GO/PS Committee Item #1
October 1, 2026
**Worksession**

# MEMORANDUM

September 28, 2026

TO: Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee
Public Safety (PS) Committee

FROM: Jim Ogorzalek, Legislative Attorney

SUBJECT: Bill 18-26, Police – Powers and duties of director – DHS law enforcement agency hiring

PURPOSE: Worksession

**Invited Attendees:**
Luisa Cardona, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Captain David Smith, Montgomery County Police Department
Brian Hawley, Montgomery County Police Department

Bill 18-26, Police – Powers and duties of director – DHS law enforcement agency hiring, was introduced on April 28, 2026. Its Lead Sponsor is Councilmember Glass. A public hearing occurred on June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m. A worksession of the Joint Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) and Public Safety (PS) Committee is scheduled for Thursday, October 1, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

Bill 18-26 would:

(1) require the Department of Police to verify certain background information for certain applicants seeking to be sworn officers employed by the Department of Police; and
(2) generally amend the law regarding police.

**Background**

Beginning in 2025, the United States Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") increased interior enforcement operations related to the deportation, expulsion, or removal of undocumented individuals. The increased enforcement operations have been carried out by multiple DHS agency components—including Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection—and have occurred in jurisdictions across the United States, including Maryland, generally, and Montgomery County, specifically. Responding to the increased enforcement operations and the tactics employed by DHS agency components, multiple states and localities

have introduced or enacted legislation prohibiting the subsequent employment of officers or agents of federal agencies involved in these DHS operations from future employment in certain positions with the relevant state or locality.

**Bill Specifics**

Bill 18-26 (known as the "Continued Excellence in Public Service Act") would require that prior to extending a final offer of employment to any individual who (1) worked as a federal law enforcement office for DHS or an agency subcomponent (2) on or after January 21, 2025, and (3) who engaged in deportation, expulsion, or removal operations during that time; the Montgomery County Police Department review and verify certain information related to the candidate.

The information to be reviewed and verified includes details related to (1) assignment and deployment locations on or after January 21, 2025; (2) the candidate's participation in or witness of use of force during operations after January 21, 2025; and (3) complaints filed against the individual or their federal employing agency. The bill also includes a provision related to an affidavit that the candidate has never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights during enforcement operations after January 21, 2025.

The bill expressly includes a carve out that an individual's participation in operations at an external boundary or port of entry does not trigger the Department's obligation to verify the information set forth in the bill. The bill also clarifies that it does not apply to candidates employed by a state or local law enforcement agency who might otherwise be included because of their temporary participation in a federal agency task force.

**SUMMARY OF IMPACT STATEMENTS**

**Climate Assessment.** "The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 18-26 will have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change as it is proposing changes to screening processes for potential MCPD candidates."

**Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact.** "The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 18-26 would have minimal impact on racial equity and social justice (RESJ) in the County. Requiring additional screening for certain Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) officer candidates who were employed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is not likely to meaningfully impact racial inequities or disparities in policing."

**Economic Impact.** "The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates that Bill 18-26 would have an insignificant impact on economic conditions in the County, as measured by the Council's priority economic indicators. The Bill would require the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) to conduct additional screening for certain candidates who were employed in U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) immigration enforcement operations on or after January 21, 202d5. It is unlikely that this policy change would affect enough candidates residing in the County in terms of the Council's priority indicators to have a measurable economic impact."

**Fiscal Impact.** "The additional workload will require a new Background Screening Specialist at a cost of $120,200 per-year, in addition to one-time costs of $1,000 for a new computer and office supplies provided to new employees."

## SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A public hearing for Bill 26-25 was held on June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m. Assistant Chief Nicholas Augustine testified on behalf of the Montgomery County Department of Police. He affirmed MCPD's commitment to rigorous hiring standards and noted that the department has not lowered background standards and has not experienced misconduct by officers whose prior employment history would have fallen under the bill's circumstances. Assistant Chief Augustine raised practical concerns about potential impacts on recruitment, applicant processing times, and administrative workload, particularly given the competitive environment for law enforcement hiring. He emphasized that any final framework should be operationally clear and efficient, and he expressed a commitment to continued collaboration with Council staff as the legislative process proceeds.

