



**HOUSE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
WRITTEN OPPONENT TESTIMONY ON HOUSE BILL 42 | NOVEMBER 18, 2025**

Chair Hall, Vice Chair Ferguson, Ranking Member Humphrey, and members of the House Government Oversight Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide written opponent testimony on HB 42.

As a bipartisan coalition of mayors in Ohio's largest cities and suburbs, public safety is our highest priority. Public safety expenses make up the lion's share of our cities' budget expenditures, and we invest significantly in our public safety forces, equipment, and infrastructure. HB 42 adds a new cost to communities by requiring our local law enforcement agencies to collect immigration data that could complicate and potentially impede our efforts to keep our communities safe.

First, the costs associated with implementing such a system would be significant. The LSC Fiscal Note notes one-time costs for agencies of around \$5,000, which, for all 900+ local law enforcement agencies in Ohio, would exceed \$4.5 million. The LSC fiscal note does not, however, account for extra training costs associated with ensuring all of our officers know the rules and how and when to collect the data.

Second, local regulations and procedures would also need to be developed to implement the policies in HB 42 - for example, if an arrestee or detainee does not have any evidence of their citizenship or immigration status with them at the time they are detained, what procedures would officers have to follow to track down and obtain such information? Will this law require *all* Ohioans to begin carrying their birth certificate or immigration paperwork with them at all times? If so, how will cities and local law enforcement agencies share that information with the public? What if a person does not have a copy of such documentation? Thinking through and creating procedures and rules for these questions in all of our law enforcement agencies will require a considerable amount of time, resources, and effort that could be better devoted to preventing, responding to, and solving crimes.

Third, related to the above, we are concerned that HB 42 will potentially expose our law enforcement agencies and cities to liability, should a regulation or procedure create a scenario that results in injury or litigation.

Fourth, the effectiveness of our local law enforcement agencies is reliant on officers' and departments' relationships with their local communities. Our cities have worked tirelessly in the past several years to implement programs and policies that are aimed at building trust and strong relationships between officers and the communities they serve. A law requiring officers to obtain and report information about immigration status could be a deterrent to some of our residents to calling the police, cooperating with investigations, or otherwise building relationships. This dynamic would impact our public safety efforts.

For these reasons, we urge the committee to decline to advance HB 42 at this time.