

## AERONAUTICS CODE REVISIONS

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

**House Bills 4834 and 4835 as introduced**

**Sponsor: Rep. Jaime Green**

**Committee: Transportation and Infrastructure**

**Revised 9-15-25**

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

## SUMMARY:

**House Bill 4834** would amend the Aeronautics Code of the State of Michigan, which regulates aviation in the state, to make changes and updates, often technical, as described below. Among other things, the act provides for the licensure, registration, and oversight of aircraft, airports, aviation schools, crew members, and related operations; authorizes forms of airport organization, including related authorities and police powers; and establishes aviation fuel taxes and registration and licensing fees. The act establishes the State Aeronautics Commission with general supervisory authority over aeronautics in Michigan. The act also establishes a director of aeronautics, within the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), as the executive officer of the commission with authority to administer the act.

### Uncrewed aircraft

The act now defines the term ***aircraft***, when used in the act, to mean any contrivance used or designed for navigation of or flight in the air. The bill would expressly provide that the term ***aircraft*** includes both crewed and uncrewed aircraft.<sup>1</sup>

The bill would add a provision requiring uncrewed aircraft to be operated in accordance with applicable federal regulations.

The bill would authorize the Office of Aeronautics in MDOT to develop and issue rules establishing licensing standards for ***droneports*** and ***vertiports***. The standards would be limited to those necessary for the safe integration of uncrewed aircraft systems in the state and would have to include at least standards related to physical placement, communication, infrastructure minimums, obstruction clearance, visual markings, and security.

***Droneport*** would mean a fixed or mobile location for housing, maintaining, fueling, and piloting commercial fleets of drones and for the safe flying of drones.

***Vertiport*** would mean a structure or area of land or water that is used for the takeoff and landing of VTOL (vertical takeoff and landing) aircraft.

---

<sup>1</sup> The bill uses the terms *crewed aircraft*, *uncrewed aircraft*, *uncrewed aircraft system*, *drone*, and *VTOL aircraft* but does not specifically define them.

### Commercial operations

The term ***commercial activity or operations***, when used in the act, is now defined as an activity or operation that offers aeronautic facilities or services to the public, such as the following:

- The sale of gasoline or oil.
- The soliciting or engaging in charter flying or flight instruction.
- The provision of shelter or the tie-down of an aircraft.
- The overhaul or repair of an aircraft or engines.

The bill would add “the provision of skydiving services in any form” to the above list of examples of an activity or operation that offers aeronautic facilities or services to the public.

The act now requires all commercial operations to be based out of a licensed aeronautical facility. The bill would eliminate that provision. In addition, the bill would eliminate provisions that now prohibit commercial operations from being conducted on either of the following:

- A *private landing area* (a location, either on land or water, that is used for the takeoff or landing of aircraft and whose use is restricted to the owner or persons authorized by the owner).
- Any land-based landing area that is not at a licensed aeronautical facility (unless conducted under a temporary field permit issued under the act).

### Aircraft registration

With some exceptions, an aircraft that is based in the state must be registered annually with the commission, and a registration fee must be paid. Although the bill would retain this provision, it would amend other provisions to provide for a three-year registration period instead of an annual one. Where the act now provides that registrations expire on January 1 each year, and requires renewal notices to be sent by the previous November 1, the bill would refer more generally to a three-year registration period and require fees to be paid every three years.

Currently, a registration fee must be paid at the rate of one cent per pound of the greater of the maximum gross weight or maximum takeoff weight it is certified for by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The bill would provide for the three-year registration to be at the rate of three cents per pound (i.e., the current annual fee over a longer registration period).

An aircraft owner that fails to register or pay the registration fee is subject to a penalty of \$50, plus \$5 for each month the fee and penalty remain unpaid, for up to one year. The bill would change this to up to three years to reflect the longer registration period.

The bill also would remove a provision that now provides for an annual registration fee to be cut in half for an aircraft being registered for the first time after July 1.

The bill would add in law that fees can be paid through an electronic credit card payment.

Finally, the bill would remove provisions that now require an aircraft to have been assigned a registration number by the FAA and have a valid and effective registration certificate issued by the FAA or a foreign government before it can be issued state certification.

#### Dealer's licenses

Similarly to the above, the act requires a person engaged in the business of buying, selling, brokering, or dealing in aircraft required to be registered under the act to be licensed by the commission. Currently, the license fee is \$25 per year, and licenses expire on January 1 of each year. The bill would provide that licenses expire after one or three years, and the license fee for the three-year period would be \$75. The bill does not state how (or by whom) the term of licensure would be decided. The bill also would eliminate a 50% proration for licenses applied for after July 1.

