



Frederick County  
School Construction  
Master Plan  
Workgroup

**FINAL REPORT**

December 19, 2024



THE MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

December 19, 2024

The Honorable Bill Ferguson  
President of the Senate

The Honorable Adrienne Jones  
Speaker of the House

Dear President Ferguson and Speaker Jones,

On behalf of the Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup, we are pleased to present the Workgroup's final report.

HB1016 in 2024 established the Workgroup, which was charged to:

- comprehensively evaluate all school facility needs in the Frederick County Public Schools portfolio;
- explore and evaluate solutions to balance the fiscal demands of the educational needs of Frederick County school construction priorities;
- consider cost saving or cost sharing opportunities for Frederick County to fund and afford:
  - (i) new school projects,
  - (ii) maintain existing buildings, or
  - (iii) renovations to aging schools to better meet educational needs; and to
- report its findings and recommendations to the County Executive of Frederick County, the Frederick County Council, the Frederick County Board of Education, the Interagency Commission on School Construction, and, in accordance with § 2-1257 of the State Government Article, the Frederick County House and Senate Delegations on or before December 31, 2024.

The Workgroup met from August through December 2024, holding a total of seven meetings. Our work reflects our shared community commitment to confront the dual challenge in Frederick County of providing additional school capacity in growing county, while addressing the needs of aging school facilities. At a time when school construction costs are at an all-time high, and the Interagency Commission on School Construction's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funding has not kept pace with escalating inflation, Frederick County must continue to seek creative and collaborative solutions.

The report submitted to you today includes several recommendations which are intended to address the charge and needs in Frederick County. In addition, the Workgroup offers several suggestions for future exploration or requiring legislative action.

The Workgroup members and we thank you for the privilege of serving Frederick County and the State of Maryland. We especially appreciate the technical expertise of Mr. Alex Donahue and Dr. Paul Lebo who provided extensive staff support to the Workgroup, and Ms. Rich and Ms. Bender who kept the meeting records. We could not have completed our work without their assistance.

Sincerely,

Delegate April Miller  
Chair

Delegate Ken Kerr  
Vice Chair

DRAFT

# **Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup Members**

---

April Miller, Delegate, Maryland House of Delegates, District 4  
Chair

Ken Kerr, Delegate, Maryland House of Delegates, District 3  
Vice Chair

William Folden, Senator, Maryland State Senate, District 4

Karen Lewis Young, Senator, Maryland State Senate, District 3

Brad Young, President, Frederick County Council Member-At-Large

Steve McKay, Member, Frederick County Council, District 2

Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager, Frederick County Government, representing  
County Executive Jessica Fitzwater

Karen Yoho, President, Board of Education of Frederick County

Rae Gallagher, Vice President, Board of Education of Frederick County

Michael Darenberg, Commissioner, Interagency Commission on School Construction

## **Additional Support**

Alex Donahue, Executive Director, Interagency Commission on School Construction

Dr. Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer, Frederick County Public Schools

Kira Bender, Chief of Staff for Delegate April Miller

Kathryn Rich, Executive Assistant, Board of Education of Frederick County

# Table of Contents

---

Letter to Legislative Leadership.....	Page i
Membership of Workgroup.....	Page ii
Table of Contents.....	Page iii
Introduction.....	Page 1
Meeting Summary.....	Page 1-3
Recommendations.....	Page 3-7
Additional Mentions.....	Page 7-8
Discussion Topics Not Recommended for Consideration.....	Page 8-9
Conclusion.....	Page 9-10
House Bill 1016.....	APPENDIX 1
Meeting Agendas.....	APPENDIX 2

DRAFT

# Final Report of the Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

---

## I. Introduction

The Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup (Workgroup) was enacted through the adoption of HB1016 (**APPENDIX 1**) during the 2024 Maryland General Assembly Legislative Session.

The Workgroup was charged to review of the 2023 update to the Educational Facilities Master Plan, and based on that review, comprehensively evaluate the school facility needs in the Frederick County Public Schools portfolio. Further, the Workgroup was to explore and evaluate solutions to balance the fiscal demands of the educational needs while considering cost saving or cost sharing opportunities for Frederick County to fund and afford new school projects, maintain existing buildings and renovations to aging schools to better meet educational needs.

