



BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Mission Statement

On behalf of the Citizens of Baltimore City, the Public Safety Committee will be responsible for matters concerning public safety, including, but not limited to, emergency preparedness, police services, fire/EMS, & their administrative functions.

The Honorable Mark Conway

CHAIR

PUBLIC HEARING

3/10/2026

1:00PM

CLARENCE "DU" BURNS COUNCIL CHAMBERS

26-0144

*Baltimore City Policies and Procedures
Safe Spaces and Communities*

City Council Committees

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

Danielle McCray - Chair
Isaac “Yitzy” Schleifer – Vice Chair
Sharon Green Middleton
Paris Gray
Antonio Glover

*Staff: Paroma Nandi
(Paroma.Nandi@baltimorecity.gov)*

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mark Conway - Chair
Zac Blanchard – Vice Chair
Danielle McCray
Isaac “Yitzy” Schleifer
Paris Gray
Phylicia Porter
Antonio Glover

*Staff: Ethan Navarre
(Ethan.Navarre@baltimorecity.gov)*

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

James Torrence – Chair
Odette Ramos – Vice Chair
Zac Blanchard
Jermaine Jones
Antonio Glover

*Staff: Anthony Leva
(Anthony.Leva@baltimorecity.gov)*

PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

Phylicia Porter - Chair
Mark Conway - Vice Chair
Mark Parker
Ryan Dorsey
James Torrence
John Bullock
Odette Ramos

*Staff: Marguerite Currin
(Marguertie.Currin@baltimorecity.gov)*

LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

Isaac “Yitzy” Schleifer - Chair
Antonio Glover – Vice Chair
Ryan Dorsey
Sharon Green Middleton
Paris Gray

*Staff: Ethan Navarre
(Ethan.Navarre@baltimorecity.gov)*

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

Ryan Dorsey – Chair
Sharon Green Middleton – Vice Chair
Mark Parker
Paris Gray
John Bullock
Phylicia Porter
Zac Blanchard

*Staff: Anthony Leva
(Anthony.Leva@baltimorecity.gov)*

LABOR AND WORKFORCE

Jermaine Jones – Chair
James Torrence – Vice Chair
Danielle McCray
Ryan Dorsey
Phylicia Porter

*Staff: Juliane Jemmott
(Juliane.Jemmott@baltimorecity.gov)*

EDUCATION, YOUTH AND OLDER ADULT

John Bullock – Chair
Mark Parker – Vice Chair
Sharon Green Middleton
James Torrence
Zac Blanchard
Jermaine Jones
Odette Ramos

*Staff: Juliane Jemmott
(Juliane.Jemmott@baltimorecity.gov)*

CHARTER REVIEW SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Ryan Dorsey - Chair
John Bullock - Vice Chair
Zac Blanchard
Jermaine Jones
Odette Ramos

Staff: Ethan Navarre (Ethan.Navarre@baltimorecity.gov)



PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

The Honorable Mark Conway
CHAIR

Bill Hearing

25-0144

Baltimore City Policies and Procedures - Safe Spaces and Communities

For the purpose of prohibiting a covered entity from discriminating against an individual based on actual or perceived immigration status; restricting a covered entity from coordinating with federal immigration officials under certain circumstances; requiring a covered entity to adhere to certain data governance standards; requiring a covered entity to adopt a certain immigration action response plan; establishing policies and procedures for the Baltimore Police Department’s interactions with federal immigration officials; defining certain terms; providing for a special effective date; and generally relating to a covered entity’s interactions with federal immigration officials.

REPORTING AGENCIES

- Law Department
 - Office of the City Administrator
 - State’s Attorney’s Office
 - Police Department
 - Office of Equity and Civil Rights
 - Department of Finance
 - Sheriff’s Office
 - Circuit Court for Baltimore City
 - Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs
-

BACKGROUND

I. BILL SUMMARY

The bill sets a number of general requirements for “covered entities” defined as any City agency that delivers a direct public service or any legal entity that enters in to a written agreement with the City and receives money from the City to support, in whole or in part, its operations.

Those requirements would prevent any covered entity from taking the following actions, if enacted:

1. Enter into an agreement for the purpose of housing individuals subject to detention on civil immigration charges;
2. Enter into an agreement for any purpose related to the enforcement of federal immigration laws;
3. Expend or use city funds, resources, or personnel to investigate, question, apprehend, detain, or arrest an individual solely for an actual or suspected violation of federal immigration law;
4. Condition the provision of a city service or benefit on the actual or perceived citizenship or immigration status of the individual seeking that service or benefit;
5. Allow an immigration official to access a space that is not regularly accessible to the public within a facility operated by a covered entity;

6. Allow an immigration official to access an individual who is being detained by or is in the custody of a covered entity;
7. Allow an immigration official to use a covered entity's facilities, information, or equipment for an immigration enforcement action purpose; or
8. Allow an immigration official to access any information regarding an individual who is the subject of an immigration enforcement action, unless the individual has consented to the disclosure.

The bill would also prohibit discrimination and bias by any covered entity based on an individual's actual or perceived immigration status; prohibit covered entities from requesting or storing information related to individuals' immigration status; and, prohibit covered entities from investigating or assisting in the investigation of individuals' immigration statuses.

Similarly, the bill would require that covered entities keep records of any instance in which it receives a request for information from immigration enforcement officials about a specific individual. Those records must include the requesting official's identification and a copy of any written request. Additionally, a covered entity that receives such a request would be required to notify the individual who is the subject of the request.

To ensure these requirements are met, the bill would require that covered entities adopt immigration enforcement action plans and submit reports on related interactions with immigration enforcement officials to the Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs. In turn, the Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs must then compile those reports and submit a comprehensive version to the Mayor and City Council by March 1 of each year.

