

IAC Meeting Agenda

Thursday, May 14, 2026

Virtual Meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Live and archived streams of IAC meetings are available at <https://mdschoolconstruction.org>

Please visit <https://mdschoolconstruction.org> to sign up for public comment.

Action items are indicated with an asterisk.

Introduction

- Meeting called to order
- Roll Call
- Revisions to the Agenda
- Public Comment

Agenda Items

1. Executive Director's Report
Alex Donahue, Executive Director
2. Consent Agenda* – Page 2
Alex Donahue, Executive Director
 - a. April 9, 2026 Meeting Minutes* – Page 2
 - b. Contract Awards* – Page 11
 - c. Revisions to Previously Approved Contracts* – Page 13
 - d. Executive Director Approvals of Extensions to Special Funding Programs – Page 15
 - e. Revision to Previously Reverted Funds – Baltimore County Public Schools – Perry Hall High (PSC L03F011) Fire Safety Project* – Page 16
 - f. Correction to Reversion Amounts – Baltimore County Public Schools* – Page 17
 - g. Reversion of Funds – St. Mary's County Public Schools* – Page 18Facility Status Changes
 - h. Property Transfer – Queen Anne's County Public Schools – Former Centreville High and Centreville Middle* – Page 19
 - i. Property Transfer – Baltimore City Public Schools – Grounds Shop* – Page 20
 - j. Land Only Property Transfer – Harford County Public Schools – Campus Hills Property* – Page 21
 - k. Land Only Property Transfer – Harford County Public Schools – Woodbridge Center Property* – Page 22
 - l. Property Disposal – Baltimore City Public Schools – Patapsco PreK-8 #163 (PSC L30F238)* – Page 23
 - m. Easements and Rights of Way* – Page 24
3. FY 2027 100% Capital Improvement Program Recommendations* – Page 25
Arabia Davis, Funding Programs Manager
4. Project Cancellation and Maximum State Award Increase – Washington County Public Schools* – Page 33
Lisa Vaughn, Lead Capital Projects Manager
5. Administrative Procedure Guide Revisions – Departmental Bill* – Page 34
Victoria Howard, Policy Analyst; Cassandra Viscarra, Deputy Director
6. Legislative Session Presentation – Page 52
Victoria Howard, Policy Analyst; Cassandra Viscarra, Deputy Director

Announcements



Item 2.A. April 9, 2026 IAC Meeting Minutes

Motion:

To approve the draft April 9, 2026 IAC Meeting Minutes, as presented.



DRAFT Meeting Minutes – April 9, 2026

Call to Order:

Chair Edward Kasemeyer called the video-conference meeting of the Interagency Commission on School Construction to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members in Attendance:

Edward Kasemeyer, Appointee of the President of the Senate, Chair
Linda Eberhart, Appointee of the Speaker of the House, Vice-chair
Courtney League, as designee for Secretary Atif Chaudhry, Maryland Department of General Services
Michael Darenberg, Appointee of the Governor
Chuck Boyd, as designee for Secretary Rebecca Flora, Maryland Department of Planning
Manish Kothari, Appointee of the Governor
Gloria Lawlah, Appointee of the President of the Senate
Krishna Tallur, as designee for Dr. Carey M. Wright, State Superintendent of Schools

Members Not in Attendance:

None.

Revisions to the Agenda:

None.

Public Comment:

None.

IAC Correspondence:

None.

1. Executive Director's Report – [Informational Only]

Executive Director Alex Donahue gave a report covering several topics of note to the commissioners. First, he stated that the spaces in Westernport Elementary School in Allegany County that had been damaged by flooding reopened for use the week of March 30, 2026, and Williamsport High School in Washington County, which had an issue with asbestos contamination around the end of last year, is fully open and operational; Washington County Public Schools has stated that they will inform the IAC in the coming weeks whether they intend to submit a request for emergency funding for remediation costs.

Next, Executive Director Donahue gave a brief overview of the FY 2027 budget and legislative session, stating that the Governor had signed the State operating budget bill, capital budget bill, and the Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act. He stated that school construction was once again funded at the legislative target of \$450 million, that sadly increases to school construction were not possible, and two bills that would have increased the annual school construction funding target did not leave committee. He added that the IAC's departmental bill, SB 48 was passed by the Senate and adopted favorably on second reading by the House on April 8. Executive Director Donahue also stated that the Capital Budget bill was amended to make changes that significantly impacted the Kopp Priority Fund

(KPF) and Enrollment Growth and Relocatable Classrooms (EGRC) programs. The change to the KPF named six LEAs who would receive the majority of the funding, and leaves only a small amount of funding for the remaining LEAs. The budget bill also modified the EGRC formula to shift funds such that seven LEAs will receive fewer funds and six LEAs will receive more than initially anticipated. Executive Director Donahue reported that in response to this, IAC staff will be publishing a notice to all LEAs regarding these changes, and because EGRC and CIP funding is applied at the same time under the CIP, IAC staff are reaching out to LEAs impacted to discuss and adjust the 100% CIP recommendations accordingly which will be brought to the May IAC meeting for approval.

Executive Director Donahue also gave an update on the Built to Learn Act, stating that if Item 5 is passed at this meeting, then the IAC will have awarded \$1.6 billion, or 93.3% of the total \$1.7 billion of BTL funding. He stated that \$113 million remains unawarded, with \$32.7 million reserved for Montgomery County, \$70 million for Howard County, and the small amount remaining held for Dorchester and Queen Anne's Counties.

Lastly, Executive Director Donahue stated that in an effort to increase accessibility and comply with federal regulations surrounding accessible web content, staff have adopted a new IAC meeting agenda format that is more easily read by screen and document readers. He also stated that this compliance will require limiting the amount of backup documentation available in agendas because of the cost and time intensive efforts that would be required to make these documents accessible. In light of this, these documents will be omitted but will be available to the public upon request, and Excel tables that previously would be published in the agenda will instead be downloadable separately on the IAC's website.

2. **Consent Agenda – [Motion Carried]**

Upon a motion by Mr. Darenberg, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to approve the consent agenda.

a. **March 12, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

To approve the draft March 12, 2026 IAC Meeting Minutes, as presented.

b. **Contract Awards**

To approve contract procurement as presented.

c. **Revisions to Previously Approved Contracts**

To approve the revisions to previously approved contract awards as presented to accurately reflect the adjustments to the State and local participation in the contract amounts, reversions of funds, and/or corrections to project allocation information, with all Dorchester contract revisions contingent on approval of Item 6 in this agenda.

d. **Informational Only – Executive Director Approvals of Extensions to Special Funding Programs**

e. **COMAR Revisions to Approved Amendments of 14.39.02.06**

To approve revisions to the COMAR 14.39.02.06 amendments approved at the March 12, 2026 IAC meeting, as presented in this item for submission.

f. **Reversion of Funds – Baltimore County Public Schools**

To revert uncontracted FY 2023 and FY 2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds totaling \$1,045,256 from the presented Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) projects, and to reduce the Maximum State Award for the projects to reflect the project decreases as presented.

g. **Reversion of Funds – Prince George's County Public Schools**

To revert uncontracted FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds totaling \$9,285,000 from the presented Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS) projects, and to reduce the Maximum State Award for the projects to reflect the project decreases as presented.

Facility Status Changes

h. Easement Request – St. Mary's County Public Schools – Chopticon High School (PSC L18F019)

To approve the conveyance of the easement as presented.

i. Informational Only – Change of School Name – Howard County Public School System – Applications and Research Lab (PSC L13F018)

j. Site Approval – Montgomery County Public Schools – Former Kensington Elementary School Reacquisition (PSC L15F112)

To approve Montgomery County Public Schools' (MCPS) use of the Former Kensington Elementary School at 10400 Detrick Ave Kensington, MD 20895, for use as administrative offices, and potential future use as an early childhood education center within the next three years, adhering to the actions identified in the State clearinghouse review, State identifier MD20251223-0771.

3. Administrative Procedures Guide Amendments – [Motion Carried]

Deputy Director Cassandra Viscarra presented revisions to the IAC's Administrative Procedures Guide. She specifically pointed out that the revisions include codifying current IAC practice of considering Pre-K enrollment separately from K-5 enrollment when looking at project eligibility for certain projects, as not all classrooms can be used as Pre-K classrooms. She also stated that more detail has been added regarding scope studies in lieu of feasibility studies for certain project scopes. Finally, she stated that renovations would be ineligible for state funding if they are estimated to cost more than 75% of what the IAC would calculate as the Maximum State Award for a renewal project at the same facility based on eligible enrollment. She stated that this change would require LEAs to justify high-cost renovations and for the IAC to review the justification in order to be eligible for funding, a necessary step due to limited state funds and vast need. She added that other smaller revisions to the APG were noted in the agenda item's summary page.

Vice-chair Eberhart asked, since the agenda is published a week prior to the IAC meeting, whether any LEAs have alerted IAC staff to any concerns or issues with the changes. Ms. Viscarra stated that staff had not received any feedback from LEAs regarding the changes. Vice-chair Eberhart asked for confirmation that the elimination of the 'Science Classrooms' definition wasn't due to a restriction on funding these classrooms. Ms. Viscarra confirmed this and indicated that while science classrooms used to be a separate category of projects that had its own requirements, for the past several years the IAC has incorporated these types of classrooms in the general renovation category.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Kothari, seconded by Chuck Boyd, the IAC voted unanimously to approve amendments to the IAC's Administrative Procedures Guide as presented.

4. FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program Supplemental Survey – [Informational Only]

Administrative Services Manager Hannah Sturm presented the FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program Supplemental Survey, and stated that the survey gathers data on school facility topics including relocatable classrooms, open space classrooms, security vestibules, air conditioning, and staffing. She stated that most categories saw only routine changes statewide, with the exception of a significant decrease in the number of open space classrooms in Prince George's County. Additionally, she stated that five LEAs have no full time equivalent staff in departments related to school construction planning, design, and project management, but overall there was a slight increase in full time equivalent staff by nine individuals.

Vice-chair Eberhart asked if the survey tracked staff for maintenance. Ms. Sturm stated that this survey does not track those positions, and Executive Director Donahue added that LEAs are asked to provide this information in their annual Comprehensive Maintenance plans.

5. Built to Learn Funding Award – Howard County Public School System – Oakland Mills Middle (PSC L13F008) – Renovation/Addition Project – [Motion Carried]

Funding Programs Administrator Sheron Johnson presented a request from the Howard County Public School System to utilize \$5,424,000 of their remaining Built to Learn funding for the Oakland Mills Middle Renovation/Addition project. She stated that the project's Maximum State Award was \$7,166,000, and that HCPSS had remaining BTL funding totaling \$70.1 million yet to be awarded.

Upon a motion made by Courtney League, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to approve the Howard County Public School Systems request for Built to Learn construction funding for the Oakland Mills Middle School Renovation/Addition totaling \$5,424,000.

6. FY 2025 Capital Improvement Program Amendment Requests – Dorchester County Public Schools – [Motion Carried]

Capital Projects Manager Laura Smyles presented a request from Dorchester County Public Schools to realign funding between two Dorchester County Public Schools planning projects that spanned five school facilities. Specifically, Ms. Smyles stated that the motion would align the funding with current billing on the two planning projects.

Upon a motion made by Krishna Tallur, seconded by Mr. Darenberg, the IAC voted unanimously to reduce the FY 2025 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) award for the Dorchester County Public Schools Dorchester Planning Project for the Sandy Hill/Maple schools from \$250,000 to \$223,675; and, to increase the FY 2025 CIP award for the Dorchester Planning Project for the Warwick/Hurlock/Vienna schools from \$250,000 to \$276,325.

7. Maximum State Award Increase Request – Montgomery County Public Schools – Drew (Dr. Charles) Elementary (PSC L15F169) HVAC Project – [Motion Carried]

Ms. Smyles presented a request from Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) to increase the Maximum State Award (MSA) for the Drew (Dr. Charles) Elementary HVAC replacement project based on higher than anticipated bids that exceeded the current MSA. She stated that since being awarded funding in the FY 2025 CIP, cost escalation for HVAC projects has been significant and that another \$1,844,150 is needed to fully fund the project, which is anticipated to be funded with LEA reserve funds in the FY 2027 CIP at the 100% approval stage in May.

Upon a motion made by Chuck Boyd, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to increase the Maximum State Award for the Montgomery County Public Schools Drew (Dr. Charles) Elementary HVAC project from \$3,049,200 to \$4,893,350 in accordance with COMAR 14.39.02.08B.

8. Maximum State Award Increase Request – Montgomery County Public Schools – Matsunaga (Spark M.) Elementary (PSC L15F254) HVAC Project – [Motion Carried]

Ms. Smyles presented a request from MCPS to increase the MSA for the Matsunaga (Spark M.) Elementary HVAC project, based on higher than anticipated bids as a result of significant cost escalation for HVAC projects that exceed the current MSA. She stated that the project received its first year of construction funding in the FY 2025 CIP and currently has a total award of \$2,831,400. She added that an additional \$3,449,750 is needed to fully fund the project, which is expected to be funded via LEA reserve funds via the FY 2027 CIP at the 100% approval stage in May if this MSA increase were to be approved.

Chair Kasemeyer remarked that the increase seemed significant, noting that the amount was nearly triple that of the initial estimate, and asked for the reasoning behind why the estimate was so far off from the bid. Executive Director Donahue stated that several projects of this type saw increases, particularly HVAC projects, which were estimated prior to the LEA determining the market price at bid. He stated that this has occurred across several counties and project types, particularly those that include steel and electronics, such as HVAC systems. He stated that the difference between the initial MSA and the updated one in this motion was not due to an error, but rather the challenges in keeping up with market prices for these projects, and is indicative of a market issue that is impacting all LEAs, requiring increases that then take funds from other projects. Ms. Smyles stated that COMAR does require the LEA to meet certain criteria in order to request an increase to the MSA, as well as engage in value management of costs and confirm that there have not been any changes to the scope of the project since the initial award.

Mr. Darenberg asked if there was any way to soften the blow of these increases, or if there are any tools to assist in getting more accurate estimates or costs for these projects. Executive Director Donahue stated that existing tools do their best to plan for costs of given scopes, and that unfortunately there isn't much else that the State is able to do to assist with this but that the Department of General Services may be able to provide additional information. Mr. Darenberg asked if there is any data that we have available that we may be able to utilize to assist in the estimating of project costs that we could provide to LEAs. Executive Director Donahue stated that we can attempt to provide additional information to LEAs at submission, but that this presents challenges as the IAC doesn't want to tell LEAs that their estimates are incorrect based on State data, when the LEAs may be utilizing data based on local factors. Courtney League added that DGS is seeing similar cost escalations in projects and that the increases are industry wide. He added that DGS tries to keep historical data and analyses for market trends for projects supported by the agency. Additionally, Courtney League asked if the IAC is asking LEAs to double check estimates that they're putting together now to ensure that they are incorporating these increases so there may be lesser increases at the time of award.

Chair Kasemeyer asked how LEAs compile the list of contractors and suppliers, and if there are certain size lists they always use. Executive Director Donahue stated that this varies depending on the region.