HB1016 stipulated the membership of the Workgroup to be:

- two members of the Senate of Maryland, appointed by the President of the Senate, based on the recommendation of the chair of the Frederick County Delegation;
- two members of the House of Delegates, appointed by the Speaker of the House, based on the recommendation of the chair of the Frederick County Delegation;
- the County Executive of Frederick County, or the County Executive's designee;
- two members of the Frederick County Council, appointed by the President of the County Council;
- two members of the Frederick County Board of Education, appointed by the President of the County Board of Education; and
- one member of the Interagency Commission on School Construction.

This final report summarizes the Workgroup's meetings, discussion and recommendations over the course of the past several months. The final report reflects the consensus among the Workgroup's members.

## II. Meeting Summary

The Workgroup began meeting on August 1, 2024. The Workgroup held a total of seven (7) meetings:

August 1  
August 29  
September 26  
October 10  
November 7  
November 21  
December 19

The agendas for these meetings can be found in **APPENDIX 2**. Presentation materials can be found on the Frederick County Public Schools website under the Board of Education tab, via BoardDocs, organized by meeting date. All meetings were recorded and were open to the public. The link to view the meetings or obtain materials is:

<https://go.boarddocs.com/mabe/fcps/Board.nsf/Public>

The Workgroup heard from subject matter experts about the school construction needs, funding sources, and prior efforts of previous State and Local workgroups relating to the similar school construction subjects. Presentations included:

- Educational Facilities Master Plan Overview
- Frederick County School Construction Funding (Local)
- Overview of the Interagency Commission on School Construction and State Funding (State)
- Overview of Prior School Construction Local and State Workgroups
- School Construction Funding Options, including P3
- K-12 Funding Strategies Across the Country
- Frederick County Public Schools Capital Projects and School Construction Performance Audit

The Workgroup discussed alternative funding methods and options, spending time examining various funding model options. They also discussed additional strategies for funding, as seen in other areas of the country, to examine if there were additional options which should be explored. In addition, the Workgroup invited municipal leaders to share their experiences relating to school construction projects and capacity, with five of the twelve Frederick County municipalities participating.

The Workgroup learned that the funding allocated to the Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC) to fund Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) has for the most part remained relatively unchanged since 2006, as established by recommendations of the Kopp Commission. The amount fluctuates depending on the Governor's proposed budget and actions by the General Assembly. Frederick County's current share of this funding is roughly \$15-\$18M per year, and this is based loosely on the percentage of enrollment in Frederick County as compared to the State's enrollment. Frederick County has received an additional allocation of significant Enrollment Growth and Relocatable Classrooms (EGRC) funding for the past several years, as Frederick County is one of the fastest growing counties in Maryland.

Frederick County's willingness to forward-fund the State's obligation for school construction funding for projects with limited planning approvals, creates a funding source that would otherwise not be available. Forward funding allows Frederick County to complete projects quickly, and often at a lower cost. Without forward funding, Frederick County would have to wait, often for several years, as the State's share of funding is awarded incrementally. Frederick County is one of only three counties that forward-funds the State share until the State can pay their promised obligations, which typically takes three to six years.

In fiscal year 2024, Frederick County Executive Jessica Fitzwater proposed a property tax increase in order to establish dedicated funds for aging school infrastructure. The new tax rate, subsequently adopted by a majority of the County Council, sets aside \$0.05 every \$100 of assessed value, and earmarks dedicated ongoing local revenue for school renovations, limited renovations and modernizations of aging facilities. Frederick County already dedicates the revenue from impact fees and school mitigation fees toward new capacity.

Throughout the Workgroup meetings, it became abundantly clear that Frederick County is able to complete additional school construction projects if additional State local planning (LP) and funding became available. In fact, Built to Learn (BTL) revenue that was awarded to Frederick County through legislation in 2020 has been completely exhausted. BTL funding provided the State share of four (4) replacement schools, with each of those projects including additional capacity.