Esther Wells testified in opposition both orally and in writing. Ms. Wells raised concerns about constitutional risk, arguing that the bill's affidavit requirement — which compels applicants to self-attest regarding prior conduct — may itself be vulnerable to due process challenges. Ms. Wells also cited operational concerns, noting that MCPD already faces staffing shortages and that added hiring complexity could discourage experienced candidates and increase administrative burdens.

## ISSUES FOR THE COMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION[1]

N/A


| This packet contains: | Circle # |
|---|---|
| Bill 18-26 | 1 |
| Lead Sponsor's Letter to Colleagues | 4 |
| Climate Assessment | 5 |
| Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact Statement | 8 |
| Economic Impact Statement | 12 |
| Fiscal Impact Statement | 15 |


[1] The Committee authorizes Council Legislative Attorneys to make non-substantive technical corrections necessary to fix any typographical, stylistic, formatting, or grammatical errors in Bill 18-26.

Bill No. 18-26
Concerning: Police – Powers and duties of director – DHS law enforcement agency hiring
Revised: 4/22/2026 Draft No. 1
Introduced: April 28, 2026
Expires: December 7, 2026
Enacted:
Executive:
Effective:
Sunset Date:
Ch. ____, Laws of Mont. Co. ____

# COUNTY COUNCIL
# FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsor: Councilmember Glass

**AN ACT** to:

(1) require the Department of Police to verify certain background information for certain applicants seeking to be sworn officers employed by the Department of Police; and
(2) generally amend the law regarding police.

By amending
Montgomery County Code
Chapter 35, Police
Section 35-3

| | |
|---|---|
| **Boldface** | *Heading or defined term.* |
| Underlining | *Added to existing law by original bill.* |
| **[**Single boldface brackets**]** | *Deleted from existing law by original bill.* |
| Double underlining | *Added by amendment.* |
| **[[**Double boldface brackets**]]** | *Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.* |
| * * * | *Existing law unaffected by bill.* |

*The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:*

**Sec. 1. Section 35-3 is amended as follows:**

**35-3. Powers and duties of director.**

* * *

(l) *DHS law enforcement agency hiring.* Prior to extending a final offer of employment to serve as a sworn officer of the County Department of Police, the director of police must review and verify the following information for any applicant who served as a federal law enforcement officer under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(18) or 18 U.S.C. § 115(c)(1), as amended, for the United States Department of Homeland Security or any of its agency subcomponents ("DHS law enforcement agency") on or after January 21, 2025, and who after that date engaged in the enforcement of federal immigration laws relating to the deportation, expulsion, or removal of individuals, excluding operations at an external boundary or port of entry, as designated under federal law:

(1) comprehensive information related to the applicant's performance and conduct, including:

(A) the precise dates and locations of any assignments or deployments on or after January 21, 2025;

(B) details related to any use of force in which the applicant participated or witnessed while engaged in the enforcement of federal immigration laws relating to the deportation, expulsion, or removal of individuals, excluding operations at an external boundary or port of entry, on or after January 21, 2025; and

(C) any complaints filed against the applicant or filed generally against a DHS law enforcement agency for actions occurring at a location where the applicant was physically

present or for which the applicant had operational involvement and of which the applicant has knowledge; and

(2) an affidavit on a form approved by the Office of the County Attorney that the applicant has never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights in the performance of their duties enforcing federal immigration laws relating to the deportation, expulsion, or removal of individuals, excluding operations at an external boundary or port of entry, on or after January 21, 2025.

This Section does not apply to any applicant employed by a local or state law enforcement agency whose applicable service as a federal law enforcement officer consisted only of temporary participation in a task force with a federal agency.

**Sec. 2. Transition.** The requirements of this legislation must be applied to the application process for each police academy class beginning with the July 2027 class.

**Sec. 3. Short Title.** This bill may be known as the "Continued Excellence in Public Service Act."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

EVAN GLASS
COUNCILMEMBER AT-LARGE

TRANSPORTATION & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE, CHAIR
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**MEMORANDUM**

April 22, 2026

**TO:** Councilmembers
**FROM:** Councilmember Evan Glass
**SUBJECT:** Introducing the Continued Excellence in Public Service Act

Over the past sixteen months, we have watched in horror as the federal government has deployed militarized immigration enforcement across the country and in our own community. The violent tactics and callous disregard for civil rights that we have seen are fundamentally at odds with the values of Montgomery County.