Finally, the bill would also limit the Baltimore Police Department's (BPD's) engagement with immigration enforcement actions to circumstances that the Department itself is required to execute a criminal warrant, court order, or other requirements under the law; however, BPD would be permitted to be present at the scene of an immigration enforcement action to de-escalate potential threats to public safety. In its engagements with immigration enforcement officials, BPD would also be required to:

1. Inquire whether any individual being held by the immigration official is being held pursuant to a warrant, a court order, or probable cause;
2. Request the name of any individual being held by the immigration official;
3. Document the interaction on the officer's body-worn camera, in adherence with department policy; and
4. Request and document the immigration official's law enforcement credentials and verify their identity by requesting they remove any mask or face covering.

II. CURRENT LANDSCAPE

Broadly, the bill would codify many policies and procedures already implemented by the City. On March 2, 2026, Mayor Scott issued an [Executive Order](#) which reaffirms City practices to protect the rights of residents and prohibits the unpermitted use of City-controlled property for civil immigration enforcement. Previously, the administration [indicated](#) city agencies were issued internal guidance last year to ensure city services and facilities remain accessible to residents, regardless of immigration or

citizenship status. Previous mayors have also signed executive orders related to federal immigration enforcement. In 2012, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake signed an [order](#) indicating that no city funds would be directed to assist in federal immigration enforcement and prohibiting the conditioning of city services on the basis of immigration status. Likewise, in 2019, Mayor Bernard “Jack” Young signed a similar [order](#).

BPD also has an existing [policy](#) in place prohibiting officers from, among other related limitations, investigating individuals on the basis of actual or perceived immigration status and assisting in immigration enforcement, except in certain circumstances.

The legislation also resembles similar laws passed in other major U.S. cities including [Boston](#), [San Francisco](#), and [Portland](#).

FISCAL NOTE

Because the City already adheres to the majority of the bill’s requirements as matters of policy, there are negligible fiscal consequences that could result from enactment. The bill would set reporting requirements related to covered entities interactions with immigration enforcement officials; however, those reporting requirements could likely be handled by existing staff.

The Department of Finance estimates the bill would result in a first-year cost of approximately \$151,000 as a result of personnel expenses related to two additional staff members in the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs and related training for staff.

Analysis by: Ethan Navarre
Analysis Date: 2/25/2026

Direct Inquiries to: Ethan.Navarre@baltimorecity.gov

**CITY OF BALTIMORE
COUNCIL BILL 26-0144
(First Reader)**

Introduced by: Councilmembers Gray, Parker, and Ramos
Cosponsored by: Councilmembers Dorsey, Conway, Middleton, Bullock, Porter, Blanchard,
Jones, Glover, Torrence, and McCray and President Cohen
Introduced and read first time: February 9, 2026
Assigned to: Public Safety Committee

REFERRED TO THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES: City Solicitor, Department of Finance, Office of the
City Administrator, Sheriff's Office, Office of the State's Attorney for Baltimore City, Circuit
Court for Baltimore City, Baltimore Police Department, Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs,
Office of Equity and Civil Rights

A BILL ENTITLED

1 AN ORDINANCE concerning

2 **Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities**

3 FOR the purpose of prohibiting a covered entity from discriminating against an individual based
4 on actual or perceived immigration status; restricting a covered entity from coordinating with
5 federal immigration officials under certain circumstances; requiring a covered entity to
6 adhere to certain data governance standards; requiring a covered entity to adopt a certain
7 immigration action response plan; establishing policies and procedures for the Baltimore
8 Police Department's interactions with federal immigration officials; defining certain terms;
9 providing for a special effective date; and generally relating to a covered entity's interactions
10 with federal immigration officials.

11 BY adding

12 Article 4 - Community Relations
13 Sections 4-1 to 4-6 to be under the new subtitle designation,
14 "Subtitle 4. Federal Immigration Enforcement"
15 Baltimore City Code
16 (Edition 2000)

17 BY adding

18 Article 17 - Police Department
19 Section 2-3
20 Baltimore City Code
21 (Edition 2000)

22 **SECTION 1. BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE,** That the
23 Laws of Baltimore City read as follows:

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS indicate matter added to existing law.
[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.

Council Bill 26-0144

Baltimore City Code

Article 4. Community Relations

SUBTITLE 4. FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

§ 4-1. Definitions.

(A) *IN GENERAL.*

IN THIS SUBTITLE, THE FOLLOWING TERMS HAVE THE MEANINGS INDICATED.

(B) *AGENCY.*

“AGENCY” HAS THE MEANING STATED IN § 4-101(B) OF THE CITY GENERAL PROVISIONS ARTICLE.

(C) *COVERED ENTITY.*

“COVERED ENTITY” MEANS:

(1) ANY AGENCY THAT DELIVERS A DIRECT PUBLIC SERVICE; OR

(2) ANY LEGAL ENTITY THAT ENTERS INTO A WRITTEN AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY AND RECEIVES MONEY FROM THE CITY TO SUPPORT, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, ITS OPERATIONS.

(D) *DIRECT PUBLIC SERVICE.*

“DIRECT PUBLIC SERVICE” MEANS THE PROVISION OF A GOOD OR SERVICE, INCLUDING A MONETARY GOOD, THAT IS DELIVERED BY A COVERED ENTITY.

(E) *IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION.*

“IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION” MEANS ANY AND ALL EFFORTS CONDUCTED BY AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL FOR THE PURPOSE OF LOCATING, APPREHENDING, DETAINING, OR REMOVING AN INDIVIDUAL WHO THE IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL BELIEVES IS VIOLATING FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW.

(F) *IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION RESPONSE PLAN; PLAN.*

“IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION RESPONSE PLAN” OR “PLAN” MEANS A SET OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ADOPTED BY A COVERED ENTITY TO GUIDE THE COVERED ENTITY’S PREPARATION FOR AND RESPONSE TO AN INTERACTION WITH AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL.

Council Bill 26-0144

1 (G) *IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL.*

2 “IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL” MEANS ANY EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
3 OF HOMELAND SECURITY, ANY EMPLOYEE OF UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND
4 CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT, OR ANY FEDERAL OFFICIAL WHO ENGAGES IN AN IMMIGRATION
5 ENFORCEMENT ACTION.