Frederick County has a queue of projects waiting for LP and State funding that have been programmed in the County's local 6-year CIP. The County Executive has forward funded the next project in the queue, Elementary School #41, without IAC planning approval or State design funding, in order to begin that project sooner and relieve school overcrowding at adjacent Oakdale Elementary School, operating at close to 160% of capacity with nearly 1,200 students. A challenge for Frederick County is that several of the projects in the queue are larger high school and middle school projects. The County will be unable to finance these large projects without State participation.

Frequently mentioned by several members of the Workgroup was the exemplary degree of collaboration that exists between Frederick County Government and Frederick County Public Schools in planning and executing school construction projects. The nature of this relationship contributes significantly to the ability of FCPS to plan and execute projects on time and typically under budget.

### **III. Final Recommendations**

The Workgroup agreed by consensus on the following recommendations:

#### **Levels of Annual Funding for the School Construction Capital Improvement Program**

The appropriate level of funding for school construction in the State has been a topic of discussions and recommendations for decades and was closely assessed by the State's 21st Century School Facilities Commission and the Workgroup on the Assessment and Funding of School Facilities. The Kopp Commission recommended that the State commit to providing at least \$250 million annually for eight years, beginning in fiscal 2006, to meet this target. Unfortunately, there have been very little increases in school construction funding in the last 20 years resulting in less capital renewal, which has contributed to the decrease in school conditions statewide.



Both the commission and the workgroup highlighted above called for increases to the annual capital funding available for schools. The reality is that if the target for school construction funding in 2006 was \$250M, inflation alone warrants an annual allocation of \$618M for Fiscal Year (FY) 2026. This does not account for any enrollment growth statewide and focuses solely on addressing capital renewal needs. Therefore, the workgroup recommends a State funding level of \$618 million for school construction for FY 2026 to provide the State's share of approved projects to fund major construction, renovation and systemic projects.

In addition, the annual allocation for school construction in the State should, at a minimum, increase by the inflation rate identified in the Construction Cost Index (CCI). It is important to highlight that the CCI does not capture the full cost of inflation on construction projects. The CCI examines the general construction cost and input price indices but does not account for all of the total final costs to construct or renovate a facility. Therefore, every three years, the State should ensure that the annual allocation for school construction accounts for the total inflationary costs over the previous three-year period.

### **Enrollment Growth and Relocatable Classrooms (EGRC)**

The workgroup considered a recommendation to limit the number of consecutive years a Local Education Agency (LEA) could receive Enrollment Growth and Relocatable Classrooms (EGRC) funding, as this funding was intended to address inadequate capacity and reduce the number of portable classrooms. However, the workgroup struggled to determine an appropriate limit due to ongoing funding challenges and State debt capacity issues.

The Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC), an independent state agency, oversees the management and execution of the program as outlined in the authorizing legislation. The IAC cannot restrict EGRC funding duration while simultaneously granting local planning approval to a small number of projects per year, with only four projects awarded planning approval in FY25, as this would delay project completion and prolong reliance on EGRC funding.

The current number of portables an LEA must have in its inventory is 250 to be eligible for the funding annually. The IAC would need to determine if the 250 portables needed for EGRC funding should be pro-rated based on the size of the LEA or a one-size fits all number like it is now, and also if that is the correct number (it was lowered from 300 a few years ago). If the goal is to reduce the number of portables below 250, more projects must be initiated. Yet, without additional funding or increased debt capacity, limiting EGRC funding could exacerbate the problem.

Finally, the current funding level for the EGRC program is \$40M and will increase to \$80M in FY 2027. Unfortunately, even with the increase in funding to \$80M, allocation of that amount of funding to seven or eight LEAs does not have a significant enough impact to reduce capacity challenges. Restricting that funding and then reallocating it will not enable the IAC to award significantly more projects, but it could have negative ramifications, especially for LEAs that have consistently received the additional funding from the onset.

Therefore, the workgroup supports a recommendation that the IAC consider studying the current EGRC eligibility for funding criteria and allocation process to determine if changes in their procedures are warranted.