Capital Projects Director Melissa Wilfong added additional context for the Matsunaga project, stating the MCPS was estimating several HVAC system projects at the same time, but Matsunaga is co-located with a special education facility, while others were not. She stated that while current capital projects staff at the IAC were not with the agency at the time, they suspect that the estimate likely was for a typical elementary school in MCPS and did not consider the co-located special education center on the property. She added that MCPS has been aware that these projects would likely need funding increases, and now having preliminary estimates has allowed for a more accurate picture of the total project cost, remarking that MCPS requested the MSA increase last year, but IAC staff asked that they hold off on the request until bids were received to ensure the most accurate amount.

Ms. Wilfong also added, in response to Chair Kasemeyer's question, that many LEAs issue public bids for all open and available contractors, and others have shortlisted contractors. Additionally, in response to Courtney League's question, she stated that LEAs have consistently been using cost estimators on HVAC projects, and not using only mechanical engineer cost estimates. She stated that increases such as this are less likely in the future, as this project in particular has seen three years of project planning. Lastly she stated that when LEAs ask for funding, they are not trying to overestimate their project budget, and instead request a conservative number at the beginning stages of requesting

funding, in order to maximize the use of available dollars and because the IAC allows for updates to the MSA later on when needed.

Upon a motion made by Courtney League, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to increase the Maximum State Award for the Montgomery County Public Schools Matsunaga (Spark M.) Elementary HVAC Project from \$2,831,400 to \$6,281,150 in accordance with COMAR 14.39.02.08B.

9. FY 2025 and FY 2026 Capital Improvement Program Project Cancellations and Reversions – Montgomery County Public Schools – Springbrook High School (PSC L15F186) HVAC Phase 1 and 2 Projects – [Motion Carried]

Ms. Smyles presented a request from Montgomery County Public Schools to cancel the Springbrook High School HVAC Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects, stating that significant delays were imminent due to extensive changes required to the overall project design and scope. She stated that the cancellation would result in \$3,158,100 in FY 2025 CIP funding and \$3,750,000 in FY 2026 CIP being reverted to the LEA reserve fund. She also stated that MCPS intends to request design funding under the FY 2027 CIP for the revised full scope of the project, with remaining reserve funding to be awarded to other FY 2027 CIP projects.

Upon a motion made by Chuck Boyd, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to cancel the Montgomery County Public Schools Springbrook High School FY 2025 Capital Improvement Program HVAC Phase 1 and FY 2026 CIP HVAC Phase 2, rescind project awards totaling \$6,908,000, and transfer the rescinded funds to the LEA reserve account.

10. FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program Rescission Request – Prince George’s County Public Schools – H. Winship Wheatley ECC (PSC L16F017) – HVAC Project – [Motion Carried]

Lead Capital Projects Manager Lisa Vaughn presented a request from Prince George’s County Public Schools for the rescission of funding for the HVAC project at H. Winship Wheatley Early Childcare Center that, due to recent changes in the county permitting requirements, has resulted in the scope of work increasing above the established scope of a systemic renovation project. She stated that the reverted funds are anticipated to be awarded to an eligible project in the FY 2027 CIP.

Senator Lawlah stated that the changes to this project were largely unforeseen and had resulted in a lot of discussion within the county, and that the request was a great decision on the part of the local and State Boards of Education. Mr. Darenberg asked whether the two-year availability of reserve funds reverted is calculated from the date of award or from the date of the vote to revert the funds. Ms. Viscarra stated that it is available two years from the date of the IAC action to revert.

Upon a motion made by Senator Lawlah, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to cancel the FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program award for the Prince George’s County Public Schools H. Winship Wheatley Early Childhood Center HVAC project, rescind project awards totaling \$10,220,000, and transfer the rescinded funds to the LEA reserve account.

11. FY 2024 Capital Improvement Program Rescission Request – Prince George’s County Public Schools – Woodridge Elementary (PSC L16F052) HVAC Project – [Motion Carried]

Ms. Vaughn presented a request from Prince George’s County Public Schools to cancel the Woodridge Elementary HVAC project due to changes in the county permitting process, similar to the H. Winship Wheatley ECC project. She stated that the scope of work has changed to reflect a larger scope than a systemic renovation project as a result of these changes, and PGCPs has requested to cancel the

project, rescind the awarded funding and transfer funds to the LEA's reserve account to be used as part of the FY 2027 CIP.

Upon a motion made by Senator Lawlah, seconded by Courtney League, the IAC voted unanimously to cancel the FY 2024 Capital Improvement Program award for the Prince George's County Public Schools Woodridge Elementary HVAC project, rescind project awards totaling \$3,650,000, and transfer the rescinded funds to the LEA reserve account.

12. Proposed COMAR Amendments to 14.39.02.09 – [Motion Carried]

Ms. Viscarra presented proposed amendments to COMAR 14.39.02.09 that would allow LEAs to request additional funding for early site work as part of their project development and design funding, making State funding available for the work when it is done, and would delay the finalization of the project's Maximum State Award until the project is fully designed, when it can be most accurately calculated.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Kothari, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to approve amendments to COMAR 14.39.02.09 that clarify the circumstances under which an LEA may use project development and design funding for early site work.

13. Adoption of Final Action – 14.39.02 and 14.39.03 COMAR Revisions – [Motion Carried]

Policy Analyst Victoria Howard presented the Final Action on revisions to COMAR 14.39.02 and 14.39.03 which were originally approved at the August 14, 2025 IAC meeting and published in the January 23, 2026 Maryland Register. She stated that the motion was originally passed unanimously, and that the revisions were published in the Maryland Register for the required 30 days, and that IAC staff received no public comment regarding the proposed changes. She stated that the revisions would be effective 10 days after final approval publication in the Maryland Register.

Upon a motion made by Courtney League, seconded by Vice-chair Eberhart, the IAC voted unanimously to adopt the final COMAR revisions as published in the January 23, 2026 Maryland Register (Volume 52, Issue 2, Pages 80-81).

14. Legislative Update – [Informational Only]

Ms. Howard presented an update on Legislation that may impact the IAC during the 2026 legislative session. She highlighted several bills that IAC staff have been following, mentioned that the budget bills and Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act had passed both chambers, and stated that staff would continue to keep the commission apprised of any bills moving forward that would impact the IAC, and intend to provide another update at the May IAC meeting, once the legislative session had concluded.

Chair Kasemeyer asked for an update on the IAC's departmental bill, Senate Bill 48, and a brief overview of the bill's contents. Executive Director Donahue stated that the bill included adjustments to statutes governing the IAC's operations, as well as statutes that control MSDE and DGS activities as they relate to the IAC. He stated that the bill modernizes the statutory language and makes updates to take into account other statutory changes made by the General Assembly in the past few years, streamlines and clarifies requirements around assessments and around the funding and transfer of facilities to counties when they are transferred to school districts, and makes some changes to reporting deadlines to allow for staff to better meet deadlines.

Chair Kasemeyer also asked about the bill addressing charter schools and whether it had been finalized. Executive Director Donahue stated that the bill, HB 1430/SB 960 had not been finalized, and

if enacted, would create a new program to provide State funds to charter schools annually for capital improvements and operating funds or debt service payments to past capital projects. He stated that he is monitoring the bill closely and has had discussions with committee staff about how it may be best implemented. Chair Kasemeyer asked if the program would be overseen by the IAC. Executive Director Donahue confirmed it would be added as a new program that the IAC would administer, and that the IAC would make payments directly to charter schools for these purposes.

Vice-chair Eberhart asked if this funding was in addition to existing funding. Executive Director Donahue stated that these funds would be in addition to the regular allotment charter schools get from the LEA they are operating within. He stated that the current draft reflected \$200 per year per student, unless the school is receiving funding via the CIP itself, which is very rare, and in which case the school would not be eligible for funding via the new program. Vice-chair Eberhart asked if this was also for charter schools operating out of former school buildings, and Executive Director Donahue confirmed that these facilities would be eligible for funding. Vice-chair Eberhart asked if this would be given to the charter schools directly or if it would be via the LEAs from the IAC. Executive Director Donahue stated that it would be given by the IAC directly to charter schools per the bill language. Vice-chair Eberhart asked if it had passed in the House. Executive Director Donahue stated that the House bill had been amended and was slightly different from the Senate bill and that the two have to be reconciled, and committees are currently discussing the amendments.

Announcements:

Executive Director Donahue stated that he would like to make an additional comment regarding the HVAC projects, as discussed in Item 8 of the agenda. He stated that agenda items such as this show that the need for HVAC improvements is huge and that the capital funding available is not sufficient. He added that the recent budget bill restrictions on the KPF limited those funds to just a few LEAs, and that it was originally a competitive grant program open to projects under all LEAs. This hurts the chances of the remaining LEAs in getting funding for their urgent projects. Additionally, Executive Director Donahue stressed that this further exacerbated the shortfall in capital funding available for HVAC projects across these LEAs. He stated that another special program for HVAC projects is not necessarily the best solution for this issue, if it encourages LEAs to focus on HVAC projects at the expense of performing more comprehensive projects that would address both HVAC deficiencies and all other deficiencies in their facilities. He added that he would continue to provide data to the General Assembly on this funding deficit and would continue to discuss with the General Assembly between now and next session.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Kothari seconded by Mr. Darenberg, the IAC voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 am.

Item 2.B. Contract Awards

Motion:

To approve the contract procurements and project reversions as presented on the following pages.

Background Information:

All public school construction projects that are awarded State funds are required to be reviewed by IAC staff and approved by the Commission. Contract approvals only apply previously awarded funds; they are not new approvals of funding.

This Item sets the exact funding amount that can be paid by the State on a given contract based upon a number of project-specific factors including, but not limited to:

- The total State funds that have been awarded to the project
- The amount of funds available after any prior contract approvals
- Review of eligible vs. ineligible expenses
- Use of prevailing wage rates, when required
- Inclusion of Minority Business Enterprise documentation
- Adherence to State procurement procedures
- Approval by the Local Board of Education

If an LEA confirms that a given contract will be the final contract for a project at the time that they request review and approval of a contract, this Item also reverts any remaining funds that will be unused when the project is complete.

The presented Contract Awards Report provides summary information; bid tabs and related documents are available upon request.

IAC staff recommend approval of the presented contracts.



Contract Awards Report

LEA Name	Project Name	PSC Number	Company Name	Recommended Local Funds	Recommended State Funds	Total Contract Amount	Applicable State Cost Share Percentage	Basis for Award of Contract	Date of the IAC Meeting	Recommended Reverted Funds	Recommended Reverted Funds Destination	Project Scope
Anne Arundel	Glen Burnie High/Building Enclosure/Windows/Roof - Phase 4	L02F020	Gales Associates, Inc.	\$143,866.72	\$164,753.00	\$308,619.72	55%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$10,678.30	LEA Reserve	Design contract.
Anne Arundel	Severna Park Elementary/Security Vestibule	L02F052	WKM Solutions, LLC.	\$288,372.00	\$801,624.00	\$1,089,996.00	100%	Base Bid	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Construction of secure vestibule.
Baltimore County	Winfield Elementary/Roof Replacement	L03F027	Gilbert Architects	\$22,948.67	\$37,442.56	\$60,391.23	62%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$1,028,854.06	Statewide Reserve	Design contract.
Baltimore County	Winfield Elementary/Roof Replacement	L03F027	Weatherproofing Technologies, Inc.	\$1,133,128.10	\$1,796,862.14	\$2,929,990.24	62%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Replacement of approximately 59,900 sf (1996) roof. This is a full roof replacement.
Baltimore County	Sandalwood Elementary/HVAC/Open Space Enclosures	L03F034	North Point Builders, Inc.	\$1,899,716.00	\$5,406,884.00	\$7,306,600.00	74%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$883,116.00	LEA Reserve	Replacement of the full 2007 HVAC system for the 76,950 sf building and renovation to enclose approximately 16,000 sf of open space classrooms.
Baltimore County	Dundalk Middle/Roof Replacement	L03F041	Colimore Architects, Inc.	\$24,402.39	\$49,544.25	\$73,946.64	67%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$74,879.50	Statewide Reserve	Design contract.
Baltimore County	Dundalk Middle/Roof Replacement	L03F041	Weatherproofing Technologies, Inc.	\$2,064,186.93	\$4,190,924.98	\$6,255,111.91	67%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Replacement of approximately 83,600 sf (1999) roof. This is a full roof replacement.
Baltimore County	White Oak Special Education/HVAC and Open Space Enclosure	L03F065	Johnson, Mirmiran, & Thompson, Inc.	\$31,008.76	\$75,917.99	\$106,926.75	71%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Commissioning services for HVAC replacement.
Baltimore County	White Oak Special Education/HVAC and Open Space Enclosure	L03F065	Smolen Emr Ilkovitch Architects	\$222,304.00	\$544,261.52	\$766,565.52	71%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Design contract.
Baltimore County	Featherbed Lane Elementary/Roof Replacement	L03F102	Weatherproofing Technologies, Inc.	\$1,427,010.54	\$2,696,156.81	\$4,123,167.35	67%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Replacement of approximately 84,300 sf (2000) roof. This is a full roof replacement.
Baltimore County	Featherbed Lane Elementary/Roof Replacement	L03F102	Bushey Feight Morin Architects	\$15,143.35	\$30,745.58	\$45,888.93	67%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$1,619,916.24	Statewide Reserve	Design contract.
Charles	Mattawoman Middle/Roof Replacement	L08F035	Patuxent Roofing & Contracting, Inc	\$1,322,559.56	\$2,043,661.44	\$3,366,221.00	64%	Base Bid Plus Alternates	05.14.2026	\$978,418.56	Statewide Reserve	Full replacement of the 97,500 sf (1995) roof.
Frederick	Parkway Elementary/Security Vestibule	L10F023	GRC General Contractor, Inc.	\$ -	\$147,344.00	\$147,344.00	100%	Base Bid	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Construction services.
Frederick	New Midway Elementary/Security Vestibule	L10F038	GRC General Contractor, Inc.	\$ -	\$155,526.00	\$155,526.00	100%	Base Bid	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Construction services.
Queen Anne's	Kent Island Elementary/Fire Alarm	L17F007	Johnson Controls Fire Protection LP	\$222,057.10	\$175,500.00	\$397,557.10	51%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Replacement of the 2000 fire alarm system.
Talbot	Easton Middle/Roof	L20F004	Garland/DBS, Inc.	\$3,698,490.00	\$ -	\$3,698,490.00	60%	Proposal	05.14.2026	\$ -	-	Full replacement of the (2003) 82,873 roof.
Washington	North Hagerstown High/Elevator Modernization	L21F024	Nichols Contracting, Inc.	\$ -	\$538,000.00	\$538,000.00	100%	Base Bid	05.14.2026	\$1,616.00	LEA Reserve	Elevator replacement.

Item 2.C. Revisions to Previously Approved Contracts

Motion:

To approve the revisions to previously approved contract awards as presented to accurately reflect the adjustments to the State and local participation in the contract amounts, reversions of funds, and/or corrections to project allocation information.