6 **§ 4-2. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.**

7 (A) *IN GENERAL.*

8 A COVERED ENTITY MAY NOT, UNLESS REQUIRED BY FEDERAL LAW, STATE LAW, OR A
9 COURT ORDER:

- 10 (1) ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOUSING INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT
11 TO DETENTION ON CIVIL IMMIGRATION CHARGES;
- 12 (2) ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR ANY PURPOSE RELATED TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF
13 FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAWS;
- 14 (3) EXPEND OR USE CITY FUNDS, RESOURCES, OR PERSONNEL TO INVESTIGATE,
15 QUESTION, APPREHEND, DETAIN, OR ARREST AN INDIVIDUAL SOLELY FOR AN
16 ACTUAL OR SUSPECTED VIOLATION OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW;
- 17 (4) CONDITION THE PROVISION OF A CITY SERVICE OR BENEFIT ON THE ACTUAL OR
18 PERCEIVED CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION STATUS OF THE INDIVIDUAL SEEKING
19 THAT SERVICE OR BENEFIT;
- 20 (5) ALLOW AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL TO ACCESS A SPACE THAT IS NOT REGULARLY
21 ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC WITHIN A FACILITY OPERATED BY A COVERED ENTITY;
- 22 (6) ALLOW AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL TO ACCESS AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS BEING
23 DETAINED BY OR IS IN THE CUSTODY OF A COVERED ENTITY;
- 24 (7) ALLOW AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL TO USE A COVERED ENTITY’S FACILITIES,
25 INFORMATION, OR EQUIPMENT FOR AN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION
26 PURPOSE; OR
- 27 (8) ALLOW AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL TO ACCESS ANY INFORMATION REGARDING AN
28 INDIVIDUAL WHO IS THE SUBJECT OF AN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION,
29 UNLESS THE INDIVIDUAL HAS CONSENTED TO THE DISCLOSURE.

30 (B) *DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.*

31 A COVERED ENTITY MAY NOT COERCE, INTIMIDATE, THREATEN, OR ACT WITH BIAS
32 AGAINST ANY INDIVIDUAL BASED ON ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CITIZENSHIP OR
33 IMMIGRATION STATUS OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR THEIR FAMILY.

Council Bill 26-0144

1 (C) *REQUEST FROM IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL.*

2 IF A COVERED ENTITY RECEIVES A REQUEST FROM AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL FOR
3 INFORMATION REGARDING AN INDIVIDUAL, TO DETAIN AN INDIVIDUAL, OR TO NOTIFY
4 IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS OF THAT INDIVIDUAL'S LOCATION, THE COVERED ENTITY SHALL,
5 UNLESS PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL LAW, STATE LAW, OR A COURT ORDER:

6 (1) ASK FOR AND DOCUMENT THE IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL'S IDENTIFICATION;

7 (2) IF THE REQUEST MADE BY AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL WAS IN WRITING, PROVIDE A
8 COPY OF THAT REQUEST TO THE INDIVIDUAL IN QUESTION; AND

9 (3) NOTIFY THE INDIVIDUAL IN QUESTION WITHIN 48 HOURS.

10 **§4-3. DATA GOVERNANCE.**

11 A COVERED ENTITY MAY NOT:

12 (1) ASK AN INDIVIDUAL TO DISCLOSE THEIR CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION STATUS UNLESS
13 THE INFORMATION IS REQUIRED BY A LAW, A COURT ORDER, OR IS NECESSARY FOR A
14 CITY FUNCTION;

15 (2) STORE ANY INFORMATION REGARDING AN INDIVIDUAL'S CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION
16 STATUS, UNLESS THE INFORMATION IS REQUIRED BY A LAW, A COURT ORDER, OR IS
17 NECESSARY FOR A CITY FUNCTION; OR

18 (3) INVESTIGATE OR ASSIST IN AN INVESTIGATION REGARDING AN INDIVIDUAL'S
19 CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION STATUS, UNLESS THE INQUIRY OR INVESTIGATION IS
20 REQUIRED BY LAW, A COURT ORDER, OR A JUDICIAL WARRANT.

21 **§ 4-4. IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION RESPONSE PLAN.**

22 (A) *IN GENERAL.*

23 A COVERED ENTITY SHALL CREATE AND ADOPT AN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION
24 RESPONSE PLAN TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBTITLE.

25 (B) *DESIGNATED OFFICIAL.*

26 A COVERED ENTITY SHALL DESIGNATE AN OFFICIAL WITHIN THE ENTITY WHO SHALL SERVE
27 AS THE PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT FOR ISSUES RELATED TO IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT
28 ACTIONS.

29 (C) *CONTENTS OF PLAN.*

30 A COVERED ENTITY'S IMMIGRATION ACTION RESPONSE PLAN SHALL INCLUDE:

31 (1) A RESPONSE PROTOCOL FOR COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION WITH AN
32 IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL;

Council Bill 26-0144

1 (2) PREVENTATIVE MEASURES THE ENTITY WILL TAKE TO PREVENT AN IMMIGRATION
2 OFFICIAL FROM ACCESSING A SPACE THAT IS NOT REGULARLY ACCESSIBLE TO THE
3 PUBLIC, UNLESS THE IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL DISPLAYS A JUDICIAL WARRANT OR
4 EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRE SUCH ACCESS; AND

5 (3) THE STEPS THE COVERED ENTITY WILL TAKE TO ENSURE ALL EMPLOYEES ARE
6 INFORMED OF THE PLAN AND REMAIN IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLAN.

7 (D) *PLAN TO BE RETAINED.*

8 A COVERED ENTITY SHALL SUBMIT A COPY OF ITS IMMIGRATION ACTION RESPONSE PLAN
9 TO THE MAYOR’S OFFICE OF IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS.

