

Legislative Analysis



TRANSFER MANAGEMENT OF LOCAL BRIDGES

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

House Bill 4973 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Annette Glenn
Committee: Transportation
Complete to 10-8-19

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

SUMMARY:

House Bill 4973 would amend two sections of 1951 PA 51 (“Act 51”), the act that governs the distribution of funding for state and local road and bridge programs. Specifically, the bill would amend section 12 to authorize the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to enter into a written agreement with a local road agency “to transfer management of 1 or more bridges under the jurisdiction of a local road agency to the department as provided in the written agreement.”

The bill would also amend Section 9a, the section dealing with the development of asset management plans, to exempt from the required local road agency asset management plan bridges that MDOT has management over under a written agreement with a local road agency as provided under the proposed amendment to section 12.

MCL 247.659a and 247.662

FISCAL IMPACT:

Section 9a of Act 51 defines “local road agency” to mean “a county road commission or designated county road agency or city or village that is responsible for the construction or maintenance of public roads within the state under this act.”

Through a process defined under sections 2 through 5 of the act, county road commissions (or designated county road agencies) have jurisdiction over a system of county roads. As provided under section 12, county road commissions and designated county road agencies receive a distribution from the Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF) for the preservation, construction, acquisition, and extension of the county road system.

Through a process defined under sections 6 through 9 of the act, cities and villages have jurisdiction over a system of city and village streets. As provided under section 13, cities and villages receive a distribution from the MTF for the preservation, construction, acquisition, and extension of the city and villages streets.

Bridges are part of many local road systems. There is not a separate MTF distribution for local bridges. County road commissions have to provide for preservation of bridges on the county road system from their MTF distributions. Similarly, cities and villages have to provide for preservation of bridges on city and villages street systems from their MTF distributions.

Bridges have specific preservation requirements. In some cases, local road agencies do not have specific expertise in bridge engineering. In addition, it could be more efficient to have a single large agency, MDOT, with bridge engineering expertise, manage a number of local bridges on behalf local road agencies.

The bill is permissive. It authorizes, but does not require, state-local road agency agreements for bridge maintenance. The fiscal impact cannot be readily estimated at this time.

Fiscal Analyst: William E. Hamilton

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.