

CITY OF BALTIMORE

BRANDON SCOTT – MAYOR

ZEKE COHEN - COUNCIL PRESIDENT



OFFICE OF COUNCIL SERVICES

NANCY MEAD – DIRECTOR

100 N. HOLIDAY STREET

BALTIMORE MD, 21202

HEARING NOTES

Bill: 25-0116

Title: Security Officers - Compensation

Committee: Labor & Workforce

Chaired by: Jermaine Jones

Hearing Date: 12/10/2025

Time (Beginning): 5:32 PM

Time (Ending): 6:38 PM

Location: Du Burns Council Chamber / Webex

Total Attendance: Approximately 16

Committee Members in Attendance: Jones, Dorsey, Porter

Bill Synopsis in the file? YES NO N/A

Attendance sheet in the file? YES NO N/A

Agency reports read? YES NO N/A

Hearing televised or audio-digitally recorded? YES NO N/A

Certification of advertising/posting notices in the file? YES NO N/A

Evidence of notification to property owners? YES NO N/A

Final vote taken at this hearing? YES NO N/A

Motioned by:

Seconded by:

Final Vote:

Major Speakers

(This is not an attendance record.)

Ty'lor Schnella – Mayors Office of Government Relations

Jeffrey Huchstein - Baltimore City Law Department

Gabriel Stuart-Sikowitz – Department of Finance

Zachary Wellman – Office of Equity and Civil Rights

Aracely Stafford – Wage Commission

Major Issues Discussed

- Chair Jones opened the hearing by introducing Bill 25-0116, which would increase wages and benefits for security officers in Baltimore. The bill aims to set a fair minimum compensation standard for security officers, addressing disparities and ensuring wages reflect the role they play in community safety.
- The Council President then gave brief remarks in support of the bill:
 - o He explained why he supports the legislation.
 - o Noted that security workers contribute to public safety and deserve recognition for their role in reducing crime.
 - o Emphasized it is unacceptable that many security officers making regular rounds, including in City Hall, earn minimum wage.
 - o Stated passing the bill is the right thing to do.
- Chair Jones then gave a brief overview of the bill in a presentation.
- The Chair moved to agency reports, beginning with the Law Department, represented by Jeffrey Hochsten.
- Ty'lor Schnella from the Mayor's Office then gave remarks, stating that the following agency reports are not in opposition to the bill but aim to support security officers while ensuring the city's administrative needs are met.
- The Department of Finance presented concerns:
 - o They do not support certain aspects of the bill that could create costs for the city.
 - o Noted potential costs such as creating 2–3 positions to enforce the legislation.
 - o Also noted impacts on small businesses in terms of increased pay obligations.
- The Department of General Services provided their agency report and deferred to BBMR for any reasons for opposition.
- The Office of Equity and Civil Rights and the Wage Commission gave their agency report:
 - o They do not oppose increasing wages for security officers.
 - o However, they cited staffing concerns and are open to discussions on amendments to ensure fairness and feasibility.
- Chair Jones then opened for questions:
 - o He began by questioning the staffing concerns. The Wage Commission noted they currently have three investigators and indicated they would need 2–3 additional staffers to enforce the bill. The Commission added that they do not automatically receive employer paychecks but must request them as necessary, prompting Chair Jones to ask why more staff would be needed under those conditions.

- Councilwoman Porter asked if there is any process to require paycheck documentation from private entities. The Wage Commission noted that under Bill 25-0116, enforcement would be limited to minimum wage paychecks. Councilwoman Porter stated she would like an amendment so that anyone contracting with the city would also be required to provide documentation to the Wage Commission.
- Councilwoman Porter then asked the Office of Equity to explain their opposition and whether it related to the survey requirement in the legislation. They responded that it was not related to the survey.
- Chair Jones followed Councilwoman Porter's question by asking whether the opposition to the bill is solely financial or staffing-related. He pointed out that the bill would not go into effect until January 1, 2027, and questioned why concerns are being raised now. The Department of Finance and Ty'lor Schnella responded that they are already budgeting for 2027, and the costs would need to be included. Chair Jones noted that the additional staffing request would only be about 0.8% of the relevant budget.
- The Chair then moved to Public Testimony, where current and former security officers, as well as lobbyists, spoke in support of the bill.

Further Study

Was further study requested?

Yes No

If yes, describe.

Juliane Jemmott,

Date: 12/10/2025

Cc: Bill File
OCS Chrono File