10 **§ 4-5. REPORTING.**

11 (A) *IN GENERAL.*

12 NO LATER THAN JANUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR, AN AGENCY SHALL SUBMIT TO THE MAYOR’S
13 OFFICE OF IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS A REPORT THAT INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

14 (1) THE NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION OR ACCESS TO FACILITIES THAT THE
15 AGENCY RECEIVED FROM IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS, IF ANY, AND HOW THE AGENCY
16 RESPONDED TO EACH REQUEST; AND

17 (2) THE NUMBER OF TIMES THE AGENCY VIOLATED THE TERMS OF THIS SUBTITLE, IF
18 ANY.

19 (B) *REPORTS TO BE COMPILED AND SUBMITTED.*

20 NO LATER THAN MARCH 1 OF EACH YEAR, THE MAYOR’S OFFICE OF IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS
21 SHALL COMPILE THE REPORTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (A) OF THIS SECTION
22 AND SUBMIT A COMPREHENSIVE REPORT TO THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL.

23 (C) *ANNUAL REVIEW BY CITY SOLICITOR.*

24 IF THIS SUBTITLE IS PREEMPTED BY ANY CHANGE IN FEDERAL, STATE, OR INTERNATIONAL
25 LAW, THE CITY SOLICITOR SHALL PROVIDE NOTICE OF THE PREEMPTION TO THE MAYOR
26 AND CITY COUNCIL.

27 **§ 4-6. TRAINING.**

28 (A) *IN GENERAL.*

29 THE MAYOR’S OFFICE OF IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS SHALL DEVELOP AND DELIVER TO ALL
30 EMPLOYEES OF A COVERED ENTITY A TRAINING COURSE REGARDING:

31 (1) HOW AN EMPLOYEE SHALL RESPOND IN THE EVENT THAT AN IMMIGRATION
32 OFFICIAL ENTERS A FACILITY OPERATED BY A COVERED ENTITY;

Council Bill 26-0144

1 (2) THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF A COVERED ENTITY DURING AN
2 INTERACTION WITH AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL; AND

3 (3) THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBTITLE.

4 (B) *BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT.*

5 THE BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT IS EXCLUDED FROM THE TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
6 IN SUBSECTION (A) OF THIS SECTION IF IT DEVELOPS AND DELIVERS AN EQUIVALENT
7 TRAINING DESIGNED FOR POLICE OPERATIONS.

8 **Article 17. Police Department**

9 **Subtitle 2. Police Department**

10 **§ 2-3. IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**

11 (A) *DEFINITIONS.*

12 (1) *IN GENERAL.*

13 IN THIS SUBTITLE, THE FOLLOWING TERMS HAVE THE MEANINGS INDICATED.

14 (2) *IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION.*

15 “IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION” HAS THE MEANING STATED IN § 4-1 OF CITY
16 CODE ARTICLE 4.

17 (3) *IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL.*

18 “IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL” HAS THE MEANING STATED IN § 4-1 OF ARTICLE 4 OF CITY
19 CODE ARTICLE 4.

20 (B) *IN GENERAL.*

21 THE DEPARTMENT MAY NOT ENGAGE IN, ASSIST, OR SUPPORT IMMIGRATION
22 ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS UNLESS:

23 (1) THE DEPARTMENT IS REQUIRED TO EXECUTE A CRIMINAL WARRANT OR COURT
24 ORDER ISSUED BY A FEDERAL OR STATE COURT; OR

25 (2) AS OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW, INCLUDING THE TERMS OF THE BALTIMORE CITY
26 CONSENT DECREE.

27 (C) *DE-ESCALATION.*

28 THE DEPARTMENT MAY BE PRESENT AT THE SCENE OF AN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT
29 ACTION TO DE-ESCALATE ANY DIRECT THREAT TO LIFE OR PUBLIC SAFETY.

Council Bill 26-0144

1 (D) *IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL INTERACTION PROCEDURE.*

2 IF THE DEPARTMENT INTERACTS WITH AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL WHO IS CONDUCTING AN
3 IMMIGRATION ACTION, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ANY APPLICABLE
4 LAW:

- 5 (1) INQUIRE WHETHER ANY INDIVIDUAL BEING HELD BY THE IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL IS
6 BEING HELD PURSUANT TO A WARRANT, A COURT ORDER, OR PROBABLE CAUSE;
- 7 (2) REQUEST THE NAME OF ANY INDIVIDUAL BEING HELD BY THE IMMIGRATION
8 OFFICIAL;
- 9 (3) DOCUMENT THE INTERACTION ON THE OFFICER’S BODY-WORN CAMERA, IN
10 ADHERENCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY; AND
- 11 (4) REQUEST AND DOCUMENT THE IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL’S LAW ENFORCEMENT
12 CREDENTIALS AND VERIFY THEIR IDENTITY BY REQUESTING THEY REMOVE ANY
13 MASK OR FACE COVERING.

14 **SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED,** That within 90 days of the taking effect of this
15 Ordinance, each covered entity shall:

- 16 (1) review all applications, questionnaires, interviews, or other forms used in relations to
17 its benefits or services and remove any questions regarding citizenship or immigration
18 status, unless it is necessary for a City function;
- 19 (2) delete any information regarding an individual’s citizenship or immigration status,
20 unless it is necessary for a City function; and
- 21 (3) review its confidentiality practices and ensure they comply with the terms of this
22 Ordinance.

23 **SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED,** That the provisions of this Ordinance do not
24 apply to any entity that currently has a written agreement with the City and receives money from
25 the City to support, in whole or in part, its operations, until such time that the entity renews its
26 existing agreement with the City or enters into a new written agreement with the City.

27 **SECTION 4. AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED,** That this Ordinance takes effect on the date it is
28 enacted.

**AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL BILL 26-0144
(1st Reader Copy)**

By: Councilmembers Gray, Parker, and Ramos
{To be offered to the Public Safety Committee}

Amendment No. 1

On page 1, in lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, in each instance, strike “a covered entity” and substitute “an agency”; and, on that same page, in line 9, strike “a covered entity’s” and substitute “an agency’s”; and, on page 2, strike in their entirety lines 10 through 18; and, on that same page, in lines 19 and 24, respectively, strike “(E)” and “(F)”, respectively, and substitute “(C)” and “(D)”, respectively; and, on that same page, in line 26, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in lines 26 and 27, strike “COVERED ENTITY’S” and substitute “AGENCY’S”; and, on page 3, in line 1, strike “(G)” and substitute “(E)”; and, on that same page, in lines 8 and 31, in each instance, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in lines 21 and 23, in each instance strike “A COVERED ENTITY;” and substitute “AN AGENCY;”; and, on that same page, in line 24, strike “A COVERED ENTITY’S” and substitute “AN AGENCY’S”; and, on page 4, in line 2, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 4, strike “COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in lines 11, 26, and 30, in each instance, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 23, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “IN CONSULTATION WITH THE MAYOR’S OFFICE OF IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS, AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 26, strike “ENTITY” and substitute “AGENCY”; and, on page 5, in line 1, strike “ENTITY” and substitute “AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 5, strike “COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 8, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 30, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on that same page, in line 32, strike “A COVERED ENTITY;” and substitute “AN AGENCY;”; and, on page 6, in line 1, strike “A COVERED ENTITY” and substitute “AN AGENCY”; and, on page 7, strike in their entirety lines 23 through 26; and, on that same page, in line 27, strike “4.” and substitute “3.”.

Amendment No. 2

On page 6, in line 24, strike “COURT;” and substitute “JUDGE”.

**AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL BILL 26-0144
(1st Reader Copy)**

By: Councilmember Conway
{To be offered to the Public Safety Committee}

Amendment No. 1

On page 3, in line 26, strike “OR”; and, on that same page, after line 7, insert:

“(8) ALLOW AN IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL TO USE ANY SPACE OWNED, LEASED, OPERATED, OR CONTROLLED BY THE AGENCY, INCLUDING A PARK, A RECREATIONAL AREA, OR ANOTHER PUBLIC FACILITY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF STAGING, COORDINATING, PLANNING, OR CONDUCTING AN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION; OR”;

and, on that same page, in line 27, strike “(8)” and substitute “(9)”.

Amendment No. 2

On page 4, in line 19, strike “STATUS,” and substitute “STATUS, INCLUDING BY SHARING ANY PERSONAL, IDENTIFYING, OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION REGARDING AN INDIVIDUAL,”.

Amendment No. 3

On page 7, after line 13, insert:

“(E) COMMISSIONER TO ISSUE.

THE COMMISSIONER SHALL ADOPT, MAINTAIN, AND PUBLISH WRITTEN POLICIES GOVERNING THE DEPARTMENT’S DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PROCEDURES FOR INTERACTIONS WITH IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS, CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION, THE BALTIMORE CITY CONSENT DECREE, AND ALL OTHER APPLICABLE LAW.”

BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL



PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

26-0144

*Baltimore City Policies and Procedures
Safe Spaces and Communities*

Agency Reports

CITY OF BALTIMORE

BRANDON M. SCOTT
Mayor



DEPARTMENT OF LAW
EBONY M. THOMPSON, CITY SOLICITOR
100 N. HOLLIDAY STREET
SUITE 101, CITY HALL
BALTIMORE, MD 21202

March 4, 2026

The Honorable President and Members
of the Baltimore City Council
Room 409, City Hall
100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Re: City Council Bill 26-0144 – Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities

Dear President and City Council Members:

The Law Department has reviewed City Council Bill 26-0144 for form and legal sufficiency. The bill would prevent a “covered entity” from entering into an agreement, spending funds, using resources or in other specified ways facilitating federal immigration enforcement. It also requires a covered entity to have an immigration enforcement action response plan, to submit annual reports and facilitate training on this topic. The bill defines “covered entity” to include both the City government as well as any “legal entity that enters into a written agreement with the City and receives money from the City to support, in whole or in part, its operations.”

A law that prevents an entity that is currently contracting with or receiving money from the City from freely associating with or contracting with others would be seen as a violation of the First Amendment, which prevents governments from making laws impairing free speech and association. U.S. Const., amend. I; *see, e.g., Nat’l Rifle Ass’n of Am. v. City of Los Angeles*, 441 F. Supp. 3d 915, 935-943 (C.D. Cal. 2019) (law violated First Amendment because it was content-based and viewpoint based where it required disclosure of any NRA dealings by City contractors); *accord First Resort, Inc. v. Herrera*, 860 F.3d 1263, 1277 (9th Cir. 2017) (“A regulation engages in viewpoint discrimination when it regulates speech based on the specific motivating ideology or perspective of the speaker”); *Valle Del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 709 F.3d 808, 823 (9th Cir. 2013)(government “may not, consistent with the First Amendment, use a content-based law to target individuals for lighter or harsher punishment because of the message they convey.”).

Such as law could also be characterized as an impairment of the right to freedom of contract. *See, e.g., Maryland-Nat’l Cap. Park & Plan. Comm’n v. Washington Nat. Arena*, 282 Md. 588, 606 (1978) (“reluctance on the part of the judiciary to nullify contractual arrangements on public policy grounds also serves to protect the public interest in having individuals exercise broad powers to structure their own affairs by making legally enforceable promises, a concept which lies at the heart of the freedom of contract principle.”).

It would also violate the Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution as it would legislatively impose new terms on all those entities with which the City has current contracts. U.S. Const., Art. 1, § 10, cl. 1; *see, e.g., Board of Trustees of Employees' Retirement System of City of Baltimore*, 317 Md. 72, 99 (1989).

For these reasons, lines 13 through 15 on page two of the bill must be deleted. An amendment to do that is attached to this report.

While the bill mentions the City's actions must comply with applicable law and the Baltimore City Police Consent Decree, it would behoove the City to make sure that this law is reviewed by the Consent Decree monitoring team. Specifically, the immigration enforcement action response plan for City agencies should be reviewed by the Consent Decree monitoring team.

It is also concerning that there would be multiple immigration enforcement action response plans for multiple agencies in the City. There should be no difference in how City agencies interact with federal law enforcement. Nor would that plan be different if the City agency provided services directly to the public or only assisted other City agencies. Since the agency plans will likely be duplicative, the bill could be streamlined if it were changed to a single immigration enforcement action response plan for all the City government. However, this change is not required for the bill to be approved for form and legal sufficiency.