Background Information:

Please see the presented report for revisions to previously approved contracts.



Contract Revisions Report

LEA Name	Project Name	PSC Number	Company Name	Original Recommended Local Funds	Revised Local Funds	Original Recommended State Funds	Revised State Funds	Total Contract Amount	State Share %	Change Description	Original IAC Approval Date(s)	Recommended Reverted Funds	Recommended Reverted Funds Destination
Baltimore County	White Oak Special Education/HVAC and Open Space Enclosure	L03F065	Towson Mechanical, Inc.	\$ 4,003,110.00	\$ 4,003,110.00	\$ 9,129,890.00	\$ 9,129,890.00	\$ 13,133,000.00	71%	Increase to the State share from \$6,191,200 to \$9,129,890 due to additional FY 2024 CIP funding approved by the IAC at the March 12, 2026 Meeting. Figures were manually adjusted due to a previously approved revision.	03/13/2025	0.00	-
Cecil	North East Middle/High/Replacement	L07F044	Polaris Fire Protection, Inc.	\$ 1,697,645.00	\$ 577,199.30	\$ -	\$ 1,120,445.70	\$ 1,697,645.00	66%	Increase to the State share using FY 2026 CIP funding awarded to the project.	09/12/2024	0.00	-

Item 2.D. Executive Director Approvals of Extensions to Special Funding Programs

Motion:

This item is informational and does not require IAC action.

Background Information:

The below deadline extensions to the Healthy School Facility Fund (HSFF) and Aging Schools Program (ASP) were authorized by the Executive Director of the IAC within the past 45 days.

For the Cecil Manor Elementary (PSC L07F030) air conditioning project in Cecil County that received funding under the FY 2024 HSFF the below deadline extensions were granted:

Deadline Type	Prior Deadline	New Deadline
Encumbrance of Funds	10/09/2025	02/25/2026
Substantial Expenditure of Funds	08/30/2026	10/31/2026
Reimbursement Request Deadline	11/30/2026	12/1/2026

For the Duval High School (PSC L16F194) bleacher and press box replacement project in Prince George’s County that received funding under the FY 2025 ASP, the below deadline extension was granted:

Deadline Type	Prior Deadline	New Deadline
Reimbursement Request Deadline	06/01/2026	05/31/2027

Item 2.E. Reversion of Funds – Baltimore County Public Schools – Perry Hall High (PSC L03F011) Fire Safety Project

Motion:

To revert uncontracted FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds totaling \$100 from the Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) Perry Hall High (PSC L03F011) fire safety project.

Background Information:

At the April 9, 2026 IAC meeting, the IAC approved the reversion of funds and reduction to the Maximum State Award for the BCPS Perry Hall High fire safety project. The motion incorrectly stated the initial CIP funding as \$100 less than its actual award. The project was originally awarded \$596,925, not \$596,825 as presented in April. This motion reverts the remaining amount.

IAC staff recommend approval of this correction.



Item 2.F. Correction to Reversion Amounts – Baltimore County Public Schools

Motion:

To revise the contract awards approved at the April 9, 2026 IAC meeting for the electrical and open space projects at Chesapeake Terrace Elementary (PSC L03F035) and Logan Elementary (PSC L03F110) to reflect that all awarded State funds are being utilized, with no funds being reverted to the Baltimore County LEA reserve account.

Background Information:

At the April 9, 2026 IAC meeting, the IAC approved two contract awards as part of Item 2.B. on the agenda, for Baltimore County's Chesapeake Terrace Elementary (PSC L03F035) and Logan Elementary (PSC L03F110) electrical and open space projects. These contract awards erroneously showed reversion amounts for each project. All funds on both projects have been utilized and there are subsequently no funds to revert.

IAC staff recommend approval of this correction.

Item 2.G. Reversion of Funds – St. Mary’s County Public Schools

Motion:

To revert uncontracted FY 2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds totaling \$374,158 from the presented St. Mary’s County Public Schools (SMCPS) projects, and to reduce the Maximum State Award for the projects to reflect the project decreases as presented.

Background Information:

SMCPS has indicated that they will not submit any additional contracts on the following projects, and has requested that the remaining project funds be reverted to their reserve account.

School	Project Type	Previously Approved State Funds	Reversion Amount	New Total State Funding Amount & Maximum State Award
Lettie Marshall Dent Elementary (PSC L18F017)	Limited Renovation	\$10,246,120	\$1,000	\$10,245,120
Benjamin Banneker Elementary (PSC L18F005)	Chiller & Controls	\$302,412	\$153,932	\$148,480
Lexington Park Elementary (PSC L18F021)	Chiller & Controls	\$237,006	\$92,736	\$144,270
Mechanicsville Elementary (PSC L18F014)	Chiller & Controls	\$159,390	\$56,310	\$103,080
White Marsh Elementary (PSC L18F016)	Chiller & Controls	\$185,020	\$70,180	\$114,840
Total	n/a	\$11,129,948	\$374,158	\$10,755,790

Item 2.H. Property Transfer – Queen Anne’s County Public Schools – Former Centreville High and Centreville Middle

Motion:

To approve the transfer of 12.65 acres at 202 Chesterfield Ave, Centreville, MD 21617 in Queen Anne’s County from the Queen Anne’s County Board of Education to the Queen Anne’s County Council. Queen Anne’s County shall obtain approval of the IAC before transferring any right, title, or interest to any portion of the property.

Background Information:

The current 12.65 acres of property previously housed Centreville High School from 1901 to 1966, Centreville Middle School 1966 to 1978, and Central Offices for QACPS from 1978 to 2025 when a new central offices facility was constructed. Due to its age and dates of use as a school facility, the facility was never issued a PSC number.

The future use of the property is unknown at this time. Queen Anne’s County shall obtain IAC approval prior to subsequent sale or disposal of this property.

Approval of this transfer by the IAC constitutes approval by the IAC and the State Superintendent of Schools, per the delegation of authority accepted by the IAC on May 16, 2025.

IAC staff recommend approval of this item.

Item 2.I. Land Only Property Transfer – Baltimore City Public Schools – Grounds Shop

Motion:

To approve the transfer of 1.55 acres at 1900 Retreat St., Baltimore, MD 21217 from the Baltimore City Board of Education (City Schools) to the Baltimore City Council. Baltimore City shall obtain approval of the IAC before transferring any right, title, or interest to any portion of the property.

Background Information:

City Schools has indicated that the 1.55 acres of property known as the Grounds Shop Property is no longer utilized by the district, and that the property is intended to be sold by Baltimore City in the future. The property was never used in the education of students, but was utilized by the Baltimore City Schools Grounds Department for maintenance.

Since the parcel of property being transferred contains no school facilities, City Schools is only required to obtain approval from the State Superintendent or their designee. Approval of this transfer by the IAC constitutes approval by the State Superintendent of Schools, per the delegation of authority accepted by the IAC on May 16, 2025.

This action, if approved, transfers 1.55 acres of property to Baltimore City. The City will need to request IAC approval prior to any sale or other disposition.

IAC staff recommend approval of this Item.



Item 2.J. Land Only Property Transfer – Harford County Public Schools – Campus Hills Property

Motion:

To approve the transfer of 31.15 acres at 301 Schucks Rd., Bel Air, MD 21015 from the Harford County Public Schools Board of Education to the Harford County Council. Harford County shall obtain approval of the IAC before transferring any right, title, or interest to any portion of the property.

Background Information:

Harford County Public Schools (HCPS) has indicated that the 31.15 acres of property on the Campus Hills property is not going to be utilized by the school or district, due to the property being outside of the priority funding area, and that the property is intended to be transferred to the Harford County government.

Since the parcel of property being transferred contains no school facilities and consists of undeveloped land only, HCPS is only required to obtain approval from the State Superintendent or their designee. Approval of this transfer by the IAC constitutes approval by the State Superintendent of Schools, per the delegation of authority accepted by the IAC on May 16, 2025.

This action, if approved, transfers 31.15 acres of property to the Harford County Council. The county will need to request IAC approval prior to any further sale, transfer, or other disposition.

IAC staff recommend approval of this Item.

Item 2.K. Land Only Property Transfer – Harford County Public Schools – Woodbridge Center Property

Motion:

To approve the transfer of 12 acres at 1219 Clover Valley Rd., Edgewood, MD 21040 from the Harford County Public Schools Board of Education to the Harford County Council. The County shall obtain approval of the IAC before transferring any right, title, or interest to any portion of the property.

Background Information:

Harford County Public Schools (HCPS) has indicated that the 12 acre Woodbridge Center property is not utilized by the school or district or suitable for a future school site, and that the property is intended to be transferred to the County government.

Since the parcel of property being transferred contains no school facilities and consists of undeveloped land only, HCPS is only required to obtain approval from the State Superintendent or their designee. Approval of this transfer by the IAC constitutes approval by the State Superintendent of Schools, per the delegation of authority accepted by the IAC on May 16, 2025.

This action, if approved, transfers 12 acres of property to the Harford County Council. The county will need to request IAC approval prior to any further sale, transfer, or other disposition.

IAC staff recommend approval of this Item.



Item 2.L. Property Disposal – Baltimore City Public Schools– Patapsco PreK-8 #163 (PSC L30F238)

Motion:

To approve the demolition and sale of the property formerly used for Patapsco PreK-8 #163 (PSC L30F238) located at 844 Roundview Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21225 from the Baltimore City Council to the Cherry Hill Development Corporation on terms set forth in the draft Land Disposition Agreement between these parties with the consideration for the sale of the property in the amount of \$260,000, in accordance with this Commission's May 31, 2018 approval of the transfer of this property to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City and subsequent receipt of outstanding bond debt on the property in the amount of \$275,951.34 on June 12, 2025.

Background Information:

On May 31, 2018, the IAC approved the following motion:

“To approve the transfer of the dedicated use of the Patapsco Middle/Elementary School #163, located at 844 Roundview Road, Baltimore MD 21225, by the Baltimore City Board of Commissioners (BOC) to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, in accordance with the Building A Portfolio of Schools 2017-18 Review and Recommendations, approved by the BOC December 19, 2017, and in accordance with the memorandum of understanding for the Construction and Revitalization of Baltimore City Public Schools dated December 2016, with the agreement that the City Government will reimburse the State the outstanding bond debt service in the amount of \$315,265.20, by the scheduled dates provided by the State Treasurer’s Office. ...The Baltimore City Government shall obtain approval of the Interagency Commission before transferring any right, title, or interest to any portion of the property.”

COMAR 14.39.02.27(C) states that *“the IAC may require the county to pay the State a proportional share of the disposition proceeds based on the proportion of the State’s investment in the school property.”* This share of disposition proceeds would be in addition to the City repayment of the outstanding State bond debt, which has already been paid by Baltimore City. Baltimore City has provided an appraisal for this property totaling \$400,000, and has negotiated a contract to sell the property to Cherry Hill Development Corp. for \$260,000. The total outstanding State bond debt of this property was \$275,951.34. As the most recent project at this facility that included State participation was in 2012 and cost less than \$25,000, and due to the sale price being less than the total bond debt amount already paid, IAC staff do not recommend recapturing prior state investment on this property.

IAC staff recommend approval of this request.

Item 2.M. Easements and Rights of Way

Motion:

To approve the conveyance of the easements and rights of way as presented.

Background Information:

The table below lists easements and rights of way granting the holder access and/or use of the designated acreage.

LEA	PSC #	School	Type of Easement	Total Site Acreage	Easement Acreage
Baltimore City	L30F064	Walter P. Carter #134	Utility easement for the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining the facility in addition to installing electrical conduit and water pipe service to the pool facility.	8.01	0.54
Carroll	L06F048	Century High	Permanent utility easement to Carroll County to operate and maintain the water main.	67	0.019
Montgomery	L15F131	Stephen Knolls Special Education School	Right-of-way designation requested as part of the McComas Avenue Neighborhood Greenway Project to help improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.	6.4299	0.017

IAC staff recommend approval of these requests.



Item 3. FY 2027 100% Capital Improvement Program Recommendations

Motion:

To approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Capital Improvement Program, including revisions to the 75% approval and 90% recommendations, as presented in this Item and in the accompanying Project Details excel file posted to the IAC’s website, for a total award of \$430,042,211, including \$428,792,211 for school construction projects and \$1,250,000 of new authorization held in reserve. Further, to authorize the IAC staff to make minor adjustments to awards and project Maximum State Awards (MSAs) based on calculation of the project’s eligible funding amount to avoid the over- or under-funding of a project.

Background Information:

In compliance with Education Article §5-304(b)(5), Annotated Code of Maryland; “on or after May 1 every year, the Interagency Commission shall approve 100% of the school construction allocation included in the capital budget bill as enacted.”

Funding availability for the Fiscal Year 2027 CIP is comprised of \$300,000,000 in preliminary new authorization pursuant to the Maryland Consolidated Capital Bond Loan (MCCBL) of 2026; \$80,000,000 in Supplemental Capital Grant Program (EGRC) funds; \$2,602,664 in prior year EGRC funds; \$18,119,884.96 in Statewide reserve funds; and \$43,191,508 in LEA reserve funds.

A total of 161 funding requests for the FY 2027 CIP, amounting to \$754,360,056, were submitted by 24 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the Maryland School for the Blind, in addition to various requests for project development and design services, and planning approval. IAC staff also recommend reserving approximately \$1.25 million for out of cycle requests for funding increases or for project development and design of new projects.

FY 2027 CIP Staff 100% Recommendations

Project Type	Planning	Funding	Total	Recommended Awards
Major Projects (including project development & design services)	9	46	55	\$279,380,485
Capital Maintenance Projects (including project development & design services)	N/A	78	78	\$149,411,726
Statewide Reserve	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,250,000
Total	9	124	133	\$430,042,211

Project Notes:

1. Caroline County Public Schools – Lockerman Middle (PSC L05FTBD): In order to adhere to the 10% limit set for project development and design service funding, \$787,739 of the \$841,739 total FY 2027 EGRC allocation for Caroline County is being held in reserve. This amount will be available for future distribution.
2. Carroll County Public Schools – The MSA for the Carroll Springs Special Education (PSC L06F027) HVAC project has been updated to reflect the MSA increase request approved by the IAC in February 2026. The LEA modified their request to fully fund the MSA balance to better align with their cash flow requirements in FY 2027.
3. Charles County Public Schools – The MSA for the La Plata High School (PSC L08F013) renewal/addition has been updated to include recent design changes.
4. Frederick County Public Schools – The LEA reduced their request for Brunswick High School (PSC L10F036) to not exceed eligible maximum project development and design funding.
5. Frederick County Public Schools – Middletown Elementary/Middle (PSC L10F085): The estimated MSA was modified to account for the demolition of the entire existing elementary and middle schools and to include an MSA increase approved by the IAC in February 2025.
6. Howard County Public Schools – Ilchester Elementary (PSC L13F057), Clarksville Middle (PSC L13F031), and Glenwood Middle (PSC L13F069) security vestibule projects: The LEA has submitted revised project scopes that have decreased the funding requested for these projects. Scope reviews have been completed, each project's MSA has been updated, and construction funding status has been updated to A.
7. Howard County Public Schools – The Triadelphia Ridge Elementary (PSC L13F073), Folly Quarter Middle (PSC L13F081), and West Friendship Elementary (PSC L13F032) HVAC project MSAs have been updated to reflect eligibility and cost share.
8. Montgomery County Public Schools – The MSAs for the HVAC replacement projects at Matsunaga (Spark M.) Elementary (PSC L15F254) and Drew (Dr. Charles) Elementary (PSC L15F169) in Montgomery County have been updated. These updates reflect a State cost share of 55%, which includes the maintenance add-on. Please note that these projects are currently being recommended for partial funding.
9. Montgomery County Public Schools – The Springbrook High School (PSC L15F186) HVAC project has been updated to reduce prior state funds as a result of the CIP FY 2025 and FY 2026 project cancellations approved by the IAC in April 2026. The LEA updated their request to modify the scope to a consolidated (rather than phased design) project and to request design funding only.
10. Prince George's County Public Schools – The LEA increased the amount of funding requested for the Cool Spring Elementary (PSC L16F134) Replacement project to seek full funding.