### **Maryland Stadium Authority Bonding Capacity**

In recent years, the State has been able to utilize the bonding authority and capacity of the Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA) to increase funding to support school construction. This was most notable in the Built to Learn Act, which was enacted in 2020 and authorized the MSA to issue up to \$2.2 billion in revenue bonds, backed by annual payments from the Education Trust Fund, for public school construction projects in the State. The workgroup recommends that the legislature request the Governor of Maryland examine the debt affordability of the MSA and determine if additional bonding capacity exists to increase capital funding for school construction in the State.

### **High School Utilization**

As high schools in Frederick County increasingly offer opportunities for students to engage in dual enrollment programs, internships, and career and technical education (CTE), FCPS must reassess how their high school buildings are being used. With more students spending significant portions of their school day off-campus, either attending college courses or gaining hands-on experience in the workforce, the traditional "seat time" model is no longer a full reflection of how school facilities are being utilized. In addition, the Blueprint for Maryland's Future places significant emphasis on Career and Technical Education (CTE), which will transform the way our high school facilities are utilized.

In light of this shift, the workgroup recommends that FCPS closely examine their facility usage to ensure they are maximizing the capacity of their high school buildings and making the most efficient use of resources. For example, classroom spaces that are vacant during certain periods could be repurposed for other educational activities such as increased online learning opportunities, expanded CTE courses, or collaboration areas for project-based learning. Additionally, FCPS could consider flexible scheduling models that allow for a more fluid use of their buildings, accommodating students' off-campus learning schedules while still meeting the needs of in-person learners.

## **CTE Strategic Facilities Master Plan Study**

County Executive Fitzwater has established a Career and Technical Education Strategic Facilities Master Plan Study steering committee. The steering committee includes a variety of stakeholders, including FCPS, Frederick Community College, the Frederick County Chamber of Commerce, and Frederick County Workforce Services.

The steering committee primary role is to select and contract with a vendor for an extensive Career and Technical Education Master Plan Study aimed at enhancing and expanding Career and Technical Education programs and space while aligning CTE programming to the evolving needs of the local economy and industry sectors. This collaborative effort reflects the broader state and national emphasis on strengthening CTE pathways to better equip students with the skills they need for the future workforce, particularly in an economy increasingly driven by technology and skilled trades.

The CTE Strategic Facilities Master Plan study will examine CTE spaces and opportunities in Frederick County, and therefore, the School Construction Master Plan Workgroup recommends that the County Executive share the final report with the delegation to enhance statewide support for the local CTE needs countywide. The workgroup recognizes it will take some time to engage a vendor and complete the CTE Master Plan Study.

## **Leasing Facilities for Schools**

The option to lease existing commercial buildings and retrofit them to serve as traditional schools is becoming an increasingly viable option for districts facing rapid growth, tight budgets, or the need for additional educational space. This approach can be particularly advantageous when there is a shortage of available land for new construction, or when school districts need to quickly adapt to shifting enrollment numbers. Commercial buildings, such as office spaces, warehouses, or retail locations, often have the advantage of being located in areas with convenient access to transportation and infrastructure, making them ideal for repurposing into educational facilities.

Retrofitting a commercial building into a school would require significant planning and investment, to upgrade a building's interior to meet the specific needs of a school environment, such as installing classrooms, administrative offices, specialized spaces like gymnasiums and cafeterias, and ensuring compliance with safety and accessibility standards. Building systems, such as HVAC, electrical, plumbing, and fire safety, may need to be upgraded to accommodate the increased demands of a school. While retrofitting can be a complex process, it allows districts to utilize available real estate quickly and efficiently, meeting urgent space needs without the long lead times and high costs associated with new construction.

Furthermore, leasing and retrofitting existing commercial buildings to serve as schools presents an option for FCPS as they face space constraints, budget limitations, and rapid enrollment growth. The workgroup recommends that FCPS examine long-term leasing options or potentially retrofitting existing commercial buildings as a strategic option to address current or future space needs, as applicable. This approach could offer a cost-efficient and timely solution for accommodating growing student populations, especially as State funding is available for improvements to commercially leased spaces with 25-year lease agreements.