If the required amendment is made to remove third parties from the bill, the Law Department can approve it for form and legal sufficiency.

Very truly yours,



Hilary Ruley
Chief Solicitor

cc: Ebony M. Thompson, City Solicitor
Ty'lor Schnella, Mayor's Office of Government Relations
Ashlea Brown, Chief Solicitor
Jeffrey Hochstetler, Chief Solicitor
Michele Toth, Assistant Solicitor
Desiree Lucky, Assistant Solicitor

AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL BILL 26-0144
(1st Reader Copy)

Amendment No. 1

On page 2, delete lines 13 through 15.



CITY OF BALTIMORE
MAYOR BRANDON M. SCOTT

TO	The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council
FROM	Erin C. Murphy Esq. – Chief of Staff and Government Affairs – Baltimore Police Department
CC	Mayor’s Office of Government Relations
DATE	03/09/2026
SUBJECT	26-0144 - Baltimore City Policies and Procedures - Safe Spaces and Communities

Position: Favorable with Amendment

BILL SYNOPSIS

City Council Bill 26-0144 Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities, the purpose of which is to prohibits City agencies from discriminating based on actual or perceived immigration status, limits when they may coordinate with federal immigration authorities, and requires data governance standards and an immigration response plan, while also establishing formal policies governing how the Baltimore Police Department interacts with federal immigration officials.

SUMMARY OF POSITION

The Baltimore Police Department supports Council Bill 26-0144. BPD currently maintains comprehensive, equitable, and effective policies that address the subject matter proposed in this legislation.

Specifically, the Department’s interactions with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) are governed by Baltimore Police Department Policy 1021, titled “Immigration Status,” which establishes clear standards and procedures consistent with applicable law and existing operational practices.

The Baltimore Police Department strictly adheres to Policy 1021 and remains committed to limiting its interactions with ICE to the greatest extent possible under applicable state and federal law. Policy 1021 was developed and approved to ensure compliance with the Consent Decree.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Baltimore Police Department does not anticipate a major fiscal impact.

AMENDMENTS

Any amendments to this bill affecting the Baltimore Police Department should align with Policy 1021 and/or the recent Executive Order on Public Safety and Immigration. Any deviation from Policy 1021 could jeopardize compliance with the consent decree.



CITY OF BALTIMORE
MAYOR BRANDON M. SCOTT

TO	The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council
FROM	Laura Larsen, Budget Director
DATE	3/10/2026
SUBJECT	26-0144 Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities

The Honorable President and
Members of the City Council
City Hall, Room 400

Position: Defers to the Law Department

The Department of Finance is herein reporting on City Council Bill 26-0144 Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities, the purpose of which is to prohibits City agencies from discriminating based on actual or perceived immigration status, limits when they may coordinate with federal immigration authorities, and requires data governance standards and an immigration response plan, while also establishing formal policies governing how the Baltimore Police Department interacts with federal immigration officials.

Background

The Baltimore City Council has proposed and passed several ordinances that deal with discrimination.

Bill #	Title	Purpose	Result
18-0308	Community Relations - Housing Discrimination - Source of Income	Prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants based on how they pay rent.	passed
19-0334	Community Relations - Redefining “Employer”	Expands the Community Relation Commissions ability to investigate discrimination in the workplace	passed
19-0481	Banning Discrimination Based on Hair Texture and Protective Hairstyles	Prevents discrimination based on hair texture	passed
23-0378	Unlawful Practices -Discrimination Based on Characteristics or Status	Prevents discrimination based on actual or perceived HIV AIDS status	passed

Fiscal Impact

The Finance Department expects there to be recurring staffing costs, a one-time materials cost, and a onetime contract cost in order for Mayor’s Office of Immigrant and Multicultural Affair (MIMA) to implement this legislation.

In discussing this legislation’s implementation with MIMA, the department identified staffing costs, materials cost to fulfill the notice required in the legislation, and a contractual cost to fulfill the training requirement.

City Hall – Room 250, 100 Holliday Street, Baltimore, MD 21202

The implementation of Bill 26-0144 will require additional staffing within the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant and Multicultural Affairs (MIMA), specifically an Operations Officer I and an Operations Research Analyst, to manage and support compliance with federal immigration enforcement response requirements. The Operations Officer I will monitor federal policy developments, oversee interagency coordination, develop and implement communication strategies, maintain partnerships with multilingual media, and advise the Mayor’s communications staff. The Operations Research Analyst will provide research and administrative support, manage multilingual content for newsletters and social media, and document MIMA engagements. Both positions will jointly develop, maintain, and manage “immigration enforcement action response plans,” track agency reporting on enforcement requests and compliance, oversee employee training programs via vendor contracts, maintain internal resource hubs, coordinate signage and distribution of instructional materials through the Department of General Services, and provide ongoing administrative and stakeholder support. The addition of these positions will also alleviate existing workload by distributing responsibilities across dedicated staff, allowing MIMA to implement the bill efficiently while enabling current staff to focus on ongoing programs and policy initiatives. These responsibilities are expected to result in measurable fiscal impacts associated with personnel costs, training, communications, and materials distribution.

MIMA is required to create and provide training to all employees of covered entities on how to respond if an immigration official enters a facility, the legal rights and responsibilities of the entity during such interactions, and the requirements of the subtitle. MIMA expects this can be fulfilled by a workday training module. MIMA has created workday training modules in the past, in order to implement City Council Bill 24-0584, Baltimore City Government Entities - Language Access. This module was a one-time cost of approximately \$15,000. MIMA expects a similar cost to fulfill the requirements of 26-0144 Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities.