11. Prince George's County Public Schools – The Riverdale Hills Early Childhood Center (PSC L16F269) renovation/addition project is receiving a D status due to lack of justification of need for the project based on eligible enrollment.
12. Washington County Public Schools – Jonathan Hager Elementary (PSC L21F055) addition project: The award for Project Development and Design has been increased beyond the typical 10% threshold to include costs for the setup and rental of relocatables to serve as temporary classrooms during the construction, contingent upon final approval of changes to COMAR 14.39.02.09, which allow for up to 20% of project costs to be awarded for project development and design when a project will have early site work.

The following pages are a condensed version of the approved project award amounts. The full supplemental Excel sheet containing all project information is available on the IAC's website as a supplemental document for the May 14, 2026 IAC meeting. That accompanying document represents the full details associated with this approval.

FY 2027 CIP 100% IAC Staff Recommendations

LEA Name	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Project Development & Design Services	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Project Development & Design Services	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Project Development & Design Services	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% LEA Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% State Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - Prior Year EGRC Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - EGRC New Authorization	Total FY 2027 Awards
Allegany	\$ 274,999.00	\$ 2,200,431.00	\$ 258,086.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,466,067.00	\$ -	\$ 163,601.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,363,184.00
Anne Arundel	\$ 1,692,208.00	\$ 14,946,952.00	\$ 2,538,312.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,692,208.00	\$ 2,711,180.00	\$ -	\$ 36,450.00	\$ 7,639,016.00	\$ 31,256,326.00
Baltimore City	\$ 2,324,109.00	\$ 18,501,391.00	\$ 2,948,845.00	\$ 13,891.00	\$ -	\$ 1,963,800.00	\$ 4,007,964.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,760,000.00
Baltimore County	\$ 833,600.00	\$ 20,964,247.00	\$ 7,643,617.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,300,272.00	\$ 1,913,908.62	\$ -	\$ 698,395.14	\$ 8,601,644.00	\$ 41,955,683.76
Calvert	\$ 534,365.00	\$ 3,487,814.00	\$ 69,873.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270,198.00	\$ 50,247.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,412,497.00
Caroline	\$ 1,032,417.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,717,583.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 2,804,000.00
Carroll	\$ -	\$ 5,664,060.00	\$ 1,384,876.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 442,719.00	\$ 1,557,332.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,210,472.00	\$ 14,259,459.00
Cecil	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000.00	\$ 900,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000.00
Charles	\$ -	\$ 6,667,082.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,237,454.00	\$ -	\$ 7,000,000.00	\$ 1,865,819.00	\$ 4,215,348.00	\$ 21,985,703.00
Dorchester	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 471,217.00	\$ 31,510.00	\$ 4,318,490.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,571,217.00
Frederick	\$ 3,609,153.00	\$ 4,247,582.00	\$ -	\$ 199,000.00	\$ -	\$ 6,124,229.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,441,426.00	\$ 27,621,390.00
Garrett	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 4,853,745.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,953,745.00
Harford	\$ 3,962,640.00	\$ 6,425,924.00	\$ 3,580,465.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 211,640.00	\$ -	\$ 1,736,994.96	\$ -	\$ 3,279,376.00	\$ 19,197,039.96
Howard	\$ 2,225,419.00	\$ 8,223,618.00	\$ 2,381,273.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,587,514.00	\$ 4,954,816.00	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,763,589.00	\$ 24,138,229.00
Kent	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00
MD School for the Blind	\$ -	\$ 9,000,000.00	\$ 1,800,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,200,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000.00
Montgomery	\$ 2,325,330.00	\$ 24,199,670.00	\$ 4,525,275.00	\$ 481,536.00	\$ 22,061.00	\$ 684,906.00	\$ 2,039,208.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,465,656.00	\$ 46,743,642.00
Prince George's	\$ 6,152,050.00	\$ 28,276,965.00	\$ 3,752,550.00	\$ -	\$ 290,674.00	\$ 1,496,872.00	\$ 7,377,938.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,235,433.00	\$ 57,582,482.00
Queen Anne's	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,623,472.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,373,472.00
Somerset	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,836,837.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,850,857.00	\$ -	\$ 1,985,410.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,673,104.00
St. Mary's	\$ 879,165.00	\$ 2,937,664.00	\$ 3,142,262.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 782,333.00	\$ 72,147.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,813,571.00
Talbot	\$ -	\$ 1,755,000.00	\$ 351,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 234,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,340,000.00
Washington	\$ 1,467,000.00	\$ 4,674,933.00	\$ 218,343.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,159,023.00	\$ 767,679.00	\$ 1,120,696.00	\$ -	\$ 3,112,092.00	\$ 12,519,766.00
Wicomico	\$ -	\$ 1,487,883.00	\$ 14,411,913.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79,003.00	\$ -	\$ 1,657,992.00	\$ -	\$ 4,902,179.00	\$ 22,538,970.00
Worcester	\$ 1,109,508.00	\$ 213,076.00	\$ 1,062,046.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 365,370.00	\$ -	\$ 136,701.00	\$ -	\$ 1,292,029.00	\$ 4,178,730.00
Totals	\$ 28,521,963.00	\$ 181,478,037.00	\$ 58,805,573.00	\$ 694,427.00	\$ 2,030,318.00	\$ 27,219,682.00	\$ 30,107,401.62	\$ 18,119,884.96	\$ 2,602,664.14	\$ 79,212,260.00	\$ 428,792,210.72
Statewide Reserve	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00
Grand Totals	\$ 28,521,963.00	\$ 181,478,037.00	\$ 59,305,573.00	\$ 694,427.00	\$ 2,030,318.00	\$ 27,969,682.00	\$ 30,107,401.62	\$ 18,119,884.96	\$ 2,602,664.14	\$ 79,212,260.00	\$ 430,042,210.72

IAC FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program 100% Staff Recommendations - Project Details

LEA Name	Priority	School Name	PSC Number	IAC Recommendation - 75% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% LEA Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% State Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - Prior Year EGRC Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - EGRC New Authorization	Total CIP Award
Allegany	1	Washington Middle	L01F034	\$ -	\$ 831,420.00	\$ -	\$ 258,086.00	\$ -	\$ 172,058.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,261,564.00
Allegany	2	Washington Middle	L01F034	\$ 274,999.00	\$ 1,131,156.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,180,244.00	\$ -	\$ 163,601.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00
Allegany	3	Braddock Middle	L01F035	\$ -	\$ 237,855.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 113,765.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 351,620.00
Anne Arundel	1	South Shore Elementary	L02F077	\$ 30,303.00	\$ 227,273.00	\$ -	\$ 45,455.00	\$ -	\$ 30,303.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 333,334.00
Anne Arundel	2	Chesapeake High	L02F012	\$ 57,143.00	\$ 428,571.00	\$ -	\$ 85,714.00	\$ -	\$ 57,143.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 628,571.00
Anne Arundel	3	Chesapeake High	L02F012	\$ 214,286.00	\$ 1,607,143.00	\$ -	\$ 321,429.00	\$ -	\$ 214,285.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,357,143.00
Anne Arundel	4	Brooklyn Park Elementary	L02F085	\$ 36,364.00	\$ 272,727.00	\$ -	\$ 54,545.00	\$ -	\$ 36,364.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000.00
Anne Arundel	5	Hilltop Elementary	L02F088	\$ 129,870.00	\$ 974,026.00	\$ -	\$ 194,805.00	\$ -	\$ 129,870.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,428,571.00
Anne Arundel	6	Hilltop Elementary	L02F088	\$ 233,766.00	\$ 1,753,247.00	\$ -	\$ 350,649.00	\$ -	\$ 233,767.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,571,429.00
Anne Arundel	7	Deale Elementary	L02F075	\$ 52,381.00	\$ 392,857.00	\$ -	\$ 78,571.00	\$ -	\$ 52,382.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 576,191.00
Anne Arundel	8	Solley Elementary	L02F067	\$ 47,619.00	\$ 357,143.00	\$ -	\$ 71,429.00	\$ -	\$ 47,619.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 523,810.00
Anne Arundel	9	Chesapeake High	L02F012	\$ 95,238.00	\$ 714,286.00	\$ -	\$ 142,857.00	\$ -	\$ 95,238.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,047,619.00
Anne Arundel	10	Georgetown East Elementary	L02F017	\$ 155,844.00	\$ 1,168,831.00	\$ -	\$ 233,766.00	\$ -	\$ 155,844.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,714,285.00
Anne Arundel	11	Annapolis High	L02F030	\$ 80,952.00	\$ 607,143.00	\$ -	\$ 121,429.00	\$ -	\$ 80,952.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 890,476.00
Anne Arundel	12	Broadneck High	L02F032	\$ 432,901.00	\$ 3,246,754.00	\$ -	\$ 649,351.00	\$ -	\$ 432,900.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,761,906.00
Anne Arundel	13	Linthicum Elementary	L02F008	\$ 108,225.00	\$ 811,688.00	\$ -	\$ 162,338.00	\$ -	\$ 108,225.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,190,476.00
Anne Arundel	14	Linthicum Elementary	L02F008	\$ 17,316.00	\$ 129,870.00	\$ -	\$ 25,974.00	\$ -	\$ 17,316.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190,476.00
Anne Arundel	15	Old Mill High	L02F139	\$ -	\$ 2,255,393.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,711,180.00	\$ -	\$ 36,450.00	\$ 7,639,016.00	\$ 12,642,039.00
Anne Arundel	16	Old Mill Middle North (Site)	L02F140	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Anne Arundel	17	Staff Development @ Carver	L02F142	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Anne Arundel	18	North County High	L02F054	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	1	Northeast Middle # 049	L30F137	\$ -	\$ 7,603,500.00	\$ -	\$ 1,520,700.00	\$ -	\$ 1,013,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,138,000.00
Baltimore City	2	Western High Building #407	L30F227	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000.00
Baltimore City	3	Lakeland PK-8 # 012	L30F179	\$ -	\$ 7,125,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,425,000.00	\$ -	\$ 950,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,500,000.00
Baltimore City	4	Southeast Building Middle/High # 255	L30F105	\$ 1,862,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,862,000.00
Baltimore City	5	Benjamin Franklin Building # 239	L30F099	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	6	Benjamin Franklin Building # 239	L30F099	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	7	Edmondson High School Building # 400A	L30F246	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	8	Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle Building #133	L30F147	\$ 323,200.00	\$ 2,908,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,232,000.00
Baltimore City	9	Moravia Park Building #105B (formerly Frankford #216)	L30F232	\$ 138,909.00	\$ 864,091.00	\$ 13,891.00	\$ 3,145.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 507,964.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,528,000.00
Baltimore City	10	Booker T. Washington Building # 130	L30F168	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	11	Furman L. Templeton Elementary # 125	L30F061	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	12	Harlem Park Building #078	L30F274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	13	Baltimore Leadership School for Young Women	L30F284	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	14	Coldstream Park # 031	L30F198	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	15	Liberty # 064	L30F135	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	16	Liberty # 064	L30F135	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	17	Mergenthaler Vocational-Technical High CTE #410	L30F226	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	18	Mt. Royal Elementary/Middle # 066	L30F069	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	19	Gardenville Elementary # 211	L30F161	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	20	Northern Building #402	L30F174	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore City	21	Roland Park Elementary/Middle # 233	L30F092	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore County	1	Dulaney High	L03F133	\$ -	\$ 16,516,248.00	\$ -	\$ 6,755,393.00	\$ -	\$ 744,607.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,983,752.00	\$ 30,000,000.00
Baltimore County	2	Scotts Branch Elementary	L03F025	\$ -	\$ 446,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 446,000.00

IAC FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program 100% Staff Recommendations - Project Details