#### Airport license fee

The bill would require the license fee associated with an airport to be used to support the safety inspection of that facility. If a facility with deficiencies requires multiple inspections to be licensed, reinspection fees would apply.

#### State Aeronautics Fund

The act establishes the State Aeronautics Fund (SAF) and requires all money received from aviation fuel taxes, as well as the portion of sales and use taxes earmarked under the General Sales Tax Act and the Use Tax Act, to be deposited into the fund. In addition, money received from various license fees and from the operation of state-operated airports, landing fields, and aeronautic facilities must be paid into the state treasury and credited to the SAF.

The bill would additionally require money received from the operation of state-owned or state-maintained weather observation stations, from "transportation reimbursements," and from any other aeronautical services to be paid into the state treasury and credited to the SAF.

Currently, all money in and credited to the SAF is appropriated for carrying out the act and to meet the expenses of the Office of Aeronautics within MDOT. The act currently requires the approval and release by the State Administrative Board of amounts authorized, upon appropriation, to be paid to persons as directed by the Office of Aeronautics. The bill would remove the State Administrative Board requirement.

In addition, the act now requires that SAF money that is appropriated or later made available be expended on an aviation project only if the project is carried out under the supervision and direction of the Office of Aeronautics. The bill would further require that the project be carried out with the approval of the State Aeronautics Commission.

#### Inspection officers

The act allows the State Aeronautics Commission to prescribe the duties and employment conditions of *enforcement* officers, and among other things provides for the following:

- Enforcement officers must be law enforcement officers in Michigan.

- Enforcement officers generally have the authority of police officers, and must be vested with the power and authority of deputy sheriffs, except that their authority is limited to investigating and enforcing the act, other laws related to airports in Michigan, and commission rules and orders.
- Enforcement officers can issue summons, make arrests, and initiate criminal proceedings against offenders.

The bill would eliminate all of the above provisions. Instead, the bill would allow the State Aeronautics Commission to prescribe the duties and employment conditions of *inspection* officers to enforce and investigate violations of the act, other laws related to airports in Michigan, and commission rules and orders. Under the bill, an aeronautical facility licensed, permitted, or approved by the commission would be subject to inspection by an inspection officer at any time.

#### Other changes to defined terms

The term ***public use facility***, when used in the act, means an airport, landing field, or other aeronautical facility that is available for use by the general public without prior approval of the owner or operator. The bill would expressly provide that both publicly owned and privately owned airports, landing fields, and aeronautical facilities are included in that definition.

The bill would provide that the term ***private airport***, when used in the act, has the same definition as *private landing area* (see above). This change could clarify the scope of a current provision of the act that allows a ***political subdivision*** that has established an airport, landing field, or other aeronautical facility to adopt and enact rules, regulations, and ordinances designed to safeguard the public on or beyond the limits of a *private airport* in its jurisdiction against the hazards of “instrumentalities used in aerial navigation.” (The term *private airport* is used nowhere else in the act.)

***Political subdivision*** means a county, city, village, or township of this state, and any other political subdivision, public corporation, authority, or district in this state that is or may be authorized by law to acquire, establish, construct, maintain, improve, and operate airports, landing fields, and other aeronautical facilities.

Currently, the definition of ***state primary surface*** provides that, for an unpaved runway or a planned paved runway, the state primary surface ends at each end of the runway (as opposed to extending 200 feet beyond each end, as for a paved runway). The bill would remove the reference to planned paved runways from these provisions.

The bill would add automated weather systems to the definition of ***airport facilities*** that applies to the chapter of the act that regulates the airports and facilities of public airport authorities.

#### Other amendments

Currently, the director of the Office of Aeronautics within MDOT is appointed by the State Aeronautics Commission to serve an indefinite term, at the pleasure of the commission, for

compensation determined by the commission. The bill would instead provide for MDOT to appoint, and determine the compensation of, the director. The bill does not specify either the length of the director's term or that the term is indefinite.

The act currently requires the commission to notify the State Administrative Board of any obstruction determined to be a hazard near a state-owned airport, landing field, or other aeronautical facility, and authorizes the State Administrative Board to institute proceedings to abate the hazard. Under the bill, MDOT would assume the roles the State Administrative Board now has in these provisions.

Finally, the bill would repeal section 36 of the act, an obsolete provision that prescribed the scope of jurisdiction of a Michigan Department of Aeronautics created in 1945.

MCL 259.2 et seq.

**House Bill 4835** would amend the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Act so that a reference there to provisions of the Aeronautics Code will reflect the change under House Bill 4834 from *enforcement* officers to *inspection* officers.

MCL 28.602

Neither bill can take effect unless both bills are enacted.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

The bills do not appear to have a direct and material fiscal impact on state or local units of government.

Legislative Analyst: E. Best  
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.