Expense	Cost	Cost Type
Operations Officer I	\$100,928	recurring
Operations Research Analyst	\$35,692	recurring
Training Module	\$15,000	One-time
Total	\$151,620	

Conclusion

City Council Bill 26-0144 is expected to result in a total estimated first-year cost of \$151,620, including \$136,620 in recurring personnel expenses and a one-time \$15,000 cost to develop the required training module. Ongoing costs in future fiscal years are projected to be limited to staffing expenditures unless additional training updates or materials are required. While the legislation strengthens policy coordination, compliance oversight, and employee preparedness across covered entities, it will require a sustained budgetary commitment to support implementation and ongoing administration within the MIMA.

For the reasons stated above, the Department of Finance defers to the Law Department City Council Bill 26-0144.

cc: Michael Mocksten
Nina Themelis

City Hall – Room 250, 100 Holliday Street, Baltimore, MD 21202



CITY OF BALTIMORE
MAYOR BRANDON M. SCOTT

TO	The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council
FROM	Catalina Rodriguez Lima, Director, Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs
CC	Mayor's Office of Government Relations
DATE	March 3, 2026
SUBJECT	Bill 26-0144: Baltimore City Policies and Procedures—Safe Spaces and Communities

Position: Favorable with amendments

BILL SYNOPSIS

This bill aims to ensure that: certain “covered entities,” defined as Baltimore City agencies and those entities that receive funding from the City, treat residents equally and regardless of immigration status; limit how said covered entities can cooperate with immigration enforcement agents; and protect residents’ personal information from being used for immigration enforcement purposes. It also requires covered entities to establish procedures for responding to immigration enforcement actions and sets standards for how the Baltimore Police Department interacts with federal immigration authorities.

Sections 4-4 through 4-6 names the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs (MIMA) as the agency responsible for retaining covered entities’ plans in relation to immigration enforcement actions in their facilities, compiling and submitting an annual report summarizing such incidents, and developing and delivering training on this subject.

SUMMARY OF POSITION

Our office endorses the intent of this bill: establishing Baltimore City facilities as a safe space for residents, regardless of immigration or citizenship status. It is critical to the well-being of our communities that residents feel safe accessing City services and that City facilities are not used as settings for immigration enforcement.

Toward this end and prior to the introduction of this bill, MIMA collaborated with the Chief Administrative Office and the Law Department last fall to issue an internal policy establishing a standardized protocol for how staff at City facilities should respond to immigration enforcement actions, as mandated by Maryland House Bill 1222 and in alignment with related guidance from the Maryland Office of the Attorney General. This internal policy was recently reaffirmed in Mayor Brandon M. Scott's executive order, effective March 2, 2026.

However, our office's primary concern is that, in its effort to provide robust protections for immigrant residents, the bill may be overly expansive in ways that could create challenges for effective implementation. In this vein, we have identified three areas for consideration that correspond with the amendments proposed later in this document.

Challenging concepts of “covered entity” and “direct public service”: As the agency tasked with the oversight, reporting, and training of this legislative mandate, MIMA has identified several considerations regarding the bill's scope. Extending the mandate to any entity receiving City funding raises feasibility concerns regarding our office's ability to ensure consistent oversight and compliance across external organizations. At the same time, the concept of a “direct public service” may unintentionally narrow the scope for City agencies, given that current guidance applies to all City agencies and facilities, regardless of whether they provide goods and services. As drafted, the bill simultaneously expands the scope to private entities while potentially limiting its application within City government based on the open-ended concept of a direct public service. Clarifying these elements would help support effective implementation.

Individualized instead of standardized “immigration enforcement action response plans”: As detailed in this bill, each covered entity is required to create its own plan, which may create additional administrative demands and present implementation challenges. Additionally, this requirement appears to create a contradiction between Sections 4-4 and 4-6 in that covered entities are responsible for developing individualized plans while MIMA is tasked with providing standardized training to those same entities. In order to better execute the intent of this bill, a uniform policy would be a more practicable approach.

Increased administrative burden without sufficient allocation of resources: MIMA currently carries out its work with a small team managing a broad portfolio of responsibilities. This workload has been further intensified by the need to respond to a constantly evolving and increasingly challenging federal immigration enforcement environment. Our office recognizes that the oversight over, reporting for, and training related to a policy of this nature align with MIMA's mission and role. However, the responsibilities outlined in Sections 4-4 through 4-6 would represent a significant expansion of duties relative to our current staffing capacity.

While the intent of the bill is commendable, aligning the scope of implementation with available

resources will be important to ensuring that the policy can be carried out effectively and sustainably.

FISCAL IMPACT

If enacted, MIMA will require additional resources to fully implement this bill's provisions, chiefly increased staffing to support policy development for, communication with, and management over other City agencies in this matter.

Training and Personnel: MIMA is a small office with limited personnel capacity, currently staffed by only three permanent full-time positions in addition to the director, with a contractual employee overseeing communications and strategic policy responsibilities. This represents a significant personnel constraint, particularly in light of the increased demands on the office resulting from the same federal immigration enforcement environment that has prompted this legislation. To effectively provide training to the several thousand City staff and hundreds of City facilities covered by this mandate, MIMA would likely need to engage an external vendor to develop a Workday course and/or deliver training through other formats. Additional staff capacity will also be necessary to support the existing managerial role and carry out the increased administrative workload created by the legislation.

Materials: Additionally, there are material costs associated with the enforcement of this proposed legislation. If the bill passes in its current form and MIMA is tasked with its implementation, our office would require funding for the fabrication and installation of permanent signage to designate non-public spaces within City facilities, given the bill's mandate that access to "space[s]... not regularly accessible to the public" be limited to immigration officials, as well as printing necessary documents, such as incident report forms and quick reference handouts to bolster policy training for and compliance by staff.

Please refer to the Department of Finance's bill report for exact costs.

AMENDMENTS

§ 4-1. Definitions

- *Requested amendment:* Strike Clause C in its entirety and replace any instance of "covered entity" with "agency" in the remainder of the bill.
- *Rationale:* Given our office's recent experience developing and administering an analogous internal policy, we recommend constraining the scope of the bill to City agencies (at the exclusion of private entities that receive any amount of funding from the city) while expanding its scope to all City agencies (regardless of the provision of goods or services).

