

## ACCOMMODATIONS FOR ANIMAL RAISERS AND TRAINERS OF SERVICE ANIMALS

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

**House Bill 5486 as introduced**  
**Sponsor: Rep. Tommy Brann**  
**Committee: Regulatory Reform**  
**Complete to 9-16-20**

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

### SUMMARY:

House Bill 5486 would amend the Michigan Penal Code to apply provisions of law that currently apply only to the use of a service animal by a person with a disability in a public accommodation to apply also to a *trainer* or *animal raiser* of a service animal.

*Trainer* would mean an individual employed by a service animal agency that is accredited by Assistance Dogs International or the International Guide Dog Federation.

*Animal raiser* would mean an individual who raises and socializes a young animal that may later be trained by a service animal agency accredited by Assistance Dogs International or the International Guide Dog Federation.

2015 PA 144 revised requirements in the Penal Code pertaining to conduct by a public accommodation regarding the use of a service animal in, and access to, the public accommodation by a person with a disability. The legislation, however, deleted language in the code that had extended the previous requirements to include those who were training the service animals.

The bill would specifically require a public accommodation to modify its policies, practices, and procedures to allow the use of a service animal by a trainer or animal raiser, if either were being accompanied by the service animal for the purpose of training or socializing it. All current provisions pertaining to the conduct by a public accommodation or responsibilities of a person with a disability would be revised to also apply to a trainer or animal raiser. This would include the following when the service animal was with a trainer or animal raiser:

- Allow staff of a public accommodation to ask what work or task the service animal has been or is being trained, or is being socialized, to perform.
- Prohibit a public accommodation from isolating a handler when accompanied by the service animal or treating the handler less favorably than other patrons or charging a fee or surcharge not charged to others.
- Prohibit a public accommodation from requiring payment of a surcharge even if other pet owners are required to pay it.
- Require a public accommodation to allow the service animal to accompany the handler in all areas where members of the public, clients, customers, and so on are permitted to go.
- Prohibit a public accommodation from asking the service animal to be removed from the premises due to allergies or fear.

- Require the service animal to be under the control of the handler and, with some exceptions, have a harness, leash, or other tether.
- Allow a public accommodation to ask for the service animal to be removed if it is out of control and the handler does not take effective action to control it.
- Require a public accommodation that properly excludes a service animal to give the handler the opportunity to obtain goods, services, or accommodations without having the service animal on the premises.
- Allow handlers to be charged for damages caused by the service animal.

The bill would allow a public accommodation to request documentation from an animal raiser showing that the animal is being socialized to later perform tasks or work as a service animal.

MCL 750.502c

### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

House Bill 5486 would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on the state and on local units of government. Under the bill, public accommodations would be required to modify their policies to allow service for the trainers and animal raisers of service animals. An increase in misdemeanor convictions could result due to public accommodations not complying with the new requirements. There is no way to know the number of convictions that would result under provisions of the bill. New misdemeanor convictions would increase costs related to county jails and/or local misdemeanor probation supervision. Costs of local incarceration in county jails and local misdemeanor probation supervision, and how those costs are financed, vary by jurisdiction. The fiscal impact on local court systems would depend on how provisions of the bill affected caseloads and related administrative costs. Any increase in penal fine revenue would increase funding for public and county law libraries, which are the constitutionally designated recipients of those revenues.

Legislative Analyst: Susan Stutzky  
Fiscal Analyst: Robin Risko

---

■ 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.