



House Concurrent Resolution 34 (Substitute H-1 as reported without amendment)

Sponsor: Representative Peter MacGregor

House Committee: Appropriations

Senate Committee: Appropriations

CONTENT

The resolution would enable county sheriff departments to receive funding under the Secondary Road Patrol Grant program in FY 2011-12 without meeting a statutory maintenance of effort requirement. The resolution also would waive a statutory maintenance of effort standard that cities and villages must meet in order to receive road patrol services provided by county sheriff departments.

Under current law, counties must meet law enforcement maintenance of standards in order to receive Secondary Road Patrol Grant funds, and cities and villages must meet the standards in order to receive secondary road patrol services from counties, unless the Legislature recognizes that reductions were due to cuts in general services due to economic conditions. The resolution would provide that legislative recognition for FY 2011-12.

The Secondary Road Patrol Grant program began in FY 1978-79, under Public Act (PA) 416 of 1978, with the objective of providing financial support through grants to county sheriff offices for the costs of patrolling secondary roads. The program also provides a smaller amount (5% of the total allocations) for training costs. The program was designed to augment, not replace, existing patrol officers, so grant eligibility is limited to those counties that have maintained, and not reduced, the level of road patrols.

The grant program has \$9.0 million in restricted funds—the source being a \$10 assessment on traffic violations—allocated for FY 2011-12. Grants are distributed on a quarterly, reimbursed basis, to counties via a percentage formula that refers to a section of the Michigan Transportation Fund Act (PA 51 of 1951) that features a distribution formula of snow removal funds to counties based on the miles of roads. As an example, under this formula, Wayne County receives 14.4% of the grant money, or nearly \$1.3 million, while Kent County receives 4.1% or \$370,000 and a county with still fewer road miles, such as Iron County, receives 0.4% or \$35,000.

FISCAL IMPACT

The resolution would have no overall fiscal impact on the State budget, but would allow certain counties that otherwise would be ineligible for the grant program to receive such funds for FY 2011-12, and would allow for cities and villages to receive patrol services whether or not those units have met a maintenance of effort standard.

Date Completed: 10-27-11

Fiscal Analyst: Bruce Baker