



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 Bills 485 through 492 (as introduced 6-16-11)  
Sponsor: Senator John Pappageorge (S.B. 485)  
Senator Arlan Meekhof (S.B. 486)  
Senator Jack Brandenburg (S.B. 487)  
Senator Dave Robertson (S.B. 488)  
Senator Dave Hildenbrand (S.B. 489 & 491)  
Senator Bruce Caswell (S.B. 490)  
Senator Darwin L. Booher (S.B. 492)  
Committee: Local Government and Elections

Date Completed: 6-20-11

### **CONTENT**

**The bills would amend various statutes to prohibit a local unit of government from adopting a charter, if applicable, or an ordinance or resolution, that included a minimum staffing requirement for employees of that local unit.**

The prohibition would apply beginning on the bills' effective date. Any provision in a charter, ordinance, or resolution adopted on or after that date that contained a minimum staffing requirement would be void and unenforceable.

Senate Bill 485 would amend the Home Rule City Act. Senate Bill 486 would amend Public Act 156 of 1851 (which governs county boards of commissioners). Senate Bill 487 would amend Public Act 293 of 1966 (which governs charter counties). Senate Bill 488 would amend Public Act 139 of 1973 (which provides for an optional unified form of county government). Senate Bill 490 would amend Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes of 1846 (which governs townships). Senate Bill 491 would amend the Home Rule Village Act. Senate Bill 492 would amend the General Law Village Act.

MCL 117.5 (S.B. 485)  
Proposed MCL 46.11d (S.B. 486)  
Proposed MCL 45.515b (S.B. 487)  
Proposed MCL 45.556b (S.B. 488)  
Proposed MCL 42.1b (S.B. 489)  
Proposed MCL 41.3a (S.B. 490)  
MCL 78.26 (S.B. 491)  
Proposed MCL 61.1d (S.B. 492)

Legislative Analyst: Julie Cassidy

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The bills would have no impact on current local revenue or expenditures. The bills would not eliminate any existing minimum staffing provision, but only would affect the imposition of such provisions in the future. Furthermore, the bills would not prohibit a local unit from maintaining the number of staff who might otherwise be employed under such a provision.

The bills could reduce future expenditures to the extent that, at some point, there would be local units that would have been bound by a minimum staffing requirement that was above the employment level the local unit wished to maintain. It is impossible to know how many such units would adopt such provisions in the future, or the costs of those provisions.

The bills would have no fiscal impact on State government.

Fiscal Analyst: David Zin

S1112\sb485sa.

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.