LEA Name	Priority	School Name	PSC Number	IAC Recommendation - 75% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% LEA Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% State Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - Prior Year EGRC Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - EGRC New Authorization	Total CIP Award
Baltimore County	3	Perry Hall Middle	L03F007	\$ 92,800.00	\$ 696,000.00	\$ -	\$ 139,200.00	\$ -	\$ 92,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,020,800.00
Baltimore County	4	Perry Hall High	L03F011	\$ 138,993.00	\$ 1,042,446.00	\$ -	\$ 208,489.00	\$ -	\$ 138,993.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,528,921.00
Baltimore County	5	Owings Mills High	L03F073	\$ 138,993.00	\$ 1,042,446.00	\$ -	\$ 208,489.00	\$ -	\$ 138,993.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,528,921.00
Baltimore County	6	Western School of Technology/Science	L03F008	\$ 87,000.00	\$ 652,500.00	\$ -	\$ 130,500.00	\$ -	\$ 87,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 957,000.00
Baltimore County	7	Sudbrook Magnet Middle	L03F126	\$ 75,814.00	\$ 568,607.00	\$ -	\$ 141,687.00	\$ -	\$ 47,849.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 833,957.00
Baltimore County	8	McCormick Elementary	L03F191	\$ 300,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,859.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 170,257.48	\$ -	\$ 698,395.14	\$ 2,071,488.38	\$ 3,300,000.00
Baltimore County	9	Martin Boulevard Elementary	L03F142	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,414,310.38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 546,403.62	\$ 1,960,714.00
Baltimore County	10	Halethorpe Elementary	L03F005	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,030.00	\$ 329,340.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 379,371.00
Baltimore County	11	Sparks Elementary	L03F117	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore County	12	Franklin Middle	L03F127	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore County	13	Patapsco High & Center for Arts	L03F145	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Baltimore County	14	Northwest Area CTE Center	L03F227	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Calvert	1	Northern Middle	L04F006	\$ -	\$ 2,952,787.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,952,787.00
Calvert	2	Sunderland Elementary	L04F014	\$ -	\$ 535,027.00	\$ -	\$ 69,873.00	\$ -	\$ 104,810.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 709,710.00
Calvert	3	Calvert Elementary	L04F004	\$ 534,365.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 165,388.00	\$ 50,247.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 750,000.00
Calvert	4	Plum Point Middle	L04F017	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Caroline	1	Lockerman Middle	L05FTBD	\$ 1,032,417.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,717,583.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 2,804,000.00
Carroll	1	Carroll Springs Special Education	L06F027	\$ -	\$ 1,087,780.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,189,153.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,276,933.00
Carroll	2	Northwest Middle	L06F002	\$ -	\$ 87,530.00	\$ -	\$ 697,281.00	\$ -	\$ 442,719.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,332,470.00	\$ 4,560,000.00
Carroll	3	Elmer Wolfe Elementary	L06F044	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,258,685.00	\$ 1,258,685.00
Carroll	4	Robert Moton Elementary	L06F018	\$ -	\$ 34,358.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 619,316.00	\$ 653,674.00
Carroll	5	Runnymede Elementary	L06F039	\$ -	\$ 883,999.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.00	\$ 884,000.00
Carroll	6	Spring Garden Elementary	L06F037	\$ -	\$ 600,958.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,958.00
Carroll	7	Westminster Elementary	L06F003	\$ -	\$ 1,113,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,113,000.00
Carroll	8	Wm. Winchester Elementary	L06F025	\$ -	\$ 653,674.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 653,674.00
Carroll	9	Carrolltowne Elementary	L06F014	\$ -	\$ 1,202,761.00	\$ -	\$ 687,595.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 368,179.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,258,535.00
Cecil	1	North East Middle/High	L07F044	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000.00	\$ -	\$ 900,000.00	\$ -	\$ 600,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000.00
Cecil	2	Thomson Estates Elementary	L07F011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Charles	1	La Plata High	L08F013	\$ -	\$ 6,667,082.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,237,454.00	\$ -	\$ 7,000,000.00	\$ 1,865,819.00	\$ 4,215,348.00	\$ 21,985,703.00
Charles	2	Dr. Thomas L. Higdon Elementary	L08F027	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Charles	3	Walter J. Mitchell Elementary	L08F033	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Charles	4	Middle School #10	L08F050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Dorchester	1	Cambridge-South Dorchester High	L09F009	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,510.00	\$ 2,318,490.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,100,000.00
Dorchester	2	Mace's Lane Middle	L09F015	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 471,217.00	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,471,217.00
Frederick	1	Brunswick High	L10F036	\$ 3,609,153.00	\$ -	\$ 199,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,808,153.00
Frederick	2	Middletown Elementary/Middle	L10F085	\$ -	\$ 4,247,582.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,124,229.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,441,426.00	\$ 23,813,237.00
Frederick	3	Linganore Creek Elementary	L10F084	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Frederick	4	Yellow Springs Elementary Replacement	L10F082	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Garrett	1	Southern Middle	L11F008	\$ -	\$ 4,853,745.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,853,745.00
Garrett	2	Crellin Elementary	L11F012	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
Harford	1	Halls Cross Roads Elementary	L12F036	\$ 211,640.00	\$ 1,587,300.00	\$ -	\$ 317,460.00	\$ -	\$ 211,640.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,328,040.00
Harford	2	Harford Academy and Elementary	L12F064	\$ 3,751,000.00	\$ 4,838,624.00	\$ -	\$ 3,263,005.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,736,994.96	\$ -	\$ 3,279,376.00	\$ 16,869,000.00
Howard	1	Ilchester Elementary	L13F057	\$ 193,200.00	\$ 136,150.00	\$ -	\$ 289,800.00	\$ -	\$ 193,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 812,350.00
Howard	2	Ilchester Elementary	L13F057	\$ 927,350.00	\$ 3,302,629.00	\$ -	\$ 1,391,025.00	\$ -	\$ 927,350.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,652,496.00	\$ 10,200,850.00
Howard	3	Clarksville Middle	L13F031	\$ 214,115.00	\$ 487,853.00	\$ -	\$ 321,173.00	\$ -	\$ 214,114.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,237,255.00
Howard	4	Glenwood Middle	L13F069	\$ 237,450.00	\$ 367,375.00	\$ -	\$ 356,175.00	\$ -	\$ 237,450.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,198,450.00
Howard	5	Worthington Elementary	L13F010	\$ 15,400.00	\$ 115,500.00	\$ -	\$ 23,100.00	\$ -	\$ 15,400.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 169,400.00
Howard	6	Fulton Elementary	L13F063	\$ 170,500.00	\$ 437,155.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 156,751.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,111,093.00	\$ 1,875,499.00
Howard	7	Gorman Crossing Elementary	L13F068	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,678,875.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,678,875.00
Howard	8	River Hill High	L13F053	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,314,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,314,500.00

IAC FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program 100% Staff Recommendations - Project Details

LEA Name	Priority	School Name	PSC Number	IAC Recommendation - 75% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% LEA Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% State Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - Prior Year EGRC Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - EGRC New Authorization	Total CIP Award
Howard	9	Triadelphia Ridge Elementary	L13F073	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 509,300.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 509,300.00
Howard	10	Folly Quarter Middle	L13F081	\$ 57,050.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 627,550.00
Howard	11	Homewood Center	L13F091	\$ 57,050.00	\$ 44,788.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 523,711.65	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	\$ 627,550.00
Howard	12	West Friendship Elementary	L13F032	\$ 46,302.00	\$ 281,888.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,110.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 509,300.00
Howard	13	Lisbon Elementary	L13F004	\$ 42,075.00	\$ 420,925.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 463,000.00
Howard	14	Clarksville Middle	L13F031	\$ 57,050.00	\$ 570,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 627,550.00
Howard	15	Dayton Oaks Elementary	L13F083	\$ 46,302.00	\$ 462,998.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 509,300.00
Howard	16	Waterloo Elementary	L13F062	\$ 42,075.00	\$ 420,925.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 463,000.00
Howard	17	Mt. Hebron High	L13F019	\$ 119,500.00	\$ 1,174,931.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,068.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,314,500.00
Kent	1	Kent County Middle	L14F003	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00
MD School for the Blind	1	Maryland School for the Blind	L25F001	\$ -	\$ 9,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,800,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,200,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000.00
Montgomery	1	Crown High	L15F284	\$ -	\$ 2,538,825.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,671,761.00	\$ 11,210,586.00
Montgomery	2	Matsunaga (Spark M.) Elementary	L15F254	\$ -	\$ 2,306,554.00	\$ -	\$ 225,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 743,096.00	\$ 3,274,650.00
Montgomery	3	Drew (Dr. Charles) Elementary	L15F169	\$ -	\$ 1,474,628.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 245,522.00	\$ 1,720,150.00
Montgomery	4	Springbrook High	L15F186	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00
Montgomery	5	New Hampshire Estates Elementary	L15F089	\$ 130,680.00	\$ 1,154,059.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,061.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,306,800.00
Montgomery	6	Goshen Elementary	L15F156	\$ 119,790.00	\$ 1,078,110.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,197,900.00
Montgomery	7	Strawberry Knoll Elementary	L15F152	\$ 462,825.00	\$ 3,471,188.00	\$ -	\$ 694,237.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,628,250.00
Montgomery	8	Sherwood High	L15F135	\$ 408,375.00	\$ 3,062,813.00	\$ -	\$ 612,562.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,083,750.00
Montgomery	9	King (Dr. Martin Luther, Jr.) Middle	L15F198	\$ 762,300.00	\$ 6,306,300.00	\$ -	\$ 554,400.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,623,000.00
Montgomery	10	Flower Valley Elementary	L15F217	\$ 346,500.00	\$ 668,229.00	\$ -	\$ 1,028,014.00	\$ -	\$ 684,906.00	\$ 737,351.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,465,000.00
Montgomery	11	Northwest High	L15F239	\$ -	\$ 1,569,603.00	\$ 377,100.00	\$ 315,900.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 51,857.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,833,640.00	\$ 4,148,100.00
Montgomery	12	Darnestown Elementary	L15F051	\$ 94,860.00	\$ 569,361.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 379,239.00	\$ 1,043,460.00
Montgomery	13	Takoma Park Elementary	L15F081	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 84,240.00	\$ 441,450.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,950.00	\$ 926,640.00
Montgomery	14	Fairland Elementary	L15F098	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 262,347.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 138,303.00	\$ 400,650.00
Montgomery	15	Olney Elementary	L15F093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 189,405.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53,145.00	\$ 242,550.00
Montgomery	16	Gaithersburg High	L15F130	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,196.00	\$ 201,960.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 222,156.00
Prince George's	1	Schmidt (William S.) Outdoor Education Center	L16F199	\$ -	\$ 2,262,750.00	\$ -	\$ 452,550.00	\$ -	\$ 301,700.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,017,000.00
Prince George's	2	Cool Spring Elementary	L16F134	\$ -	\$ 12,246,285.00	\$ -	\$ 3,300,000.00	\$ -	\$ 889,885.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,120,301.00	\$ 23,556,471.00
Prince George's	3	Cool Spring Elementary School Annex/Therapy Pool	L16F273	\$ 356,900.00	\$ 1,643,100.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000.00
Prince George's	4	High Point High	L16F085	\$ 1,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000.00
Prince George's	5	New Northern Area High	L16F268	\$ 1,616,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 384,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000.00
Prince George's	6	Riverdale Hills Early Childhood Center	L16F269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Prince George's	7	Crossland High	L16F033	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000.00
Prince George's	8	Cooper Lane Elementary	L16F131	\$ -	\$ 547,932.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 547,932.00
Prince George's	9	Reed (Catherine T.) Elementary	L16F144	\$ 237,545.00	\$ 2,375,450.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,612,995.00
Prince George's	10	Kettering Elementary	L16F188	\$ 241,549.00	\$ 2,242,955.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,484,504.00
Prince George's	11	Capitol Heights Elementary	L16F056	\$ 102,456.00	\$ 1,024,560.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,127,016.00
Prince George's	12	Buck Lodge Middle	L16F094	\$ 399,938.00	\$ 3,999,380.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,399,318.00
Prince George's	13	Barnaby Manor Elementary	L16F123	\$ 127,727.00	\$ 1,149,549.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,277,276.00
Prince George's	14	Oxon Hill Middle	L16F162	\$ 226,688.00	\$ 637,272.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 305,287.00	\$ 189.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,324,132.00	\$ 2,493,568.00
Prince George's	15	Samuel Chase Elementary	L16F221	\$ 93,247.00	\$ 147,732.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,674.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 744,064.00	\$ 1,025,717.00
Prince George's	16	Largo High	L16F011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,935,938.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,046,936.00	\$ 4,982,874.00
Prince George's	17	Cesar Chavez Elementary	L16F167	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 719,781.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 719,781.00
Prince George's	18	Arrowhead Elementary	L16F074	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,348,429.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,348,429.00
Prince George's	19	Princeton Elementary	L16F176	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 989,601.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 989,601.00
Queen Anne's	1	Kennard Elementary	L17F012	\$ -	\$ 2,750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,703,496.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,453,496.00
Queen Anne's	2	Centreville Elementary	L17F005	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 389,706.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 389,706.00
Queen Anne's	3	Centreville Middle	L17F004	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,530,270.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,530,270.00

IAC FY 2027 Capital Improvement Program 100% Staff Recommendations - Project Details

LEA Name	Priority	School Name	PSC Number	IAC Recommendation - 75% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 75% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 90% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Project Development & Design Services Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% Construction Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% LEA Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - 100% State Reserve Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - Prior Year EGRC Funding	IAC Staff Recommendation - EGRC New Authorization	Total CIP Award
Somerset	1	Crisfield Academy & High School	L19F004	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,836,837.00	\$ -	\$ 2,850,857.00	\$ -	\$ 1,985,410.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,673,104.00
St. Mary's	1	Chopticon High	L18F019	\$ -	\$ 2,166,471.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,166,471.00
St. Mary's	2	Esperanza Middle	L18F010	\$ 879,165.00	\$ 771,193.00	\$ -	\$ 3,142,262.00	\$ -	\$ 782,333.00	\$ 72,147.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,647,100.00
St. Mary's	3	Leonardtown High	L18F004	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Talbot	1	Easton Middle	L20F004	\$ -	\$ 1,755,000.00	\$ -	\$ 351,000.00	\$ -	\$ 234,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,340,000.00
Washington	1	Downsville Pike Elementary	L21F059	\$ -	\$ 3,412,495.00	\$ -	\$ 218,343.00	\$ -	\$ 751,211.00	\$ 196,679.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,614,788.00	\$ 7,193,516.00
Washington	2	Jonathan Hager Elementary	L21F055	\$ 1,467,000.00	\$ 1,111,884.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,812.00	\$ 571,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 497,304.00	\$ 3,695,000.00
Washington	3	North Hagerstown High	L21F024	\$ -	\$ 150,554.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 360,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,120,696.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,631,250.00
Washington	4	Paramount Elementary	L21F030	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Washington	5	Springfield Middle	L21F009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wicomico	1	Fruitland Primary	L22F016	\$ -	\$ 1,487,883.00	\$ -	\$ 14,411,913.00	\$ -	\$ 79,003.00	\$ -	\$ 1,657,992.00	\$ -	\$ 4,902,179.00	\$ 22,538,970.00
Wicomico	2	Fruitland Intermediate	L22F017	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wicomico	3	Wicomico Middle	L22F015	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wicomico	4	Westside Intermediate	L22F026	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wicomico	5	Salisbury Middle	L22F025	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Worcester	1	Buckingham Elementary	L23F007	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 394,671.00	\$ 394,671.00
Worcester	2	Berlin Intermediate	L23F012	\$ 1,092,958.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,684.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 897,358.00	\$ 2,027,000.00
Worcester	3	Worcester Technical High School	L23F015	\$ 16,550.00	\$ 213,076.00	\$ -	\$ 1,025,362.00	\$ -	\$ 365,370.00	\$ -	\$ 136,701.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,757,059.00
Totals	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 28,521,963.00	\$ 181,478,037.00	\$ 694,427.00	\$ 58,805,573.00	\$ 2,030,318.00	\$ 27,219,682.00	\$ 30,107,401.62	\$ 18,119,884.96	\$ 2,602,664.14	\$ 79,212,260.00	\$ 428,792,211.00
State Reserve	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -	\$ 750,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00
Grand Totals	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 28,521,963.00	\$ 181,478,037.00	\$ 694,427.00	\$ 59,305,573.00	\$ 2,030,318.00	\$ 27,969,682.00	\$ 30,107,401.62	\$ 18,119,884.96	\$ 2,602,664.14	\$ 79,212,260.00	\$ 430,042,211.00

Item 4. FY 2026 Capital Improvement Program Rescission and Maximum State Award Increase – Washington County Public Schools

Motion:

1. To approve the rescission of the Washington County Public Schools (WCPS) FY 2026 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Hancock Elementary (PSC L21F015) HVAC replacement project totaling \$2,490,000 and to transfer the funds to the LEA's reserve account; and,
2. To increase the Maximum State Award (MSA) for the Boonsboro High (PSC L21F001) HVAC replacement project from \$7,262,500 to \$10,272,000, in accordance with COMAR 14.39.02.08B, and to transfer \$3,009,500 from the LEA's reserve account to fund the FY 2025 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project.