On April 28, I will introduce the Continued Excellence in Public Service Act, which aims to strengthen the relationship between our immigrant community and the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD). Specifically, the Continued Excellence in Public Service Act will require that MCPD applicants who may have participated in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's immigration enforcement efforts on or after January 21, 2025 undergo an additional detailed background review process, beyond the current rigorous department standards, before being hired as Montgomery County police officers.

I want to be very clear: Federal agents engaging in dangerous, harmful and deceptive practices do ***not*** represent our values or those of the Montgomery County Police Department. I have worked closely with Chief Yamada and MCPD to craft this legislation in such a way that reaffirms our commitment to our immigrant community without compromising ongoing police recruitment efforts.

I am immensely proud of the work that this Council has done in collaboration with our immigrant community and local law enforcement to reaffirm our commitment to keeping Montgomery County a safe and welcoming place for everyone, and I look forward to continuing this important work. Please email Hannah Wilcove in my office with any questions or to be added as a co-sponsor to this legislation.

# Climate Assessment

**Office of Legislative Oversight**

## BILL 18-26: POLICE – POWERS AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR – DHS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY HIRING

## SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 18-26 will have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change as it is proposing changes to screening processes for potential MCPD candidates.

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF BILL 18-26

Across the U.S., state and local jurisdictions are introducing legislation to respond to the Trump administration's aggressive immigration enforcement campaign.[1] Specifically, multiple states have introduced bills that aim to restrict the hiring of some federal immigration officers in state and local law enforcement.[2] In 2026, state delegates in the Maryland General Assembly introduced a bill to ban state law enforcement from hiring individuals who were employed as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers after January 20, 2025.[3] The bill did not move out of committee.[4]

The purpose of Bill 18-26 is to require the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) to conduct additional screening for certain candidates who were employed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). This screening would be required for MCPD officer candidates who: [5]

- Worked as federal law enforcement for DHS or a DHS sub-agency on or after January 21, 2025; and
- Engaged in immigration deportation, expulsion, or removal operations after that date, unless the operations were at an external boundary or port of entry.

Candidates from state or local law enforcement agencies who meet these requirements because of their temporary participation in a federal agency task force would be exempt from additional screening.

For candidates who meet the requirements, MCPD would be required to review and verify the following before extending a final offer of employment:[6]

- The candidate's assignment and deployment locations on or after January 21, 2025;
- Their participation in or witness of use of force during operations on or after this date; and
- Any complaints filed against the candidate or their federal employing agency.

Candidates would also have to submit an affidavit to MPCD attesting that, on or after January 21, 2025, they never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights during immigration enforcement operations.

According to the Bill's lead sponsor, Bill 18-26 aims "to strengthen the relationship between our immigrant community and MCPD."[7]

The Council introduced Bill 18-26 on April 28, 2026.

## ANTICIPATED IMPACTS

As the Bill proposes changes to screening processes for potential MCPD candidates, OLO anticipates Bill 18-26 will have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change, including the reduction and/or sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions and community climate resilience.

## RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The Climate Assessment Act requires OLO to offer recommendations, such as amendments or other measures to mitigate any anticipated negative climate impacts.[8] OLO does not offer recommendations or amendments as Bill 18-26 is likely to have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change, including the reduction and/or sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions and community climate resilience.

## CAVEATS

OLO notes two caveats to this climate assessment. First, predicting the impacts of legislation upon climate change is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, uncertainty, and the broad, global nature of climate change. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to inform the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

## PURPOSE OF CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS

The purpose of the Climate Assessments is to evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on the County's contribution to addressing climate change. These climate assessments will provide the Council with a more thorough understanding of the potential climate impacts and implications of proposed legislation, at the County level. The scope of the Climate Assessments is limited to the County's contribution to addressing climate change, specifically upon the County's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and how actions suggested by legislation could help increase the County's community climate resilience.

While co-benefits such as health and cost savings may be discussed, the focus is on how proposed County bills may impact GHG emissions and community resilience.

# CONTRIBUTIONS

OLO staffer Kaitlyn Simmons drafted this assessment.

