlier version of the bill. (12-15-09)

Legislative Analyst: Chris Couch
Fiscal Analyst: Ben Gielczyk

■ 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.