§ 4-4. Immigration Enforcement Action Response Plan

- *Requested amendment:* Append to Clause A: “or, alternatively, the Mayor or an office or agency designated by the Mayor may adopt guidelines or rules applicable to multiple agencies, in furtherance of the efficient implementation of this subtitle.”
- *Rationale:* Allowing a designated agency (e.g., MIMA) to adopt guidelines or rules applicable to multiple agencies would streamline adoption and engender meaningful implementation.

§ 4-5. Reporting

- *Requested amendment:* Strike “March 1” and replace with “April 1.”
- *Rationale:* As the agency tasked with compiling, drafting, and issuing this report, we feel that a more feasible window for this responsibility is a full fiscal quarter.



CITY OF BALTIMORE
MAYOR BRANDON M. SCOTT

TO	The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council
FROM	Amber Green, Chief Equity Office, Office of Equity and Civil Rights
CC	Mayor's Office of Government Relations
DATE	3/10/2026
SUBJECT	26-0144 – Baltimore City Policies and Procedures - Safe Spaces and Communities

POSITION: Favorable with Amendment

BILL SYNOPSIS

The Office of Equity and Civil Rights (OECR) has reviewed and is herein reporting on City Council Bill 26-0144 – *Baltimore City Policies and Procedures - Safe Spaces and Communities*.

This is an ordinance that accomplishes the following:

- Define terms related to federal immigration enforcement.
- Prohibit covered entities from engaging in acts related to federal immigration enforcement, such as:
 - Entering into agreements to house individuals for detention
 - Enforce federal immigration laws
 - Expend/use city funds, resources, or personnel
 - Condition a city service or benefit
 - Allow access to a non-public space to an immigration official
 - Allow access to an individual being detained by the covered entity
 - Allow use of a facility, information, or equipment
- Prohibit discrimination by a covered entity against an individual based on actual or perceived immigration status.
- Provide for a procedure to handle requests from an immigration official.
- Prohibit covered entities from asking to disclose, storing, or investigating an individual's immigration status.
- Require covered entities to develop an immigration enforcement action response plan.
- Require covered entities to report annually the number of immigration enforcement-related requests received and how they were handled.

- Require the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs develop a training on the rights and responsibilities of this article to be delivered to cover entities.
- Prohibit the Baltimore Police Department from engaging in, assisting, or supporting immigration enforcement.
- Require Baltimore Police Department Officers de-escalate threats to life or public safety during an immigration enforcement action.
- Establish a procedure in which the Baltimore Police Department shall respond to immigration enforcement actions, including:
 - Ask an immigration official if an individual is being held pursuant to a warrant, court order, or probable cause
 - Request the name of the individual being held
 - Document the immigration enforcement action on the body-worn camera
 - Verify and document the immigration enforcement official’s identity and credentials.
- Provide 90 days for covered entities to enter compliance with the ordinance.
- Provide for an immediate effective date of the ordinance.

The bill accomplishes this by adding Sections 4-1 to 4-6 to Article IV and Section 2-3 to Article XVII of the Baltimore City Code.

SUMMARY OF POSITION

The protections Baltimore’s immigrant residents and their families enacted by City Council Bill 26-0144 are likely to bolster equity, improve immigrant residents/families' sense of safety and belonging, and promote access to city services for residents vulnerable to federal immigration enforcement actions or profiling. An important improvement in this bill is granting recourse to those who are violated under the bill through the City’s anti-discrimination law, Article IV of the Baltimore City Code.

Explicit anti-discrimination protections for immigrants in Baltimore City are rightly placed within Article IV of the Baltimore City Code and should be based on national origin, immigration documentation status, and/or citizenship status, whether actual or perceived. While the CRC currently protects against discrimination based on national origin in public accommodations under Article IV, Subtitle 3-2 of the Baltimore City Code, that differs slightly from the citizenship status protection this bill grants. It is also important to protect people against discrimination based on their *perceived* citizenship status, as the proposed bill does, as that is more likely to be the basis of most anti-immigrant discrimination. Perceived citizenship status is also closely tied to racial discrimination rather than being based on actual documentation/national origin.

FISCAL IMPACT

The anti-discrimination protections expanded under City Council Bill 26-0144 may result in an influx of complaint correspondence to the Community Relations Commission within the OECR, the City’s anti-discrimination enforcement body. Due to this, the legislation is expected to have a minimal to moderate operational and investigatory impact on the OECR.

AMENDMENT

Any amendments to this bill with respect to BPD should be closely aligned with current policy. Any deviations from policy approved by the consent decree monitoring team could jeopardize compliance with the consent decree. This concern is of great importance and relevance to the work of the Police Accountability Division within the OECR.

CONCLUSION

The OECR discerns no inequity in the bill's intent, purpose, or impact and supports the initiative; however, the office defers to the Law Department's legal concerns and BPD's concerns with respect to the consent decree. As such, the Office of Equity and Civil Rights respectfully request a **favorable report** on City Council Bill 26-0144, **provided for the adoption of the Law Department's amendments and any amendments necessary regarding BPD, so long as they don't jeopardize compliance with the consent decree.**



Amber Greene
Respectfully Submitted, Director, Office

of Equity & Civil Rights

Baltimore City Sheriff's Office

Samuel Cogen, Sheriff

Main Office
The Clarence Mitchell Courthouse
100 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Phone: 410-396-1155
Fax: 410-727-3507



District Court Office
111 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Phone: 410-396-7412
Fax: 410-396-7439

TO: The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council

FROM: Nicholas T.R. Blendy, Esq., Assistant Sheriff, Baltimore City Sheriff's Office

RE: City Council Bill 26-0144 - Baltimore City Policies and Procedures – Safe Spaces and Communities

DATE: March 10, 2026

POSITION: NO POSITION

Based on its review of the proposed legislation, the Baltimore City Sheriff's Office takes **no position** on City Council Bill 26-0144.

If you have any questions, please contact Nicholas T.R. Blendy, Esq., Assistant Sheriff, at Nicholas.Blendy3@baltimorecity.gov.