Background Information:

COMAR 14.39.02.08B allows the IAC to:

"...increase the maximum State construction allocation for a capital maintenance project when: (1) The LEA submits: (a) The final project scope of work; and (b) A cost estimate developed by a design professional licensed in the State of Maryland or the bid tabulation for the project; (2) The LEA documents that the: (a) LEA has taken reasonable actions to reduce construction costs; and (b) Construction costs have resulted from exceptional circumstances; and (3) The IAC determines that: (a) The requested scope of work is eligible for State funding; and (b) The scope of work and associated costs are reasonable."

On April 16, 2026, IAC staff received notification from WCPS that bids received for the FY 2025 CIP HVAC replacement project at Boonsboro High School came in over budget. The project was originally estimated in the fall of 2024 and since that time, the market has seen increased costs for equipment and labor associated with HVAC projects. In order to make funding available, WCPS is requesting approval to rescind the HVAC replacement project at Hancock Elementary funded through the FY 2026 CIP totaling \$2,490,000 and to increase the Maximum State Award for Boonsboro High HVAC replacement project from \$7,262,500 to \$10,272,000 and apply \$3,009,500 from their LEA reserve fund account to the project.

WCPS believes this is the best way to move forward with this project and intends to request funding approval in a future CIP for Hancock Elementary. IAC staff have reviewed the request and find the costs to be reasonable.



Item 5. Administrative Procedures Guide Amendments

Motion:

To approve amendments to the IAC's Administrative Procedures Guide (APG) as presented, contingent upon the signature of Senate Bill 48 by Governor Moore.

Background Information:

During the 2026 Legislative Session, the IAC's departmental bill, Senate Bill 48 was passed by both chambers of the State Legislature. The APG revisions outlined below are necessary to ensure procedures are reflective of the changes that were made as a result of the passage of SB 48. Note that changes are contingent still on the signing of the bill by Governor Moore, which is expected to take place this month.

Section 2

- Clarification that Site Approvals require State Superintendent approval of any site that will be used for the education of students.
- Clarification that sites acquired for the purpose of site-banking are not required to be reviewed by the State Superintendent until three years prior to the site being submitted for local planning approval.
- Revision to the terms under which bond debt must be collected.
- Adjusting the grace period of bond debt repayment by LEAs from two years to five years.
- Information on the frequency of revisions from LEAs to SFA data.

Section 3

- Changes to circumstances when design submissions must be submitted for review by the State Superintendent.
- Changes to the cost threshold for design review for State funded projects.
- Adding travel time as a specific criteria to consider when evaluating adjacent schools.
- Clarification that project-specific Educational Specifications are required for projects that impact the planned configuration of student-occupied spaces.
- Stating that locally-only funded projects that are not submitted to the IAC for review are ineligible to receive State funding.
- Increase to the cost threshold for change orders that must be approved by the State Superintendent.
- Requirement that payments over \$50,000 will only be approved for distribution via Automated Clearinghouse Transactions.

IAC staff recommend approval of these changes.

IAC Administrative Procedures Guide Excerpt for Proposed Revision Consideration at the May 14, 2026 IAC Meeting

Unchanged sections are excluded except where they precede changes and provide context necessary to understand the proposed change.

1.C. Definitions

Acronym or Term	Definition
Maximum State Award (MSA)	The estimated maximum amount of State construction funding through the IAC's standing funding programs and that is established at the time the project is first approved for construction funding. Sometimes referred to as 'maximum State construction allocation' in statute.
State-Funded Project	A project is considered to be State Funded when it is approved for Project Development & Design Funding, Planning, or Construction Funding. For funding approvals that occur in the Capital Improvement Program, "approval" means upon approval of the 100% CIP in May and does not include any preliminary recommendations or projections. preliminary 75% or 90% approvals.

2. Portfolio Level Policies and Tools

2.B. Site Approval

2.B.1. General

School sites are selected by the LEAs as appropriate to support their school facilities and programs and may be acquired for the purpose of constructing a specific school facility or may be banked for later use. LEA acquisition of banked land for the intention of later use as a school site is done at the LEA's risk, as sites are not evaluated by the IAC until a school is planned to be built on a site. The State Clearinghouse process may help LEAs determine later issues with a site, but this review should not be interpreted as approval to use a site for a school facility.

2.B.2. Applicability

2.B.2.a. Approval Requirements

Per COMAR 14.39.02.14, IAC approval is required for:

- Site approvals and/or acquisitions for which an LEA will request local planning approval in the IAC's Capital Improvement Program within the next three years;
- The use of previously approved sites for school construction purposes if the approval was given more than three years prior;
- Previously approved sites where there is a change in use of the school (e.g., elementary school becomes a middle school) or a second school or regional program is co-located at the site; and,
- Replacement facilities when there is an increase in capacity on the school site.

2.B.2.b. Exceptions

~~Other types of~~ Site approvals must receive State Superintendent approval ~~for any site that will be used for the education of students, whether it will request State funding within the next three years or not~~ ~~but do not require IAC approval~~. These types of acquisitions can still be performed via the BMS system. See [Section 2.B.4.](#) for information on when State Superintendent approval is required.

2.B.3. Clearinghouse Review ~~of School Site~~

Clearinghouse review is a prerequisite for site approval by the IAC and the State Superintendent. Prior to requesting site approval, the LEA shall submit Site Review materials to the Maryland State Clearinghouse to mdp.clearinghouse@maryland.gov with a cover letter requesting a review.

The submission must include:

- The Site Analysis Report Form 104.1 and all necessary attachments
- Environmental Assessment Form 104.2

Both of the above forms are available on the IAC's website under [LEA Resources](#).

Clearinghouse review is valid for three years. The Maryland Department of Planning's [State Clearinghouse Division Intergovernmental Monitor is available online](#). Please see the Intergovernmental Monitor for site review information.

Note that Clearinghouse review is required only for acquisition of properties that will be used for school facilities. Partial acquisitions of land, such as small strips of land added to an existing nearby school site, are not required to have Clearinghouse review ~~, although they must still be approved by the State Superintendent~~.

2.B.4. State Superintendent Approval

Approval from the State Superintendent of Schools is required separately from IAC approval pursuant to Education Article, §§ 2-303(f)(1) and 4-115(b)(1). Submission of the IAC's Site Approval process in the BMS notifies MSDE of the need for a letter from the State Superintendent. A letter addressed to the Superintendent requesting site approval will be required to be uploaded as part of the BMS process. No separate request has to be made. MSDE staff may reach out to the LEA to request additional information as needed to facilitate review and approval by the State Superintendent.

Certain types of site approvals must be approved by the State Superintendent, but do not require IAC approval. If land is being acquired to add to an existing school site, State Superintendent approval is required, but IAC approval is not. LEAs should still submit a request for State Superintendent approval via the BMS Site Approval process to facilitate State Superintendent approval and to maintain accurate records of land acquisitions. ~~A separate request for State Superintendent approval is not required to be made by an LEA. Sites or land acquired for the purposes of site-banking, or for non-educational use do not have to be approved by the State Superintendent until three years prior to its submission to the IAC for local planning approval.~~

2.C. Facility Status Changes

2.C.1. General

The IAC tracks and approves the status of school sites, school facilities, and any property owned by State and County Boards of Education. To submit a notification or request for State approval, an authorized representative of the LEA or County should initiate a Facility Status Change Process in the BMS under their Global LEA project with the relevant type of request selected. For information on how to initiate a Facility Status Change Process, refer to the IAC's [FSC Process User Guide](#).

2.C.2. Applicability

LEAs and/or County governments must submit a request for approval or a notification of any school name change, change in school use, easement, right-of-way, lease, transfer, or disposal of any property owned by the Board of Education or formerly owned by the Board of Education and transferred to local government. The State Superintendent has delegated authority to approve the transfer, disposal, and sale of public school property, in accordance with Education Articles §§ 2-303(f)(1)(i), 4-115(c), and COMAR 14.39.02.25 to the IAC.

2.C.2.a. Requests for Approval

Education Article, § 5-303, Ann. Code of MD, and COMAR 14.39.02.22–.27 require LEAs to request IAC approval to:

- Grant easements or rights-of-way on a school property;
- Lease of 10% or more of a school to a third party (outside of a space with a cooperative use agreement);
- Transfer a school site or school building; and
- Dispose of an educational facility or former school property by selling, leasing, or other disposal.

2.C.2.b. Notification Only; No Approval Required

Education Article, § 5-303, Ann. Code of MD, and COMAR 14.39.02.22 require LEAs to report:

- School name changes; and
- Change in school use, including ~~school closures,~~ changes in educational function and grade reconfigurations.

2.C.3. Bond Debt and Repayment of State Investment

Transferring or disposing of a school facility or former school property, or electing to change the use of a school facility from educational use for more than five years, ~~may~~ ~~will~~ result in a requirement for reimbursement of outstanding bond debt and ~~may additionally result in a~~ ~~or~~ requirement to pay the State a proportional share of disposition proceeds based on the proportion of the State's investment in the property, per Education Article, § 5-308, Ann. Code of MD, and COMAR 14.39.02.27.

When a property is transferred or disposed of ~~, is no longer used for a purpose eligible for State funding for school construction,~~ and has outstanding bond debt in excess of \$5,000, the submitting LEA and the local County government will ~~be required to execute a~~ ~~receive a copy of the executed~~ Property Transfer Agreement (PTA) ~~between the IAC and the local jurisdiction~~ ~~upon approval by the IAC, and signature by the IAC's Assistant Attorney General and Chair~~. School facilities with outstanding bond debt should be paid by the responsible County or City

where the facility is located by mailing a check, remittance to State of Maryland to 351 W. Camden St. Suite 701, Baltimore, MD 21201. With their check, they should include a copy of the [Bond Debt Repayment Form](#), indicating the school in which the bond debt is being repaid, the amount of debt, and the LEA's contact information for any questions IAC staff may have. Counties or LEAs that are required to pay back State bond-debt have ~~<add text> five years from the date of IAC approval to fully repay outstanding bond debt in accordance with the PTA. <end add text> <delete text> a two-year grace period after transfer before they must make a lump-sum payment of bond debt or begin scheduled payments on an agreed upon repayment schedule outlined in the approved PTA. <end delete text>.~~

2.E. Statewide Facilities Assessment (SFA)

2.E.1. General

The SFA was initially established by the 21st Century School Facilities Act of 2018, which established the Nancy K. Kopp Public School Facilities Priority Fund (KPF) and mandated that the IAC conduct an assessment of the condition and educational sufficiency of each Pre-K–12 public school facility in Maryland. The Act mandated that the SFA allow for comparison of the condition of all school facilities to identify and rank facility needs for potential future funding through the KPF. The SFA was not designed to identify potential solutions to address facilities' needs.

2.E.2. Applicability

Education Article § 5-310 requires the IAC to assess enough school facilities annually to ensure that SFA data for any facility is never more than four years old. To achieve this, IAC staff aim to assess 25% of active and holding school facilities annually. Additionally, to ensure the comparability of data, any facilities not assessed in a given year are estimated to have natural system aging; IAC staff update actual enrollment data and mathematically age the condition data, resulting in a data update for 100% of school facilities each year.

2.E.3. Methodology

To create this comparable needs evaluation, the SFA uses both Facility Condition Index (FCI) physical condition measures and Educational Sufficiency attribute measures. The FCI calculation is a depleted-value measure based on observed remaining useful lifespan (ORUL) of each major building-system component and not the cost of repairs. This produces comparable data regardless of the replacement costs.

2.E.4. LEA Engagement

2.E.4.a. ~~<delete text> Data Refresh <end delete text>~~ **Annual Refresh of Facilities Data** ~~<end add text>~~

Education Article § 5-310(f)(2) requires that each LEA cooperate with the IAC to update the SFA data and contribute data requested by the IAC for that purpose. Annually, this will include at a minimum ~~<added text>~~ the following data regarding the school facilities that the IAC has identified will be visited in this fiscal year ~~<end added text>~~:

- LEA review of the list of schools to be assessed ~~<delete text> that year <end delete text>~~ and any relevant comments ~~<add text> the <end add text>~~ ~~<delete text> an <end delete text>~~ LEA may have on those facilities;
- LEA comments on any changes to data ~~<delete text> for the 75% of schools that are not assessed and for which systems will be mathematically aged one year <end delete text>~~;

- The provision of relevant new information about facilities; and
- A post-assessment review of data.

2.E.4.b. Submission Process

All documents should be submitted via the SFA Pre-Assessment Document Upload process in the <add text> designated IAC data system. <end add text> <delete text> BMS. LEAs should initiate the process on their Global LEA project.<end delete text>

2.E.4.c. Scheduling and Coordination

IAC staff will provide the list of schools to be assessed and the scheduled assessment dates to the LEA. IAC staff will work with the LEA to schedule assessments to minimize disruption to the delivery of educational services. LEAs generally do not have input on which facilities are assessed each year. Assessments can be rescheduled due to facility issues or educational needs (i.e. testing weeks) on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of IAC staff. Scheduling issues are to be brought to the attention of IAC staff during the annual kickoff meeting or at least 30 days before the assessment date. Exemptions from assessment are granted according to the following guidelines:

Case Type	Guideline
1: Active or holding facility scheduled by LEA to close but closure has not yet been finalized by the local BOE for surplus.	Assess the facility as scheduled. IAC staff assess facilities that are actively housing students and portions of facilities that are directly associated with occupied areas, such as shared mechanical rooms.
2: Active or holding facility that is split between instructional spaces and non-instructional administrative or support spaces such as central offices or maintenance offices.	Assess all areas used to deliver programs or services to the students being served in the facility and all areas and systems required to support such delivery, including mechanical rooms and outdoor areas used by students and student-support staff.
3: Active, holding, or closed facility that the local BOE has approved for surplus and intends to transfer to another owner within 18 months.	The facility will not be assessed.
4: Active, holding, or closed facility for which the local BOE has approved a replacement project in the form of a BOE-approved request to the State for funding participation for construction OR has published a request for bids for a locally funded replacement project.	The facility will not be assessed.
5: Non-LEA Owned Facilities	The facility will not be assessed.

2.E.4.d. Kickoff Meeting

A kickoff meeting invitation, including data requests, will be sent annually at least 30 days before the LEA’s first assessment. An LEA may opt to decline the invitation if they feel the kickoff isn’t necessary. However, all requested data items are due two weeks before the first assessment and must include at a minimum:

- A spreadsheet/questionnaire provided by the IAC and completed by the LEA to facilitate collecting building data;

- Current Schematic floor plans for all facilities to be assessed (vectored, to scale, numbered, labeled by use, with room NSF);
- Changes to facility assets since the last assessment, including both local and State funded projects;
- Updates to relocatable units on-site;
- Updates to HB 1290 Survey documentation provided by the IAC ~~for the schools being assessed by the IAC in this fiscal year~~;
- Updates to Facility Space Use;
- Updates to planned future use (imminent closings, swing space, etc.) of each facility; and,
- The point of contact for each site assessment.

2.E.4.e. Summary and Replies

IAC staff will provide a summary of each site visit for review after assessment. LEAs will then have 30 days to review and provide comments for consideration. Non-responses will be considered an acceptance of assessment results. LEAs should contact the Assessment & Maintenance Manager and the Data Assessment Coordinator to request an extension to the review timeline if needed. Requests for extensions are reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and extra review time is not guaranteed.