---

[1] D. Han and S. Kapos, "States move to rein in ICE after fatal Minnesota shooting," Politico, January 11, 2026.
[2] M. Ventrelli, "Colorado bill disqualifies former ICE agents from getting job in local law enforcement," Colorado Politics, February 20, 2026; L. La, "California Democrats to Trump immigration agents: Don't apply here," CalMatters, April 22, 2026; J. Raftery, "Taking aim at ICE: State bill would ban former agents from being hired as police officers," MyNorthwest News, January 22, 2026.
[3] C. Foreback, "Proposed Maryland bill would prohibit some ICE officers from working for state police agencies," CBS News, March 12, 2026.
[4] HB0832, Maryland General Assembly.
[5] Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, Montgomery County Council, introduced April 28, 2026, pgs. 1-2.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Memo from Councilmember Evan Glass to Councilmembers, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, pg. (4).
[8] Bill 3-22, Legislative Branch – Climate Assessments – Required, Montgomery County Council, Effective date October 24, 2022

# Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Impact Statement

**Office of Legislative Oversight**

## BILL 18-26: POLICE - POWERS AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR - DHS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY HIRING

### SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 18-26 would have minimal impact on racial equity and social justice (RESJ) in the County. Requiring additional screening for certain Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) officer candidates who were employed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is not likely to meaningfully impact racial inequities or disparities in policing.

### PURPOSE OF RESJ IMPACT STATEMENTS

RESJ impact statements (RESJIS) evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice in the County. RESJ is a **process** that focuses on centering the needs, leadership, and power of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) and communities with low incomes. RESJ is also a **goal** of eliminating racial and social inequities. Applying a RESJ lens is essential to achieve RESJ.[1] This involves seeing, thinking, and working differently to address the racial and social inequities that cause racial and social disparities.[2]

### PURPOSE OF BILL 18-26

Across the U.S., state and local jurisdictions are introducing legislation to respond to the Trump administration's aggressive immigration enforcement campaign.[3] Particularly, multiple states have introduced bills that aim to restrict the hiring of some federal immigration officers in state and local law enforcement.[4] In 2026, state delegates in the Maryland General Assembly introduced a bill to ban state law enforcement from hiring individuals who were employed as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers after January 20, 2025.[5] The bill did not move out of committee.[6]

The purpose of Bill 18-26 is to require MCPD to conduct additional screening for certain candidates who were employed by DHS. This screening would be required for MCPD officer candidates who:[7]

- Worked as federal law enforcement for DHS or a DHS sub-agency on or after January 21, 2025; and
- Engaged in immigration deportation, expulsion, or removal operations after that date, unless the operations were at an external boundary or port of entry.

Candidates from state or local law enforcement agencies who meet these requirements because of their temporary participation in a federal agency task force would be exempt from additional screening.

For candidates who meet the requirements, MCPD would be required to review and verify the following before extending a final offer of employment:[8]

- The candidate's assignment and deployment locations on or after January 21, 2025;
- Their participation in or witness of use of force during operations on or after this date; and
- Any complaints filed against the candidate or their federal employing agency.

Candidates would also have to submit an affidavit to MPCD attesting that, on or after January 21, 2025, they never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights during immigration enforcement operations. Of note, Bill 18-26 would not require MCPD to make hiring decisions based on the collected screening information.

According to the Bill's lead sponsor, Bill 18-26 aims "to strengthen the relationship between our immigrant community and MCPD."[9]

The Council introduced Bill 18-26 on April 28, 2026.

This RESJIS builds on the one for Expedited Bill 49-21, Police – Police Accountability Board – Administrative Charging Committee – Established.[10] Please refer to this RESJIS for background on policing and racial equity.

## ANTICIPATED RESJ IMPACTS

To consider the anticipated impact of Bill 18-26 on RESJ in the County, OLO recommends the consideration of two related questions:

- Who would primarily benefit or be burdened by this bill?
- What racial and social inequities could passage of this bill weaken or strengthen?

Because of historical and contemporary racial inequities,[11] Black and to a lesser extent, Latinx, community members are overrepresented in law enforcement interactions with MCPD. This includes traffic stops, uses of force, and arrests (Table A, Appendix). Thus, Black and Latinx community members would be disproportionately impacted by any changes to hiring practices for MCPD officers.