Further, the workgroup suggests FCPS consider conducting a thorough assessment of available Frederick County commercial properties that could be potentially considered as future school spaces, evaluating factors such as location, structural integrity, and potential for customization to meet educational requirements.

## **Tax Incentives for Financing New School Construction**

To support financing new school construction, the workgroup recommends that Frederick County and the State of Maryland explore a variety of tax incentives that allow developers to provide the capital investment for new school construction. The most effective approach may involve a combination of state and county incentives. By establishing incentives, developers can not only reduce their financial risk but also contribute to the development of vital educational infrastructure that serves the growing communities in Frederick County. By maximizing the use of tax incentives, new school construction can proceed timely alongside commercial or residential projects.

Additionally, the Workgroup notes the challenge and limited ability to identify and secure future new school sites. In recent years, there has been a focused collaborative effort between FCPS and County staff, which yielded a future high school site and an elementary school site purchase. There has not been the same degree of collaboration between municipal governments, the County and FCPS. The Workgroup supports examining tax or other incentives to secure future school sites, particularly within municipal boundaries, and especially within the City of Frederick due to its size. Municipal governments must work collaboratively with the County and developers to plan for future school sites early in the development process.

### **IV. Additional Mentions**

There are uniquely twelve municipal governments located in Frederick County. Each of these municipalities has autonomy over land use decisions within their boundaries. Because land use decisions often impact schools, either directly or indirectly, the Workgroup invited the municipal Mayors/Burgesses to attend a Workgroup meeting to share their perspectives. Five of twelve participated in a meeting: Thurmont, Emmitsburg, Brunswick, Middletown and the City of Frederick (Mayor Pro Tem attended instead of the Mayor).

Several Municipalities expressed the need for support from the County and State when it comes to planning schools within municipal areas, with traffic impacts frequently mentioned. The municipal Mayors/Burgesses seek input earlier in the planning process, even prior to plans

coming to municipal planning boards. The Workgroup supports efforts for more collaboration and communication to avoid adverse municipal growth impacts on schools.

The Workgroup also discussed the impact certain legislation either has had or will have on Frederick County schools. For example, aspects of Maryland's Blueprint for Education when fully implemented will require additional space for pre-kindergarten, Career-Technical programs, or collaborative teaching spaces. Additionally, other possible legislative changes have been discussed at both the State and local level, relating to affordable housing and adequate public facilities (APF) which could impact schools. In a growing county, such as Frederick County, these types of legislative changes must be monitored carefully to not compound an already significant school capital funding challenge. Any legislation that impacts Frederick County school facilities or capacities, should include a subsequent appropriation of school construction funding.

## **V. Discussion Topics Not Recommended for Consideration**

The work group carefully considered several potential funding mechanisms, including an Educational Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax and Public-Private Partnerships. However, after thorough evaluation, these options were not recommended for further consideration. The Educational Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax, while it could provide additional funding at the local level, raised concerns about the impact of additional taxes on the community when taxes were just increased by \$0.05. Similarly, Public-Private Partnerships, though promising in some contexts, were not recommended due to concerns over long-term sustainability, the complexity of agreements, and the potential for inconsistent outcomes. Ultimately, the work group decided to focus on more direct and equitable funding solutions that align with the county's and state's educational priorities. Below are more details about the options evaluated but not recommended.

### **Educational Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax**

The workgroup explored many alternative financing options available to support school construction needs. One model in particular that could support the increasing needs of school construction is the funding option used in the State of Georgia known as the Educational Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (E-SPLOST).

The E-SPLOST is a sales tax program used by school districts in Georgia to fund educational facilities and resources. Funds are specifically allocated to support educational needs, specifically the construction, renovation, and maintenance of school facilities. This can include building new schools, upgrading existing infrastructure, purchasing new technology or educational equipment, and other resources that enhance the quality of education. The E-SPLOST is a local sales tax that is approved by voters in each county and is typically a 1% sales tax that is added to the regular state sales tax.