2.E.4.f. Additional Facility Information

LEAs will have the opportunity to provide input on any facility not assessed during the assessment cycle. This should be discussed with the ~~Data~~ Assessment ~~Coordinator~~ ~~Data~~ Coordinator during the kickoff so an appropriate time for a discussion can be scheduled during the LEA's assessment cycle. Any updates to a facility's data in a non-assessment year do not change the assessment cycle calendar for that facility. The facility would still be subject to an in-person inspection within four years of the last cycle-based site visit. The window of opportunity for LEAs to submit requests to change data on the 75% of the portfolio that is not receiving a site visit in the cycle will open on July 1 and close on a date specified by IAC staff, but will be no more than seven months later.

~~As required by Education Article §5-310(b)(2)(ii), the IAC will accept revisions from LEAs a minimum of once every four years any information that is relevant to a given assessment, including spaces likely to contain lead paint, and certification of the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act Plan for the space.~~

2.E.5. Annual Report

At the end of the assessment cycle each LEA will receive a copy of all of their SFA data and generated metrics. The IAC will produce an Annual Report detailing aggregated Statewide facilities data for publication.

2.F. State-Rated Capacity (SRC)

2.F.1. General

State-rated capacity is the number of students that IAC staff determines that an individual school facility has the physical capacity to enroll (COMAR 14.39.02.05A). Note that a facility's SRC may be different from the facility's design capacity. The specific function of the SRC is to establish *—for funding-award purposes—* a single statewide basis on which to consistently estimate the number of FTE students that a facility can serve in delivering State-required educational programs and services. The

actual enrollment and the SRC are used by the IAC to establish the utilization of a facility. Projected utilization of a school facility and the adjacent school facilities is used in IAC decisions to award State capital funding, including to determine Eligible Enrollment for school facilities as a result of capital school construction projects.

2.F.2. Reserved for Future Use

This section is reserved for future use.

2.F.3. Applicability

All school facilities that are either in active educational use or are available for educational use must have an IAC-approved SRC.

2.F.4. Setting and Updating the SRC

While the SRC may be estimated during project planning and design, it is not set until after a project that changes the amount of educational space is complete and the school is occupied. The SRC can be updated when changes to the educational program change the use of the educational space. In both cases, the SRC must be based on the educational spaces and programs in place at the time of the request to set or update the SRC.

2.F.4.a. Timeline

A request to set the SRC for a school project should be submitted no later than three months after a school construction project that changes capacity is complete and the school is occupied. A request to update the SRC for a school can be submitted whenever changes to the educational program at a school change the use of educational space at the school.

However, if an LEA desires that an updated SRC or SRCs be used to determine the Eligible Enrollment for a request for planning or construction funding approval for a school project, then the LEA must submit the request to update the SRC of the project school and/or the schools adjacent to the project school at least three months prior to the submission of the request for planning or construction funding approval for the school project

2.F.5. Elementary Schools

For purposes of calculating SRC, elementary schools are defined as schools enrolling students in one or more grades from Pre-K through grade 6 (COMAR 14.39.02.05B), but not grade 7. An elementary school classroom is a space of 550 net square feet or greater in which the majority of the school day is spent in the instruction of the core curriculum. This does not include special subject classrooms such as music classrooms, art classrooms, science labs, etc.

2.F.5.a. Approved, Standard Capacities for Elementary School Classrooms

The standard capacities for elementary school classrooms are:

Elementary School Type	Standard Capacities
Prekindergarten	20
Kindergarten	22
Grades 1-5	23
Grade 6: if classroom is in an elementary school	23
Grade 6: if classroom is in an elementary/middle school or a secondary school	25
Alternative Education	10
Special Education	10

2.F.5.b. SRC Calculation

SRC for an elementary school is calculated using the following formula: Multiply the number of classrooms in each grade by the approved capacity for that grade and then add the resulting products. For facilities where open-space classrooms are included, see [Section 2.F.7.](#)

2.F.6. Secondary Schools

For purposes of calculating SRC, secondary schools are schools enrolling students in one or more grades from 6 through 12 (COMAR 14.39.02.05C). A secondary school classroom is a space of 600 net square feet or greater, unless the LEA designates a space smaller than 600 square feet as a classroom. All spaces in which students are regularly receiving secondary school content are considered classrooms and include laboratories, technology rooms, career and technology education rooms, music rooms, fine and performing art rooms, family and consumer science rooms, gymnasiums, and auxiliary physical education classrooms. One physical education classroom up to 2,500 square feet which contains specialized equipment that cannot be stored or relocated may be excluded upon LEA request with supporting documentation. A gymnasium up to 13,000 square feet counts as two classrooms. A gymnasium exceeding 13,000 square feet counts as three classrooms.

2.F.6.a. Approved, Standard Capacities for Secondary Classrooms

The standard capacities for secondary classrooms are:

Secondary School Type	Standard Capacities
Grade 6-12 classrooms	25
Career and Technology Programs	20
Alternative education classrooms	10
Special educational classrooms	10

2.F.6.b. SRC Calculation

SRC for an individual secondary school is calculated according to the following formula: Multiply the number of regular classrooms by the applicable approved capacity and multiply this product by 85% and ~~rounded~~ up to the nearest whole number. Then, multiply the number of ~~alternative classrooms and~~ special education classrooms by the applicable approved capacity. Finally, sum the results. For facilities where open-space classrooms are included, see [Section 2.F.7](#).

3.D. Eligible Enrollment

3.D.6. Adjacent Schools

3.D.6.a. General

An adjacent school is an existing school or proposed school that is of the same grade band configuration or shares one or more grade bands with the project school; and,

- Has an attendance area that is at any point geographically contiguous with that of the subject school;
- Has an attendance area that is not geographically contiguous with that of the subject school, but that can be readily accessed for the purposes of redistricting; and/or,
- Is part of a larger redistricting plan.

3.D.6.b. Combined Schools

Combined schools (elementary/middle, middle/high, etc.) that possess grade bands that overlap with the project school are included as adjacent schools in the calculation of Eligible Enrollment.

3.D.6.c. Identification

In order to calculate Eligible Enrollment, IAC staff will compare the adjacent schools listed in the FIDB with the adjacent schools shown in the most recent EFMP. If there is a difference, IAC staff will determine the adjacent schools consistent with the requirements of 3.D.6.a above. LEAs should update the adjacent schools listed in the FIDB to reflect the most recent EFMP via the Facility Inventory Database Update process within the BMS.

3.D.6.d. Requests to Exclude or Include Adjacent Schools

An LEA may submit a request to exclude or include an adjacent school(s) from the calculation of the Eligible Enrollment for a school construction project. Requests should be submitted at least two months before a request for construction funding is submitted in order to be considered.

Requests will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- *Disparate program type*: An adjacent school possesses a program that is dissimilar to the project school, such as a Regional Special Education program.
- *Geographic barriers*: An adjacent school is inaccessible due to geographic circumstances that prohibit the student population from passing from one attendance area to the other. Barriers may include waterways, topography, active railroads, and/or major roads, without available crossings.
- *Travel time*: Travel time of prospective students as compared with travel time of current students in the project and adjacent zones. ~~between attendance areas for the considered population exceeds approved LEA Board of Education Transportation Policy guidelines.~~

- Regional Plans: If the LEA has plans to redistrict students or adjust grade bands at the project school or at schools adjacent to the project school, the IAC may consider those plans in the evaluation of eligible enrollment for the project school.
- Other: Whenever an LEA does not consider a geographically adjacent school to be a functionally adjacent school, but the adjacent school does not meet the above adjacency criteria, the LEA may still submit a request for an adjacency exclusion or inclusion. Any rationale(s) supporting a request falling under “Other” must be consistent with the Board of Education-approved EFMP in effect at the time of the request or be otherwise approved by the LEA Board of Education.

In some instances, the IAC may grant a partial exclusion based on the evaluation of the data provided by the LEA. A partial exclusion indicates that the IAC has determined that a limited portion of the available capacity projected at an adjacent school should be considered in the determination of Eligible Enrollment. Partial exclusions will be considered on a project-by-project basis. Partial exclusions will be at the discretion of IAC staff and can be appealed via the appeal process in [Section 3.D.7](#). An approved or partially approved request to exclude/include adjacent schools will be considered good for up to two years from the date of approval so long as the school project and attendance zone boundaries and student assignment policies for the project school and the schools adjacent to the project school remain the same. An approved or partially approved request to exclude/include adjacent schools for a school project will not be reflected in the FIDB.

3.E. Educational Specifications (Ed Specs)

3.E.1. Applicability

Project-specific Ed Specs are required for all new, replacement, and renewal projects, as well as any project executed in association with ~~changes in educational programming or grade band configurations.~~ **<add text> a change in grade band configuration or that will affect the plan configuration of student-occupied spaces.<end add text>** ~~<delete text>~~ If you are unsure whether Ed Specs are required, contact your assigned OSF Architect and CPM.

3.G. Schematic Design (SD) Submissions

3.G.1. General

During the SD phase of a project, the LEA should work with the design team to explore alternative concepts that meet the project requirements. From these alternates, a preferred design should be selected and the SD submission should be prepared from this selection. Design contracts with the Architect/Engineer should define the requirements of the SD submission to include all items required on the [SD Submission Checklist](#) as well as the project requirements indicating anticipated project scope in GSF, project capacity and total project budget.

An SD submission to the IAC is required for all State funded nonsystemic projects or any project in which changes are made to the educational spaces layout or equipment. For projects that include changes to the educational programming of the school, such as renovations and replacement projects, Educational Specifications approval is required before proceeding to SD. For replacement of an existing school or projects proposing abandonment of an existing building or demolition of more than 50% of

the building's gross square footage, Feasibility Study approval or approval of a Feasibility Study Waiver is required before a project can proceed into SD.

3.G.2. Purpose

The purpose of the SD submission is to allow the State to confirm that the project meets educational programming requirements for State funded facilities. This includes the following:

- Comparison to the educational specifications if applicable.
- Review of project estimates to ensure they are in keeping with anticipated standards.
- Review of the project schedule to ensure that timely submissions are planned in a manner that allows for expenditure of anticipated or allocated funding.
- Review of updates to project scope and changes to any applicable funding factors.
- Preliminary review of Eligible Enrollment if the project has not yet received construction funding.
- Preliminary estimation of GAB add-ons for CUS, Concentration of Poverty, English Learners and CTE.
- Confirmation that the project will achieve its intended purpose with the selected concept.
- Confirmation that the proposed option as outlined in the drawings and narratives meets the project requirements of budget, schedule, size and capacity.

Comments provided might include references to applicable Federal, State, and local codes but these are only provided to assist the LEA. Conformance to all codes and standards is strictly the responsibility of the LEA.

3.G.3. Applicability

An SD Submission to the IAC is required for all State funded nonsystemic projects or any project in which changes are made to the educational spaces layout or equipment. If deemed appropriate, the IAC Executive Director, in consultation with the OSF Executive Director, may waive this requirement at the request of the LEA for projects with minimal impacts to educational spaces.

3.G.3.a. State Superintendent Approval

Per Education Article §2-303(f), the State Superintendent of Schools approves or disapproves the designs and contracts for all projects in excess of ~~\$1,000,000~~ **\$1,250,000** that affect the plan configuration of student-occupied spaces or make alterations to HVAC systems that are not like-for-like replacements. In order to streamline process submission, the IAC and MSDE both utilize the BMS for review of SD submissions. No separate submission need be made to the State Superintendent for SDs.

3.G.3.b. Locally Funded Projects

Locally funded projects are only those projects that have not been requested for State planning or funding approval and that will not ever be requested for State planning or funding approval. Submission of a project as "locally funded" precludes the project from receiving any State funding.

Review of locally funded projects is through the MSDE Office of School Facilities (OSF), who have partnered with the IAC to use the BMS for these submissions to streamline submissions by the LEAs. Refer to locally funded project submission requirements on the [IAC website](#). LEAs should submit locally funded project SD submissions via the BMS Schematic Design Submission process, selecting the "local funds only" option.

3.H. Design Development (DD) Submissions

3.H.1. General

During the DD phase of a project, the design team further refines the Schematic Design and evaluates and selects systems and materials for the project. The design team works closely with the Owner to develop and refine the project and provide drawings and specifications that define the design details, building systems, material selection, construction types, equipment and other components required to ensure delivery of the project. The design team also prepares a detailed cost estimate and project schedule to confirm that the design intent is achieved within the allocated project budget. All major design decisions should be finalized and approved by the Owner at the completion of the DD phase. The design team and Owner should endeavor to make coordinated and cost-conscious decisions that will provide optimum performance and reduce the long-term cost of ownership.

A DD Submission to the IAC is required for all State funded projects. The design scope should include all items required in the [Design Development Checklist](#). Project schedules should be coordinated to ensure all elements of this checklist are available in a timely sequence including site investigation as required, geotechnical reports, outline specification and detailed project cost estimate. These documents along with the completed submission package must be reviewed and approved by the Owner before submission to the IAC.

3.H.2. Purpose

The purpose of the DD submission is to confirm that the project meets educational programming requirements, ensure budget compliance, review details and material selection, and confirm that the timeline for project progress meets funding requirements. This includes the following:

- Review of furniture and equipment drawings to ensure compliance with educational specification requirements;
- Review of any changes to the design that has occurred since Schematic Design;
- Review of detailed cost estimate to confirm that cost control measures have been taken to ensure the project is on budget;
- Confirmation that the project remains on schedule and will meet the anticipated opening date;
- Review of alternatives to confirm the project includes the flexibility needed to account for changes in the bidding market;
- Detailed review of project systems, including layout and specifications, to ensure they are in conformance with State requirements;
- Review of project design parameters to ensure optimum efficiency has been achieved;
- Confirmation that the life cycle costs of the building systems selected were considered prior to selection; and
- Detailed review of design calculations include electrical, structural, mechanical and plumbing calculations.

3.H.3. Applicability

A DD Submission to the IAC is required for all ~~State-funded~~ projects ~~that~~ that either are State funded or for which an LEA will request state funding and:

- Are estimated to cost more than \$1,250,000;
- That will impact the plan or configuration of student-occupied spaces, or

- That replace or make changes to an HVAC system or air conditioning system that are not like-for-like replacement of system components.

Failure to submit a project for DD review precludes the project from future State funding. <end add text>

3.H.3.a. State Superintendent Approval

Per Education Article § 2-303(f), the State Superintendent of Schools approves or disapproves the designs and contracts for all projects <delete text> in excess of \$1,000,000 <end delete text> <add text> that cost in excess of \$1,250,000 and will affect the plan configuration of student-occupied spaces <end add text>. In order to streamline process submission, the IAC and MSDE both utilize the BMS for review of DD submissions. No separate submission need be made to the State Superintendent for DDs.

3.H.3.b. Locally Funded Projects

Review of locally funded projects is through the OSF. Refer to locally funded project submission requirements <delete text> on the IAC website and submit locally funded project DD submissions <end delete text> in accordance with the MSDE Submission Requirements for Locally-Funded Projects document.