Bill 18-26 would require MCPD to review and verify certain information for candidates who were employed by DHS. However, the Bill would not require MCPD to make hiring decisions based on this screening information. Thus, Bill 18-26 may not meaningfully change MCPD's hiring practices. Further, the screening requirements are not likely to meaningfully impact racial inequities in policing – such as biases in institutional policies, practices and culture – [12] that drive racial disparities in policing outcomes.

Therefore, OLO anticipates Bill 18-26 would have a minimal impact on RESJ in the County.

## RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The County's RESJ Act requires OLO to consider whether to recommend amendments to bills that could reduce racial and social inequities and advance RESJ.[13] OLO anticipates Bill 18-26 would have a minimal impact on RESJ in the County. As such, OLO does not offer recommended amendments. However, should the Council seek to improve the RESJ impact of this Bill, OLO offers one policy option for Council consideration:

- **Require MCPD to condition hiring decision of DHS candidates based on screening results.** Specifically, the Council could collaborate with impacted community members, the Advisory Commission on Policing, and other community stakeholders to identify disqualifying conduct for Bill 18-26 and require MCPD to reject DHS candidates who meet the disqualification criteria. This could help prevent the hiring of officers that would worsen existing racial disparities in policing outcomes.

- **Require MCPD to screen candidates for misconduct in any local, state or federal law enforcement role.** One recent study found certain indicators of misconduct in prior law enforcement jobs – including written reprimands and suspensions, unjustified uses of force, and racial bias complaints – are strong predictors of future misconduct among police hires.[14] Yet, the study also found law enforcement agencies rarely use information on pre-hire misconduct for screening decisions.[15] To help prevent the hiring of officers that would worsen existing racial disparities in policing outcomes, the Council could expand the proposed screening requirements to consider a candidate's history of misconduct in any law enforcement agency. The Council could also require MCPD to reject candidates who are found to have a history of misconduct.

## CAVEATS

Two caveats to this RESJIS should be noted. First, predicting the impact of bills on RESJ is challenging due to data limitations, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, this RESJIS is intended to inform the Council's decision-making process rather than determine it. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

## APPENDIX

**Table A. MCPD Traffic Stops, Uses of Force, and Arrests by Race and Ethnicity**

| Race or ethnicity[16] | Traffic Stops (FY18-FY22) | Uses of Force (2025) | Arrests (2025) | County Population (2024) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian | 6.0 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 15.3 |
| Black | 30.0 | 53.0 | 49.9 | 18.3 |
| Native American | < 1.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Pacific Islander | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| White | 35.0 | 15.0 | 18.3 | 39.5 |
| Latinx | 21.0 | 25.0 | 29.0 | 21.0 |

Source: N. Carrizosa, OLO Report 2022-12: Analysis of dataMontgomery Traffic Violations Dataset, OLO, pg. 9; 2025 Annual Use of Force Report, MCPD, pg. 9; OLO analysis of Police Arrests dataset, dataMontgomery; Table DP05, 2024 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Census Bureau.

[1] Definition of racial equity and social justice adopted from M. Gamblin et al., "Applying Racial Equity to U.S. Federal Nutrition Programs," Bread for the World and Racial Equity Tools.
[2] Ibid.
[3] D. Han and S. Kapos, "States move to rein in ICE after fatal Minnesota shooting," Politico, January 11, 2026.
[4] M. Ventrelli, "Colorado bill disqualifies former ICE agents from getting job in local law enforcement," Colorado Politics, February 20, 2026; L. La, "California Democrats to Trump immigration agents: Don't apply here," CalMatters, April 22, 2026; J. Raftery, "Taking aim at ICE: State bill would ban former agents from being hired as police officers," MyNorthwest News, January 22, 2026.
[5] C. Foreback, "Proposed Maryland bill would prohibit some ICE officers from working for state police agencies," CBS News, March 12, 2026.
[6] HB0832, Maryland General Assembly.
[7] Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, Montgomery County Council, introduced April 28, 2026, pgs. 1-2.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Memo from Councilmember Evan Glass to Councilmembers, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, pg. (4).
[10] RESJIS for Expedited Bill 49-21, Office of Legislative Oversight, January 10, 2022.

