



**House
Legislative
Analysis
Section**

Manufacturer's Bank Building, 12th Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone: 517/373-6466

INCLUDE TOWNSHIPS ON HIGHWAY MAP

House Bill 5636 (Substitute H-1)
First Analysis (4-9-90)

RECEIVED

Sponsor: Rep. James A. Kosteva
Committee: Transportation

MAY 16 1990

Mich. State Leg. Lib. 111

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

Michigan's Department of Transportation (MDOT) currently oversees the design and printing of the official state highway map. MDOT's map committee uses various criteria to determine which items (i.e. cities, roads, highways, lakes, rivers, and the like) belong on the map and which do not. Apparently to reduce clutter, the committee does not include townships on the map unless one has a post office and meets certain minimum size requirements (generally, at least 60,000 people). Townships that meet these criteria are for the most part located in the Detroit area, but even so are added only to the Detroit city-insert map on the reverse side of the full state map. Some people feel the 60,000 figure is too high and that some smaller townships should be added to both the state and the appropriate city insert map. With this in mind, legislation has been proposed to create a state map act that would specify guidelines for including on the map all that is currently on the map, and also would provide for the inclusion of certain townships.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The bill would create the State of Michigan Highway Map Act to prescribe requirements for the official state highway map and to give to the Department of Transportation certain powers and duties. The official map (as printed and distributed by the department) would contain only those highways and roads, units of government, and other travel information described in the bill, while the department would determine the appropriate coloring and symbols to be used.

Highways and Roads. The official map would include the following information relative to highways and roads:

- The federal and state trunkline system;
- Selected county roads from information supplied by county engineers;
- The primary signed intercounty route system;
- Interstate exit numbers when a route was complete from beginning to end;
- Interchange detail on city inserts and the Detroit area only; and
- Out-of-state trunklines and county roads through information supplied by the highway departments of various states and the province of Ontario.

Water Features. The map would show lakes and rivers, as space permitted, and boat lines service including the sailings and months in operation when appropriate.

Municipalities. Local governmental units would be shown considering the following guidelines:

- A city or village would be shown only if it was incorporated or had a post office with a postmaster;
- An incorporated city or village with 10,000 people or more would be shown with its boundary limits "screened" and colored yellow;

- An incorporated city or village and an unincorporated place name with less than 10,000 people would be shown with a red circle that approximates the downtown business district on a state or federal trunkline. If the business district was on a county road, the city, village or unincorporated place name would be shown with a gray circle;
- A city could have an insert on the map if it had more than 20,000 people and was incorporated;
- Out-of-state cities and villages would be shown based on information supplied by the highway departments of other states and Ontario;
- Townships with more than 25,000 people would be shown and designated where the township office was located;
- Townships with fewer than 25,000 people could be shown if 1) an obsolete settlement name location within the township was removed and 2) a township board resolution stating this was submitted to the department;
- A township that otherwise qualified to be shown would not need to be shown if it was adjacent to a city with the same name; and
- All communities and settlements currently shown on the 1990 official map would be shown.

Various Symbols and Designations. The following items would be depicted by symbols or other appropriate designations determined by the department:

- State parks, with assistance from the Department of Natural Resources;
- Roadside parks, safety rest areas, travel information centers, and scenic turnouts;
- Certified airline airports if they had scheduled commercial flights, and military airports with 3,000-foot or more paved and lighted runways;
- Passenger and auto ferries and passenger only ferries;
- International and domestic seaports;
- International rail interchange points;
- Indian reservations;
- County seats shown by a black circle with a black dot in the center;
- The state capitol shown by double black circles around a black star;
- Hospitals with 24-hour emergency facilities;
- Intercity bus terminals as shown on city inserts only;
- Rail passenger stations as shown on city inserts only;
- Post offices if recognized by the U.S. Post Office;
- Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore;
- Father Marquette National Memorial shown by a solid red circle;
- National Ski Hall of Fame as directed by a red arrow;
- Mt. Curwood, the state's highest point, indicated by a red asterisk;
- Michigan Space Center shown by a red arrow;
- 4-year universities having 10,000 or more students on city inserts only.

H.B. 5636 (4-9-90)

OVER

Information Panels. Informational panels could only display:

- facilities that charged a fare;
- state police posts including their telephone numbers;
- the state's speed limits including an explanation of the right turn law;
- state highway district offices including a telephone number;
- a listing of counties and county seats showing their populations as of the last federal or special census;
- historical markers;
- Isle Royale;
- prime deer locations from the natural resources department;
- state parks;
- travel information;
- public accommodations;
- mileage chart;
- index to cities and villages; and
- city area panels that were shown on the 1990 official map.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

According to the transportation department, the bill would have budgetary implications for the state. As the bill could provide for perhaps 20 additional townships being added to the official state highway map, additional staff would be required and more time would have to be spent by the staff to work the new townships into the new map design. The department's cost under the bill could not be determined but would depend on how many townships actually qualified and how these additions would affect the current map's layout. Further, to accommodate those townships that qualified to be added, a larger map could be needed at an additional cost. (4-5-90)

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The bill would provide statutory guidelines for the design of Michigan's official highway map, but more specifically would require that townships with at least 25,000 people that also had a post office be included on both the large state map as well as the individual city inserts. (Townships smaller than this could also be added if a township's board submitted a resolution to delete an existing obsolete settlement name.) Currently, other municipalities with a fairly small population (for instance cities or villages with at least 10,000 people) are often included on the map. By specifying criteria for the inclusion of, primarily, townships with at least 25,000 people, the bill would help travelers locate them on the map. Apparently, about 20 townships would qualify for addition to the full state map and the city inserts under the bill. (Four townships — Redford, Canton, Waterford, and Clinton — are now shown on the Detroit city insert found on the reverse side of the official state map.)

Against:

Cartography, which is the science of map design, is an art best left to qualified engineers and designers. The official state highway map, according to a spokesman from MDOT's map committee, is already too cluttered — especially in the Detroit area. Legislating what should and should not be added to the official map would be unnecessarily costly (a larger map could very easily be required to accommodate more townships) and could present a danger to drivers who had to struggle to read

an overly-cluttered map. Further, MDOT's map designers receive hundreds of requests annually for changes to be made to the map (which is redesigned and printed every two years) and must carefully consider the impact that even one change might have on the entire design. The bill would interfere with this process by encouraging many other special interest groups to request that they, too, be added to the map.

POSITIONS:

The Michigan Townships Association supports the bill. (4-5-90)

Canton Township supports the bill. (4-5-90)

The Department of Transportation opposes the concept of the bill. (4-5-90)