



Telephone: (517) 373-5383

Fax: (517) 373-1986

House Bill 5007 (as discharged)

Sponsor: Representative Ryan Berman House Committee: Government Operations

Senate Committee: Families, Seniors, and Veterans (discharged)

CONTENT

The bill would amend Public Act 222 of 1972, which governs the form, issuance, and use of an official State personal identification (ID) card, to do the following:

- -- Delete a requirement that an applicant pay a fee of \$10 to the Secretary of State (SOS) for each original or renewal official State personal ID card issued.
- -- Prohibit the SOS from charging a fee, beginning January 1, 2022, for issuing an original or a renewal official State personal ID card, for the late renewal of an official State personal ID card, or for renewing a corrected official State personal ID card.
- -- Specify that the SOS would have to waive the \$10 fee for a duplicate official State personal ID card if the individual were participating in and receiving benefits from the Family Independence Program or the State Disability Assistance Program or the individual had a homeless verification letter and a photo identification card generated from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Homeless Management Information System.

The bill is tie-barred to Senate Bill 303, which would amend the Michigan Election Law to require a voter to vote a provisional ballot if the voter did not have his or her ID or if his or her signature were determined not to match the digitized signature in the electronic poll book.

MCL 28.292 & 28.292a Legislative Analyst: Tyler VanHuyse

FISCAL IMPACT

The bill would result in a loss in revenue collections for the Department of State as a result of the elimination of the \$10 fee for issuance or renewal of a State personal identification card. Also, the bill would eliminate the \$10 fee for a late renewal. The Department collects an estimated \$2.5 million annually from new issuances, renewals, and reissues of State personal ID cards. Currently the fees are deposited in the State's General Fund and appropriated to the Department as a State restricted fund to support the Department's costs to implement Public Act 222 of 1972. The bill would require the Legislature to appropriate the necessary funds from the General Fund. Accordingly, the cost likely would be neutral for the Department; however, the State's General Fund would be reduced by the corresponding amount lost from the collection of the \$10 fee.

Date Completed: 10-6-21 Fiscal Analyst: Joe Carrasco