[11] Ibid.
[12] J. Cobbina, "Is hiring more black officers the key to reducing police violence?," MSU Today, Michigan State University, February 4, 2020.
[13] Bill 27-19, Administration – Human Rights – Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice – Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee – Established, Montgomery County Council.
[14] S. Dilchert, et al., "The Importance of Not Looking the Other Way: Prehire On- and Off-the-Job Misbehavior Predicts Subsequent Police Misconduct," American Psychological Association, pg. 14.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Racial groups are non-Latinx for all data points in this table.

# Economic Impact Statement

**Montgomery County, Maryland**

## Bill 18-26, Police – Powers and duties of director – DHS law enforcement agency hiring

## Summary

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates that Bill 18-26 would have an insignificant impact on economic conditions in the County, as measured by the Council's priority economic indicators. The Bill would require the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) to conduct additional screening for certain candidates who were employed in U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) immigration enforcement operations on or after January 21, 202d5. It is unlikely that this policy change would affect enough candidates residing in the County in terms of the Council's priority indicators to have a measurable economic impact.

## Background and Purpose of Bill 18-26

Across the U.S., state and local jurisdictions are introducing legislation to respond to the Trump administration's aggressive immigration enforcement campaign.[1] Specifically, multiple states have introduced bills that aim to restrict the hiring of some federal immigration officers in state and local law enforcement.[2] In 2026, state delegates in the Maryland General Assembly introduced a bill to ban state law enforcement from hiring individuals who were employed as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers after January 20, 2025.[3] The bill did not move out of committee.[4]

The purpose of Bill 18-26 is to require MCPD to conduct additional screening for certain candidates who were employed by DHS. This screening would be required for MCPD officer candidates who: [5]

- Worked as federal law enforcement for DHS or a DHS sub-agency on or after January 21, 2025; and
- Engaged in immigration deportation, expulsion, or removal operations after that date, unless the operations were at an external boundary or port of entry.

Candidates from state or local law enforcement agencies who meet these requirements because of their temporary participation in a federal agency task force would be exempt from additional screening.

For candidates who meet the requirements, MCPD would be required to review and verify the following before extending a final offer of employment:[6]

- The candidate's assignment and deployment locations on or after January 21, 2025;

---

[1] D. Han and S. Kapos, "States move to rein in ICE after fatal Minnesota shooting," Politico, January 11, 2026.
[2] M. Ventrelli, "Colorado bill disqualifies former ICE agents from getting job in local law enforcement," Colorado Politics, February 20, 2026; L. La, "California Democrats to Trump immigration agents: Don't apply here," CalMatters, April 22, 2026; J. Raftery, "Taking aim at ICE: State bill would ban former agents from being hired as police officers," MyNorthwest News, January 22, 2026.
[3] C. Foreback, "Proposed Maryland bill would prohibit some ICE officers from working for state police agencies," CBS News, March 12, 2026.
[4] HB0832, Maryland General Assembly.
[5] Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, Montgomery County Council, introduced April 28, 2026, pgs. 1-2.
[6] Ibid.

- Their participation in or witness of use of force during operations on or after this date; and
- Any complaints filed against the candidate or their federal employing agency.

Candidates would also have to submit an affidavit to MPCD attesting that, on or after January 21, 2025, they never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights during immigration enforcement operations.

According to the Bill's lead sponsor, Bill 18-26 aims "to strengthen the relationship between our immigrant community and MCPD."[7]

The Council introduced Bill 18-26 on April 28, 2026.

## Information Sources, Methodologies, and Assumptions

As required by Section 2-81B of the Montgomery County Code, this Economic Impact Statement evaluates the impacts of Bill 18-26 on residents and private organizations, using the Council's priority economic indicators as the measure. In doing so, it examines whether the Bill would have a net positive or negative impact on overall economic conditions in the County.[8]

It is unlikely that this policy change would affect enough candidates residing in the County in terms of the Council's priority indicators to have a measurable economic impact. Therefore, OLO anticipates that the Bill would have an insignificant impact on economic conditions in the County.

## Variables

Not applicable

## Impacts

**WORKFORCE ▪ TAXATION POLICY ▪ PROPERTY VALUES ▪ INCOMES ▪ OPERATING COSTS ▪ PRIVATE SECTOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ▪ ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ▪ COMPETITIVENESS**

Not applicable

## Discussion Items

Not applicable

## Caveats

Two caveats to the economic impact analysis conducted here should be noted. First, predicting the economic impacts of legislation is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, the multitude of causes of economic outcomes, economic shocks, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to *inform* the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the Bill under consideration.

