



City of Bladensburg Legislation Report (March 2, 2026)

| Bill Title | Bill Number | Sponsor(s) | Status/Hearing Notes | General Notes |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Vehicle Laws - Automated Enforcement - Reciprocal Agreements, Arrangements, and Declarations | HB 249 (SB 173) | Chair, Environment and Transportation Committee | In the House - Hearing 2/12 at 1:00 p.m. (1/19) | <p>Allows Maryland to work with other states and jurisdictions to collect unpaid traffic camera tickets.</p> <p>Pro(s): Closes a major enforcement loophole. Supports Vision Zero. Revenue increase. Regional consistency.</p> <p>Con(s): May prioritize ticket collection over safety. Impacts low-income drivers. Due process concerns. Potential administrative burden.</p> |
| | SB 173 (HB 249) | Chair, Judicial Proceedings Committee | In the Senate - Hearing 1/21 at 11:00 a.m. (1/13) | |
| MD Housing Certainty Act Land Use - Permitting - Development Rights (Maryland Housing Certainty Act) | HB 548 (SB 325) | Behler | In the House - Hearing 2/19 at 1:00 p.m. (2/3) | <p>It "locks in" the rules for housing projects earlier in the approval process, and it delays when impact fees and excise taxes are collected.</p> <p>Pro(s): Increases regulatory certainty. Aligns Maryland with neighbor states. Could speed housing production.</p> <p>Con(s): Limits local flexibility. Fiscal strain on municipalities. Climate & public safety concerns.</p> |
| | SB 325 (HB 548) | Augustine | <p>In the Senate - Hearing 2/17 at 1:00 p.m. (1/23)</p> <p>NOTES FROM HEARING: Testimony reflected broad agreement that Maryland has a housing shortage, but disagreement over whether SB 325 appropriately balances regulatory certainty for developers with local land use authority and infrastructure planning.</p> | |
| Traffic Control Signal Monitoring and Speed Monitoring Systems - Exemptions From Liability - Vehicle Rental Companies | SB 921 (HB 1522) | Harris | In the Senate - Hearing 3/04 at 1:00 p.m. (2/12) | <p>The bill redefines the "owner" of a vehicle so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rental companies can be held responsible. • Leasing companies can be held responsible. • Short-term lessees (under 6 months) can be held responsible. • Special registration plate holders can be held responsible. <p>Under current law, these entities are never liable for automated camera tickets. Under this bill, they could be.</p> <p>Pro(s): Improves accountability. Increases public safety revenue without raising taxes. Closes logistical loopholes.</p> <p>Con(s): Costs may be passed to consumers. Risk of increased litigation. Expanding liability increases financial penalties in a system some consider overused.</p> |
| | HB 1522 (SB 921) | Odom | In the House - Hearing 3/12 at 1:00 p.m. (2/13) | |
| Motor Vehicles - Out-of-State Drivers - Automated Enforcement (Out-of-State Driver Accountability Act) | HB 210 (SB 965) | Foley | In the House - Favorable with Amendments Report by Environment and Transportation (3/2) | <p>Requires counties and municipalities that already use automated traffic enforcement cameras (speed cameras, red light cameras, school bus cameras, etc.) to submit a quarterly report to the State's Vision Zero Coordinator.</p> <p>Pro(s): Improves accountability for out-of-state drivers. No significant state cost. No New Fines or Penalties.</p> <p>Con(s): No direct enforcement solution/doesn't establish interstate enforcement mechanisms or withhold registrations</p> |
| | SB 965 (HB 210) | Charles | In the Senate - First Reading Senate Rules (2/13) | |
| Land Use - Zoning - Limitations (Starter and Silver Homes Act of 2026) | HB 239 (SB 36) | Chair, Economic Matters Committee | <p>In the House - Hearing 2/12 at 1:00 p.m. (1/19)</p> <p>NOTES FROM HEARING: The Administration's witnesses framed HB 239 as not eliminating single-family zoning, but</p> | This bill aims to make it easier to build smaller, typically less-expensive homes by limiting a set of local requirements that can increase land costs and block townhouses in single-family zones. |

