



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

JAHMILA K. EDWARDS
DIRECTOR OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

April 24, 2025

Michael M. McSweeney
Clerk to the Council
141 Worth Street
New York, NY 10013

Dear Mr. McSweeney:

Transmitted herewith is the bill disapproved by the Mayor. The bill is as follows:

Int. 175-B - A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to a plan regarding security perimeters adjacent to educational facilities.

Sincerely,

Jahmila Edwards
Director of Intergovernmental Affairs

cc: Honorable Julie Menin



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10007

April 24, 2026

Hon. Michael McSweeney
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council
141 Worth Street
New York, NY 10013

Re: Disapproval of Introductory No. 175-B

Dear Mr. McSweeney:

Pursuant to Section 37 of the New York City Charter, I hereby disapprove Introductory No. 175-B, which would amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York “in relation to a plan regarding security perimeters adjacent to educational facilities.”

Over these past few weeks, I have heard from activists and community-based organizations, civil and reproductive rights groups, faith leaders and congregations, labor advocates and unions, education workers and students, and many other New Yorkers regarding their concerns about this legislation and its potential impact on them.

I disapprove Int. 175-B because it risks trading unnecessarily on New Yorkers’ constitutional rights. Moreover, the bill frames student protest as primarily a security concern, a premise I do not accept.

Int. 175-B implicates New Yorkers’ fundamental rights. The First Amendment right to free speech and assembly—the right to protest—is a core U.S. constitutional principle. When people protest outside a school or another educational facility, that right is in play. There is no equivalent and countervailing constitutional right, such as the right to worship, that must be weighed. In that light, this bill raises the risk of encroachment on New Yorkers’ fundamental right to protest.

This prospect is all the more concerning given the scope and potential reach of Int. 175-B. The bill defines “educational facility” expansively, to encompass any place in New York City “where educational programming takes place,” whether private or public, school or not. This definition includes museums, community centers, teaching hospitals, private event spaces, schools, and universities—anywhere New Yorkers are learning in an organized way. This would bear on New Yorkers’ right to protest across our city, with particular impact on the ability of unions and other labor activists to organize.

On college campuses, the bill would increase the risk of immigration consequences for immigrant student activists by raising the odds that they might come into contact with the criminal legal system during student protests. As a result, Int. 175-B would also chill immigrant students' constitutionally protected speech.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby disapprove Introductory No. 175-B.

Respectfully,



Zohran Kwame Mamdani
Mayor

cc: Hon. Julie Menin, Speaker

Proposed Int. No. 175-B

By Council Members Dinowitz, Ariola, The Speaker (Council Member Menin), Schulman, Gennaro, Louis, Narcisse, Brewer, Hanks, Zhuang, Riley, Lee, Maloney, Wong, Feliz, Banks, Encarnación, Mealy, Salaam, Ung, Abreu, Hankerson, Marte, Brooks-Powers, Felder, Paladino, Vernikov, Carr and Morano

A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to a plan regarding security perimeters adjacent to educational facilities

Be it enacted by the Council as follows:

1 Section 1. Chapter 1 of title 10 of the administrative code of the city of New York is
2 amended by adding a new section 10-188 to read as follows:

3 § 10-188 Plan regarding security perimeters adjacent to educational facilities. a.

4 Definitions. For purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

5 Educational facility. The term “educational facility” means any building, structure, or place
6 where educational programming takes place. Such term includes but is not limited to public and
7 nonpublic childcare programs, early childhood programs, elementary schools, middle schools,
8 junior high schools, high schools, colleges, and universities.

9 Interference. The term “interference” means restricting an individual’s freedom of
10 movement.

11 Intimidation. The term “intimidation” means placing an individual in reasonable fear of
12 physical harm to themselves or to another individual.

13 Physical obstruction. The term “physical obstruction” means rendering ingress to or egress
14 from an educational facility impassable, or unreasonably difficult or hazardous.

15

16 b. No later than 45 days after the effective date of the local law that added this section, the
17 police commissioner shall submit to the mayor and the speaker of the council a proposed plan to

1 address and contain the risk of physical obstruction, physical injury, intimidation, and interference,
2 while preserving and protecting the rights to free speech and assembly, and protest, at educational
3 facilities through the use of security perimeters, in accordance with subdivision d, at entrances to,
4 and exits from, such educational facilities, including parking lots or driveways of such educational
5 facilities. For educational facilities located on private property, the entrances and exits are where
6 a person may enter or exit the private property from the public domain, for purposes of such plan.

7 c. No later than 90 days after the effective date of the local law that added this section, the
8 police commissioner shall submit to the mayor and the speaker of the council, and post on the
9 police department's website, a final plan.

10 d. The proposed and final plans shall include considerations to be used by the police
11 department in connection with:

12 1. Deciding whether and when to use a security perimeter at entrances to, and exits from,
13 an educational facility, including the duration of such a security perimeter;

14 2. Determining the extent of such a security perimeter, as measured from entrances to, and
15 exits from, an educational facility;

16 3. Implementing such a security perimeter, including steps taken by the police department
17 to ensure that such a perimeter neither curtails the rights to free speech and assembly, or protest
18 nor impedes emergency access to, or egress from, an educational facility, including but not limited
19 to access or egress by emergency personnel;

20 4. Engaging and communicating with administrators of an educational facility while
21 carrying out the actions set forth in paragraphs 1 through 3 of this subdivision, in order to
22 understand their relevant needs and concerns; and