3.H.4. Process

Required elements and submission instructions are listed in the DD Submission Checklist, which should be submitted via the BMS Design Development Submission process. DD reviews are conducted collaboratively by the MDGS Office of Design, Construction, and Energy and the OSF. MDGS staff serve as lead reviewers for State and Federally funded projects. OSF staff serve as lead reviewers for locally funded and forward funded projects.

Collaborative reviews are not required for charter school construction projects (unless State-funded and in an LEA-owned building), for which OSF will review, and for capital maintenance projects that do not involve spatial changes, for which MDGS will review.

Per COMAR 14.39.02.15D(1)(b), State funded, and forward funded projects for which State funding is anticipated at a later date, should not proceed to the Construction Document (CD) phase without receipt of a DD approval letter.

3.H.5. Combined DD and CD Submissions

MDGS may, on a case-by-case basis, approve the submission of a combined DD and CD submission. LEAs should contact the MDGS representative via email to request a combined DD and CD submission.

3.I. Construction Document (CD) Submissions

3.I.1. General

During the CD phase of a project, the design team prepares the documents required to ensure construction contracts include all information necessary to accurately bid and build the project. CDs clearly outline contractual requirements and specify the rights and responsibilities of all parties to the contract and should include all documents required including drawings, specifications, schedules, scopes, and contractual documents required to ensure completeness. The contents of the CDs provide the information needed to ensure compliance to the design intent and resolve any disputes. The design

team and Owner should review updated cost models throughout the CD phase of the project to ensure project budgets and schedules can be met and that cost-conscious decisions are made that reduce the long-term cost of ownership.

A CD Submission to the IAC is required for all State funded projects. Design scope procurement should specifically include all items required for compliance to the CD submission requirements. Because CD approval is required prior to issuance of Bid Documents, design schedules should provide detailed deadlines to ensure timely submissions are coordinated with requirements of procurement and construction schedules. The completed submission package must be reviewed and approved by the LEA prior to submission to the IAC.

3.1.2. Purpose

The purpose of the CD submission is to ensure that all documentation is provided as required to conform with standards, provide the required outcome, and reduce long-term risks to State investment. The following are critical considerations in the CD review:

- Review of the complete Project Manual including all required specifications;
- Review of any changes since Design Development that could impact project outcomes;
- Review of detailed cost estimates to confirm that cost-control measures have been taken to ensure the project is on budget;
- Confirmation that the project remains on schedule and will meet the anticipated opening date;
- Review of alternatives to confirm the project includes the flexibility needed to account for changes in the bidding market;
- Detailed review of drawings to ensure the information is included at a level required to reduce risk and allow confirmation of compliance with State requirements; and
- Review of the project's contractual documents included in the front end of the Project Manual, including schedules, scopes, bid announcement, sample contracts and contract attachments, insurance requirements, prevailing wage, MBE, and other documents required to ensure completeness.

3.1.3. Applicability

A CD Submission to the IAC is required for all ~~State funded projects~~ projects that either are State funded or for which an LEA will request state funding and:

- Are estimated to cost more than \$1,250,000;
- That will affect the plan or configuration of student-occupied spaces; or
- That replace or make changes to an HVAC system or air conditioning system that are not like-for-like replacement of system components.

Failure to submit a project for DD review precludes the project from future State funding. For projects of limited scope, a combined Design Development and Construction Document submission may be acceptable. The MDGS in ~~coordination~~ ~~conjunction~~ with the IAC must approve a combined submission prior to the LEA proceeding with submission.

3.1.3.a. State Superintendent Approval

Per Education Article § 2-303(f), the State Superintendent of Schools approves or disapproves the designs and contracts for projects ~~that meet the criteria established in 3.1.3.~~ ~~in excess of \$1,000,000.~~ In order to streamline process submission, the

IAC and MSDE both utilize the BMS for review of CD submissions. No separate submission need be made to the State Superintendent for CDs.

3.1.3.b. Locally Funded Projects

Review of locally funded projects is through the OSF. Refer to locally funded project submission requirements ~~on the IAC website and submit locally funded project CD submissions~~ in accordance with the MSDE Submission Requirements for Locally-Funded Projects document.

3.1.4. Process

The IAC works with its partner agencies who assist in review of design submissions on behalf of the IAC. For State funded CD submissions, authority has been delegated to the MDGS. Required elements and submission instructions are listed in the [CD Submission Checklist](#). After the submission has been deemed complete, MDGS staff will perform a technical review and develop a set of comments distributed via an uploaded comment letter. Once all comments have been satisfactorily addressed, MDGS will inform the IAC that the project has met the requirements and will coordinate issuance of an approval letter. If at any point in the process it does not appear that the project will be able to meet applicable requirements, MDGS will coordinate with the IAC to issue a letter indicating the unresolvable issues.

An approval letter from MDGS is required before Bid Documents can be issued. Project schedules must be planned in order to achieve this requirement. If, for any unforeseen reason, this can not be achieved, please request consideration for an exception from MDGS and the IAC. This consideration will only allow Bid Documents to be issued and in no circumstance should LEAs open or accept bids on State funded projects prior to receipt of a CD approval letter.

Per Education Article § 2-303, the State Superintendent of Schools approves or disapproves school designs ~~that exceed \$1,250,000 and will impact the configuration of student-occupied spaces~~. In order to perform this function, the OSF works collaboratively with MDGS to conduct project reviews. In the case where collaborative reviews are required, OSF will provide separate review memos with comments that must be satisfactorily addressed for an approval letter to be issued. See the [IAC's website](#) for a more detailed description of the collaborative review process.

3.U. Contract Approval

3.U.1. General

IAC approval is required for any contract for which the LEA is requesting State participation or credit toward the Local Cost Share of a project.

3.U.2. Applicability

Approval of contracts is required regardless of the value of the contract. IAC funding is limited to the Maximum State Award, as identified in the approved applicable program approval document and approved funding awards. If the lowest responsive bidder's proposal exceeds the Maximum State Award and the local funds available, the LEA can:

- Supplement awarded State funds with local funding,
- Revise and rebid the project, or,

- Cancel the project and revert available funding to the appropriate reserve fund in accordance with Education Article § 5-303(j) or applicable program procedures.

3.U.3. Process

LEAs should submit a Contract Approval process in the BMS for all contracts individually; no combined submissions are permitted. Authority to approve contracts with a total value under \$100,000 is delegated to IAC staff. All contracts over \$100,000 must be approved at a monthly IAC meeting. Accordingly, LEAs should submit contracts with a total value of \$100,000 or greater by the deadline indicated on the [IAC Meeting and Approval Schedule](#), available on the IAC's website, for a given meeting to ensure timely approval. Contracts with a total value under \$100,000 can be submitted at any time, and will be reviewed on a rolling basis by IAC staff.

Following approval, LEAs can generate and export a Contract Approval Report in the BMS as a record for approval. A user guide for generating this report is available [on the IAC website](#).

If additional funds are awarded to a project that has a previously approved contract, the contract can be revised to adjust the State funding available to be paid towards the contract.

If a project and/or contract is canceled, the LEA should notify their assigned Capital Projects Manager to request a revision.

3.U.4. Submissions

Contract Approval requests should be made via the Contract Approval process in the BMS. Submitters should complete all required fields and any additional information available. Processes will be routed depending on value, and only contracts over \$100,000 will be brought to an IAC meeting.

3.U.5. Change Orders

Pursuant to Education Article § 5-314(c)(1) and COMAR 14.39.02.15G, an LEA shall maintain contingency funds for change orders and may issue change orders without prior approval of the IAC. However, pursuant to Education Article § 2-303(f)(1)(iv), any change order that costs more than ~~text~~ \$50,000~~end delete text~~ ~~text~~ \$350,000 for the addition to or renovation, restoration, or construction of student-occupied spaces~~end add text~~ shall be approved by the State Superintendent, or the State Superintendent's designee, and should be submitted to MSDE in accordance with OSF instructions. The IAC does not fund change orders.

3.U.6. Program Exceptions

Contracts for projects funded entirely with BTL funds are approved by the Maryland Stadium Authority (MSTAD) rather than the IAC. LEAs should contact the MSTAD for approval details. Contract approval is not required for projects funded solely with PTG funds. SSGP projects require IAC contract approval, but should be submitted via the SSGP Contract Approval process in the BMS.

3.U.7. Contract Approval for Locally-Funded Projects

Contracts for Locally-Funded ~~text~~ addition or renovation ~~end add text~~ projects ~~text~~ costing more than \$1,250,000 that affect the plan configuration of student-occupied spaces ~~end add text~~ are required to be approved by the State Superintendent. Submit BOE approval action, bid tabulation, and a description of bid alternates accepted in PDF format to myron.mason@maryland.gov within ten calendar days of board action.

3.V. Submission for Payment

3.V.1. General

The LEA is responsible for assuring that all charges applied to a project as a State expense are eligible for State funding. Projects that are procured by the LEA in the expectation that they will be funded in a future year Capital Improvement Program (forward-funded projects) are required to follow State requirements and procedures for project procurement, project delivery, and alternative financing, as applicable. The LEA is responsible for determining the validity of the contractor's requisition for services.

3.V.2. Submission Process

Upon review and approval by the LEA, requests for payments to contractors and/or reimbursement to LEA shall be submitted through the Invoice/Reimbursement Request process in the BMS. All submissions for payment must be certified by the contractor, an authorized official of the LEA, and, if applicable, the project architect. See [Section 2.J.](#) for further information on designating an authorized LEA official prior to submission.

<add text>Payments over \$50,000 will only be approved for distribution through Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) transactions, a type of electronic fund transfer. Vendors can enroll in State of Maryland ACH by contacting the General Accounting Division of the State of Maryland Comptroller. If a vendor elects to request payment via check, LEAs may choose to pay the vendor directly and submit a request to the IAC for reimbursement.<end add text>

Submissions must include:

- All related contractor or supplies invoices or pay applications;
- Payee's federal Employer Identification Number (EIN), or, social security number if no EIN has been assigned;
- For LEA reimbursements, the LEA Voucher Number;
- For LEA reimbursement, proof of payment made by the LEA to the vendor or contractor, such as bank canceled checks or proof of ACH from the banking institution.

Upon receipt of notice from the General Accounting Division that payment has been made, the IAC will send notification via the BMS to the LEA with the document number and date of payment.

Item 6. Legislative Session Presentation

Motion:

This item is informational and does not require IAC action.

Background Information:

Please see the presented presentation on the 2026 Legislative Session.

Cassandra Viscarra, Deputy Director
Victoria Howard, Policy Analyst



Interagency Commission on School Construction

2026 Legislative Session Presentation

May 14, 2026

Capital Budget

SB 283; Ch. 5

Total IAC Program Funds: \$510.85 Million

Built to Learn Fund: \$27M - Special Funds for PGCPs P3 program (excludes \$42M local funds)

Nancy K. Kopp Public School Facilities Priority Fund (KPF): \$70M - General Obligation (GO) Bonds

Public School Construction Program (CIP): \$300M - GO Bonds

Senator James E. "Ed" DeGrange Nonpublic Aging Schools Program (NASP): \$5M - GO Bonds

\$1.5 million required to be distributed to Woodbourne School

Supplemental Capital Improvement Program (EGRC): \$80M - GO Bonds

School Safety Grant Program (SSGP); \$10M - Operating Budget

SEIF for City Schools HVAC - \$18.85M



FY 2027 Kopp Priority Fund and EGRC

Nancy K. Kopp Public Schools Priority Fund

- Modified (FY 2027 only) to direct specific allocations to seven named LEAs:
 - Anne Arundel County: \$3M
 - Baltimore City: \$16M
 - Baltimore County: \$5M
 - Frederick County: \$5M
 - Howard County: \$6M
 - Montgomery County: \$15M
 - Prince George's County: \$19M
- IAC to award the remaining \$1M to eligible projects submitted by the other 17 LEAs

Amended EGRC Distributions

- \$4.5M allocated to county with “greatest percentage of enrollment growth above the statewide average” (Frederick)
- \$57.5M allocated based on “each eligible county board’s proportionate share of the total full-time equivalent enrollment of the county boards that are eligible to participate in the Program.”
- Remaining \$18M allocated based on each eligible county board’s proportionate share of percentage of enrollment growth above the statewide average percentage.

IAC Operating Budget

SB 282; Ch. 4

- Operating Budget FY 2027: **\$8,741,130***
- Operating Budget as a percentage of total Capital Budget for FY 27: **1.7%**
- Total Pins: **44**
- Total Personnel Budget: **\$7,045,263 (81%)**

**Agency operating expenditures only, does not include SSGP funding*

SB 48/HB 233

Returned Passed; Not Yet Signed

IAC Departmental Bill:
*Education - Public School
Construction - Alterations*

- Trims requirements for State review of LEA projects' design docs
- Shifts deadlines of IAC quarterly reports due to DLS and combines two reports with similar contents
- Replaces IAC 75% CIP approval with three CIP status reports (Nov, Dec, Jan)
- Clarifies differences between the Maintenance Effectiveness and Statewide Facilities assessments
- Modernization of terms used throughout

HB 854

Returned Passed; Not Yet Signed

*School Construction - Nonpublic
Special Education School
Renovation Program -
Established*

- Creates new IAC-administered program as of 7/1/2026
- But does not fund it for FY 2027
- Intent language to provide \$5M annually for capital improvements in approximately 13 non-public special-education schools
- Includes renovations and improvements to classrooms, school facilities, and residential cottages on school grounds; health, safety, and accessibility improvements; infrastructure modernization and technology upgrades; and new construction as required to comply with standards.

HB 1430

Passed Enrolled; Not Yet Signed

*Maryland Public Charter School
Program - School Facilities -
Funding*

- Creates a new funding program to allow for charter schools to receive approximately \$200 per student for school facilities starting in FY 2028
- Requires IAC staff to draft procedures, manage program, and distribute funds directly to charter schools
- If CIP decreases from the prior year; program funding is reduced by the same proportion.

HB 311/SB 507

Returned Passed; Not Yet Signed

Public Schools - Individuals With Disabilities - Accessibility and Emergency Planning

- Requires local school systems to identify issues of accessibility for those with disabilities during regular safety evaluations
- Local school systems to provide information in annual reports to MCSS, likely minimal need for IAC involvement
- IAC may see additional funding requests in the future for exterior door projects to remediate any ADA noncompliance

Other Enrolled Bills

SB 833 - Queen Anne's County - Authorized Uses of Revenues From Development Impact Fees - Expansion

- Adds School Construction as a permitted use of revenue earned from Development Impact Fees.

HB 870 - Environment - Permit Applications for New Buildings - Notice (Large Buildings for Tomorrow Act)

- Requires local permitting entities to inform the Department of the Environment when a building over 35,000 sf. applies for a building permit application.

SB 646 - Public School System Contracts - Prohibited Provisions

- Restricts LEAs from entering into contracts containing certain types of binding arbitration or other extrajudicial dispute resolution clauses.

We'd love
to hear your questions