City of Bladensburg Legislation Report (March 2, 2026)

| Bill Title | Bill Number | Sponsor(s) | Status/Hearing Notes | General Notes |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>removing barriers that prevent smaller/attached home types from being built (and argued this could help affordability by expanding supply/options).</p> <p>Some local leaders and housing officials raised concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no affordability requirements (so new units may still be priced out of reach), and there's risk of displacement if redevelopment targets lower-cost neighborhoods. • The bill could preempt local planning, limiting ability to match growth to infrastructure/schools/transportation capacity, and could undermine county-driven plans. | <p>Pro(s): Could increase the supply and variety of homes. Creates more consistent statewide rules. Targets specific "cost-adders" that can make entry-level construction difficult or uneconomic.</p> <p>Con(s): limits a county/municipality's ability to tailor zoning/design standards. Affordability isn't guaranteed. Displacement and equity risks. Administrative burden for locals.</p> |
| | SB 36 (HB 239) | Chair, Education, Energy the Environment Committee | In the Senate - Hearing 2/17 at 1:00 p.m. (1/27) | |
| Land Use - Residential Housing - Oversight, Regulation, and Taxation (Building Affordably in My Back Yard Act) | SB 267 | Brooks | In the Senate - Hearing 2/17 at 1:00 p.m. (Education, Energy, and the Environment) (1/23) | <p>SB 267 is a broad, multi-part housing bill that tries to increase housing supply (especially affordable housing) by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting statewide housing production targets 2. Creating more certainty and speed in development approvals 3. Allowing local tax incentives (and disincentives) tied to housing 4. Limiting investor purchases (temporarily) 5. Studying infrastructure and state permitting barriers <p>Pro(s): Creates Housing Accountability. Adds Regulatory Certainty. Gives Local Governments More Tools.</p> <p>Con(s): Significant State Preemption Concerns. Administrative Burden on Large Counties. Does Not Guarantee Affordability at Scale.</p> |
| Prince George's County Termination of Gas/Electric Service to Multi-Family Dwelling Units - Notification | HB 353 | Prince George's County Delegation | In the House - First Reading Environment and Transportation (1/19) | <p>Requires utilities to notify elected officials before terminating service (master/sub-meter multi-family units) for non-payment.</p> <p>Pro(s): Increases transparency/early intervention; protects tenants from landlord non-payment.</p> <p>Con(s): Added admin burden on utilities</p> |
| Prince George's County Supplemental Homeowner Property Tax Credit Required | HB 368 | Prince George's County Delegation | In the House - Hearing 2/03 at 1:00 p.m. (1/24) | <p>Supplements state homeowner tax credit for seniors (raises income/net worth/property thresholds).</p> <p>Pro(s): Relieves fixed-income seniors facing high assessments (income to \$75K, net worth \$200K+).</p> <p>Con(s): County funds admin/no state reimbursement; eligibility expansion costs.</p> |



City of Bladensburg Legislation Report (March 2, 2026)

| Bill Title | Bill Number | Sponsor(s) | Status/Hearing Notes | General Notes |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Alcoholic Beverages – Class A Licenses for Grocery Stores | HB 415 | Prince George's County Delegation | In the House - Hearing 3/04 at 1:00 p.m. (Economic Matters) and Hearing canceled (Government, Labor, and Elections) (2/13) | <p>Allows certain grocery stores inside the Beltway to obtain Class A beer or beer & wine licenses.</p> <p>Pro(s): Increases convenience for residents by allowing alcohol sales at grocery stores.</p> <p>Con(s): May negatively affect nearby small liquor stores and local businesses.</p> |
| Prince George's County - Crosswalk Monitoring Systems - Authorization PG 323-26 | HB 1227 | Prince George's County Delegation | In the House - First Reading Environment and Transportation (2/11) | <p>Allows Prince George's County to use automated crosswalk cameras in school zones, but only if the County Council passes a local law approving it.</p> <p>These cameras would ticket drivers who fail to stop for pedestrians in a crosswalk, as already required under Maryland law (§ 21-502(a)(2))</p> <p>Pro(s): Pedestrian Safety in School Zones. A \$40 fine is less punitive than many automated enforcement fines. Revenue Limited to Safety Purposes.</p> <p>Con(s): Expansion of Automated Enforcement. Can disproportionately affect low-income residents. Initial startup expenses may be significant.</p> |