The use of the E-SPLOST is not implemented automatically; rather, voters in each county must approve it through a referendum. This vote typically occurs every five years, although the specific duration can vary and the tax is only effective in the district where it is approved. If county residents approve an E-SPLOST, the funds are used exclusively within that county for

school construction and renovation needs. The implementation of an E-SPLOST can provide a steady stream of funding to address immediate needs. Because the tax is tied to sales rather than property values, it supports a balanced funding mechanism that also includes non-residents, tourists, and consumers.

### **Public Private Partnerships**

Discussions of the use of public-private partnerships (PPPs) are increasing in Maryland as an alternative method to support and enhance school construction needs. PPPs involve collaborations between a local school district, state government, and private companies, where the private sector brings in capital, expertise, and management, while the public sector provides oversight, funding, and access to public assets. These partnerships are designed to improve efficiency, leverage private investment, and ensure that educational facilities and services are up to modern standards.

One prominent area where PPPs are being applied is in school construction and renovation in Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS). PGCPS faces challenges in maintaining and updating aging school buildings. Through PPPs, private companies have been involved in designing, building, and managing new or renovated schools. In these arrangements, the private partner finances the construction, and the PGCPS repays the investment over time through a long-term lease agreement. This model allows for the rapid deployment of new infrastructure without placing an immediate burden on public budgets.

While the use of PPPs in Maryland schools has shown promise, it also raises concerns around accountability, transparency, and long-term costs. Critics argue that privatization could lead to a lack of control over public assets and increase costs for taxpayers in the long run. Therefore, it is essential that these partnerships are carefully structured with clear agreements, rigorous oversight, and a focus on the public interest to ensure that they deliver tangible benefits to students and communities.

Frederick County Government forward funding the State's share of school construction projects with limited planning has been demonstrated to complete projects more quickly and at a lower cost. However, in light of the pressing needs for improved school facilities in Frederick County, the workgroup supports FCPS further examining the opportunity for using public-private partnerships, whenever possible.

In addition, the State could identify a dedicated revenue stream to support the long-term costs associated with a PPP outside of the traditional capital budget. State support and commitment to a portion of the funding of a PPP is critical for improving facility conditions statewide.

## **VI. Conclusion**

The Workgroup concluded that local funding is not the main issue hampering Frederick County's ability to advance school construction projects. The timing of LP and State funding due to limited debt capacity is the primary factor impacting Frederick County today. Frederick County already forward funds the State share and has dedicated revenue in place to fund the

local share of projects. Until additional State funding or debt capacity becomes available Frederick County's ability to advance projects is limited.

The Maryland General Assembly enacted the Built to Learn Act in 2020, which allocated nearly \$2 billion dollars in new funding for school construction through the Maryland Stadium Authority. With this sweeping legislation, Frederick County's share of the funding was approximately \$87M. Frederick County spent the funding by FY25, funding the replacement of four elementary schools, each with additional capacity added. It is unlikely the General Assembly will create an additional source of school construction revenue, beyond the Built to Learn Act funding, in the near future.

In the meantime, while we seek additional sources of revenue, Frederick County Public Schools, the Board of Education, and Frederick County Government will continue to work with the IAC and our legislative leaders on the recommendations put forth in this final report. Frederick County is a leader in school construction in Maryland, and we look forward to continuing our excellent working relationship between all the partners, as we strive to become even better.

DRAFT

## HOUSE BILL 1016

F3

4lr1811  
CF SB 1152

---

**By: Frederick County Delegation**

Introduced and read first time: February 5, 2024

Assigned to: Appropriations

---

Committee Report: Favorable

House action: Adopted

Read second time: March 4, 2024

---

## CHAPTER \_\_\_\_\_

1 AN ACT concerning

2 **Frederick County – School Construction Master Plan Workgroup**3 FOR the purpose of establishing the Frederick County School Construction Master  
4 Plan Workgroup; and generally relating to the Frederick County School  
5 Construction Master Plan Workgroup.6 SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND,  
7 That:

8 (a) There is a Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup.