---

[7] Memo from Councilmember Evan Glass to Councilmembers, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 18-26, pg. (4).
[8] Montgomery County Code, "Sec. 2-81B, Economic Impact Statements."

## Contributions

Stephen Roblin, PhD (OLO) prepared this report.

# Fiscal Impact Statement

Office of Management and Budget

| | |
|---|---|
| **Bill 18-26** | **Police - Powers and duties of director - DHS law enforcement agency hiring** |
| **Bill Summary** | Bill 18-26 adds additional background screening requirements for individuals applying to be a police officer with the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD). MCPD must verify the following for any applicant who participated in specified immigration enforcement activities while working as a law enforcement officer at the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) or any of its subordinate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) on or after January 21, 2025:<br><br>- The dates and locations of their work<br>- The details of any use of force in which the applicant participated or witnessed<br>- Complaints filed against the applicant<br>- Complaints filed against the applicant's LEA when for an operations in which the applicant was present, or in which the applicant was otherwise involved<br>- An affidavit attesting that the applicant never intentionally violated an individual's constitutional rights in their time working for a DHS LEA.<br><br>There are two main exceptions: 1) applicants who were posted at an external boundary or port of entry and 2) those who were employed by a state or local LEA who had a temporary assignment on a task force with a federal agency. |
| **Fiscal Impact Summary** | The additional workload will require a new Background Screening Specialist at a cost of $120,200 per-year, in addition to one-time costs of $1,000 for a new computer and office supplies provided to new employees. |

| **Fiscal Year** | **26** | **27** | **28** | **29** | **30** | **31** | **Total** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Personnel Costs** | $120,200 | $120,200 | $120,200 | $120,200 | $120,200 | $120,200 | $721,200 |
| **Operating Expenses** | $1,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $1,000 |
| **Total Expenditures** | **$121,200** | **$120,200** | **$120,200** | **$120,200** | **$120,200** | **$120,200** | **$722,200** |
| **Revenues** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** |
| **Total Impact** | **($121,200)** | **($120,200)** | **($120,200)** | **($120,200)** | **($120,200)** | **($120,200)** | **($722,200)** |
| **FTE** | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Fiscal Impact Analysis** | The new responsibilities outlined above will increase MCPD's background investigations unit's workload enough to require a new position, a Background Screening Specialist with an estimated annual salary and benefits cost of $120,200, in addition to $1,000 in one-time cost for a new computer and office supplies. Without the new position, the workload would be absorbed by current staff and the length of a background investigation will increase for all applicants, not just police officer applicants. |
| **Staff Impact** | The workload of Bill 18-26 would fall on MCPD's background investigations unit, which consists of one Program Manager II and ten Background Screening Specialists. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Without a new background investigator position added to the unit, the time it takes to conduct a background investigation will increase as the new workload is absorbed by the existing staff. |
| **Actuarial Analysis** | The bill is not expected to impact retiree pension or group insurance costs. |
| **Information Technology Impact** | The bill is not expected to impact the County Information Technology (IT) or Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems. |
| **Other Information** | |
| *Later actions that may impact revenue or expenditures if future spending is projected* | The bill does not authorize future spending. |
| *Ranges of revenue or expenditures that are uncertain or difficult to project* | The actual impact of Bill 18-26 depends on the number of police officer applicants with experience working for a DHS LEA. It also depends on how easy it will be to implement some of the bill's requirements. For example, it may be difficult to verify an applicant's exact work locations and dates while he or she was employed by a DHS LEA, especially if DHS is unwilling to share the records.<br><br>MCPD additionally notes that if the bill were enacted, the County's requirement to treat all applicants the same could necessitate this elevated level of screening for all officer applicants, and if so additional Background Screening Specialist positions would be needed above the one noted in this Fiscal Impact Statement. |
| *Contributors* | Nicholas Augustine, Montgomery County Police Department<br>Amy Costanza, Montgomery County Police Department<br>Brian Hawley, Montgomery County Police Department<br>Taman Morris, Montgomery County Police Department<br>Dale Philips, Montgomery County Police Department<br>Richard H. Harris, Office of Management and Budget |