9 (b) The Workgroup consists of the following members:

10 (1) two members of the Senate of Maryland, appointed by the President of  
11 the Senate, based on the recommendation of the chair of the Frederick County Delegation;12 (2) two members of the House of Delegates, appointed by the Speaker  
13 of the House, based on the recommendation of the chair of the Frederick County Delegation;14 (3) the County Executive of Frederick County, or the County Executive's  
15 designee;16 (4) two members of the Frederick County Council, appointed by the  
17 President of the County Council;

---

**EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.**

[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.

Underlining indicates amendments to bill.~~Strike out~~ indicates matter stricken from the bill by amendment or deleted from the law  
by amendment



1           (5) two members of the Frederick County Board of Education, appointed by  
2 the President of the County Board of Education; and

3           (6) one member of the Interagency Commission on School Construction.

4           (c) The members of the Workgroup shall elect the chair of the Workgroup.

5           (d) The Frederick County Board of Education shall provide staff for the  
6 Workgroup.

7           (e) A member of the Workgroup:

8               (1) may not receive compensation as a member of the Workgroup; but

9               (2) is entitled to reimbursement for expenses under the Standard State  
10 Travel Regulations, as provided in the State budget.

11          (f) Based on its review of the 2023 update to the Educational Facilities Master  
12 Plan, the Workgroup shall:

13               (1) comprehensively evaluate all school facility needs in the Frederick  
14 County Public Schools portfolio;

15               (2) explore and evaluate solutions to balance the fiscal demands of the  
16 educational needs of Frederick County school construction priorities; and

17               (3) consider cost saving or cost sharing opportunities for Frederick County  
18 to fund and afford:

19                   (i) new school projects;

20                   (ii) maintain existing buildings; or

21                   (iii) renovations to aging schools to better meet educational needs.

22          (g) On or before December 31, 2024, the Workgroup shall report its findings and  
23 recommendations to the County Executive of Frederick County, the Frederick County  
24 Council, the Frederick County Board of Education, the Interagency Commission on School  
25 Construction, and, in accordance with § 2–1257 of the State Government Article, the  
26 Frederick County House and Senate Delegations.

27          SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect June  
28 1, 2024. It shall remain effective for a period of 1 year and 1 month and, at the end of June  
29 30, 2025, this Act, with no further action required by the General Assembly, shall be  
30 abrogated and of no further force and effect.



**Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup**

August 1, 2024, 6:00 pm  
Board of Education Boardroom

On April 25, 2024, Governor Wes Moore approved the Frederick County Delegation Bill HB1016, passed by the Maryland General Assembly. This bill establishes the Frederick County School Construction Master Plan Workgroup, focusing on the development and implementation of the master plan for school construction in Frederick County.

On or before December 31, 2024, the Workgroup shall report its findings and recommendations to the County Executive of Frederick County, the Frederick County Council, the Frederick County Board of Education, the Interagency Commission on School Construction, and, in accordance with § 2-1257 of the State Government Article, the Frederick County House and Senate Delegations.

**Agenda**

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. Opening comments and remarks – Delegate Miller
  - a. Introduction of members
- III. Election of Chair/Co-Chairs
- IV. Review of Charge to the Workgroup
  - a. Educational Facilities Master Plan
- V. Presentations on the Current Status of Frederick County Maryland School Construction - Perspectives from
  - a. State level - Interagency Commission on School Construction - Alex Donahue, Executive Director IAC

- b. School level - FCPS - Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer
- c. County level - Frederick County Budget Office - Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager

VI. Discussion

- a. Overview of prior school construction workgroups
  - i. State level - Alex Donahue, Executive Director IAC
  - ii. Frederick County/FCPS level - Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer FCPS, and Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager
- b. Workgroup strategy
- c. Member remarks
- d. Set dates and times for future workgroup schedules
- e. Future agenda - Presentation of Oakdale Elementary School overcrowding situation and solutions

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT – Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations

VIII. ADJOURNMENT



## Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

August 29, 2024, 5:00 pm  
Board of Education Boardroom

### Agenda

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of August 1, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. Overview of prior school construction workgroups
    1. State level - Alex Donahue, Executive Director IAC
    2. Frederick County/FCPS level - Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer FCPS, and Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager
  - B. Workgroup strategy
- IV. SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION FUNDING OPTIONS – past, present, & future
  - A. State level - Alex Donahue, Executive Director IAC
  - B. Frederick County/FCPS level - Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer FCPS, and Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager

V. DISCUSSION

A. Member discussion

1. Rethinking School Impact Fees in the Context of Form-Based Development (e.g., the South Frederick Corridor Plan)

B. Proposed next workgroup meeting of September 26, 2024 at 5 p.m.

C. Future agenda topics

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations

VII. ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT



## Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

September 26, 2024, 5:00 pm  
Board of Education Boardroom

### Agenda

- 1 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- 2 FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of August 29, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- 3 UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. No unfinished business
- 4 MUNICIPALITIES
  - A. Feedback, Ideas and Discussion on school construction funding challenges, strategies, and status
- 5 K-12 FUNDING STRATEGIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY DISCUSSION
- 6 DISCUSSION
  - A. Potential legislative solutions (if time permits)
  - B. Member remarks
  - C. Set dates and times for future workgroup schedules
  - D. Future agenda topics
- 7 PUBLIC COMMENT - Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations
- 8 ADJOURNMENT



## Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

October 10, 2024

6:00 pm

Board of Education Boardroom

### Agenda

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of September 26, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. Municipalities - Any that did not share from the 9/26/24 meeting can - feedback, ideas, and discussion on school construction funding challenges, strategies, and status
- IV. FINDINGS & IMPLEMENTATIONS OF PAST FREDERICK WORKGROUPS
  - A. Janice Spiegel, Special Projects Manager for Frederick County Budget Office; overview of projects and past workgroups (Frederick County Construction Workgroup 2016-2017, Knott Commission, and County Executive Ad HOC Workgroup)
  - B. Alex Donahue, IAC Director; summary and details on the Knott Commission AFWG of 2021
  - C. Steve McKay, County Council; summary and details on county audit on school construction.
  - D. Paul Lebo, Chief Operating Officer, FCPS; FCPS Facilities Status Update
- V. HIGHER EDUCATION & OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEDERAL GRANTS
  - A. How to partner with higher education/universities in Maryland - expanding or including programs
  - B. Ideas to include that could qualify for federal grants (solar/vehicle charging)
- VI. DISCUSSION
  - A. FCPS school naming policy (if time permits)
  - B. Member remarks
  - C. Set dates and times for future workgroup schedules
  - D. Future agenda topics

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT - Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT





## Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

November 7th, 2024, 6:00 pm  
Board of Education Boardroom

### Agenda

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of October 10, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. Steve McKay, Frederick County Council; audit summary
- IV. LEGISLATIVE IDEAS
  - A. Open for member discussion on legislative ideas to implement for the end of workgroup report, county and/or state legislation
  - B. Discussion on final report structure
- V. DISCUSSION
  - A. Member remarks
  - B. Set dates and times for future workgroup schedules
  - C. Future agenda topics
- VI. PUBLIC COMMENT - Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations
- VII. ADJOURNMENT



## Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup

November 21st, 2024, 6:00 pm  
Virtual - Google Meet

### Agenda

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of November 7, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. No unfinished business
- IV. REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE AND FINAL REPORT IDEAS
  - A. Any final discussion on legislative ideas
  - B. Discussion on the final report - due at the end of December
- V. DISCUSSION
  - A. Member remarks
  - B. Set dates and times for future workgroup schedules
  - C. Future agenda topics
- VI. PUBLIC COMMENT - Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations
- VII. ADJOURNMENT



## **Frederick County - School Construction Master Plan Workgroup**

December 19, 2024, 6:00 pm

Virtual - Google Meet

### **Agenda**

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II. FIRST BUSINESS
  - A. Approval of November 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - B. Attendance of Members
- III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
  - A. No unfinished business
- IV. FINAL REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT
  - A. Any final discussion, comments, or concerns to draft
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT - Two-minute limit per comment. Members reserve the right to make alterations
- VI. ADJOURNMENT