Appendices A-E (Budgeting Documents)

- A: Draft FY 2025 Board of Education Capital Budget
- B: Frederick County Executive Jessica Fitzwater's proposed FY 24-29 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Frederick County approved FY 23-28 CIP
- C: Proposed Calendar for the EFMP and FY2024 Capital Budget
- D: Frederick County Capital Improvement Program Policies
- E: State IAC Funding Priorities

APPENDIX A: DRAFT FY2025 BOARD OF EDUCATION CAPITAL BUDGET

Source: Frederick County Public Schools, May 2023



FREDERICK COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET Fiscal Year 2025

| | | Funding Request* | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-------------|--|
| PROJECT DESCRIPTION | LOC | AL STATE | TOTAL | |
| | | (000's om | nitted) | |
| | | | | |
| MAJOR CONSTRUCTION/RENOVATION: | | | | |
| IN CONCENSION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN | | | | |
| Green Valley ES Replacement - Construction | \$6,5 | 00 \$0 | \$6,500 | |
| Valley ES Replacement - Construction | \$8,3 | | \$8,300 | |
| Yellow Springs ES Replacement - Construction | \$16,4 | 64 \$18,532 | | |
| Middletown Co-Located ES/MS- Site | \$10,8 | 343 \$10,775 | 5 \$21,618 | |
| New east Frederick area ES - Design | \$6,4 | 62 \$10,606 | | |
| Brunswick HS Replacement - Design | \$3,7 | 52 \$5,427 | \$9,179 | |
| Liberty ES Replacement - Design | \$6,6 | 80 \$10,343 | 3 \$17,023 | |
| New Bus Depot - Design/ | \$1,5 | 00 \$0 | \$1,500 | |
| Feasibility Study | \$20 | 0 \$0 | \$200 | |
| | Subtotal \$60,7 | o1 \$55,683 | 3 \$116,384 | |
| | | | | |
| BUILDING/SITE IMPROVEMENTS: | | | | |
| Portable Classroom Relocation/Replacement | \$2,0 | 00 \$0 | \$2,000 | |
| Systemics: | | | | |
| Ballenger Creek ES Limited Renovation - Construction | \$1,8 | 63 \$3,461 | \$5,324 | |
| Spring Ridge ES Limited Renovation - Construction | \$1,9 | 23 \$3,570 | \$5,493 | |
| Twin Ridge ES Limited Renovation - Design/Construction | \$5,0 | 75 \$9,425 | \$14,500 | |
| Hillcrest ES Limited Renovation - Design | \$29 | 8 \$553 | \$850 | |
| Middletown HS Roof Replacement (Section A) | \$26 | 5 \$491 | \$756 | |
| Walkersville MS Roof Replacement (Sections E, G) | \$76 | 0 \$1,412 | \$2,172 | |
| Tuscarora HS Roof & Flashing Replacement (Sections 6, | 12, 13) \$82 | 2 \$153 | \$235 | |
| Playground Equipment Replacement | \$25 | 0 \$0 | \$250 | |
| Systemic Contingency | \$50 | 0 \$0 | \$500 | |
| | Subtotal \$11,0 | 116 \$19,064 | \$30,080 | |
| | | | | |
| | TOTALS \$73,7 | '17 \$74,747 | 7 \$148,464 | |

*Major construction project budgets reflect current budget estimates and may be revised at time of submission to the County and State in fall 2023. State funding request includes new requests only and does not include request for repayment of capital dollars forward funded by the County.

Note: Project funding is subject to approval by County Council and State.

APPENDIX B: FREDERICK COUNTY EXECUTIVE JESSICA FITZWATER'S PROPOSED FY 24-29 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) AND FREDERICK COUNTY APPROVED FY 23-28 CIP

Source: Frederick County, April 2023 and July 2022

FY2024 - 2029 Proposed Capital Improvement Program Board of Education

| Project _ | 6-year | Total Project | Prior | 2024 | 2025 |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| New/Modernizations | | | | | |
| Urbana ES: Replacement Northern Frederick City area ES New (Yellow Springs ES) | 0 48,879,217 | 46,139,665 48,879,217 | 46,139,665 0 | 0 17,186,026 | 0 29,693,191 |
| Middletown Co-located ES/MS replacement Liberty ES: Replacement | 96,366,092 49,038,390 | 96,766,092 49,116,890 | 400,000 78,500 | 8,416,215 0 | 13,229,694 16,422,469 |
| Blue Heron ES Brunswick ES: Replacement/Addition | 2,020,000 | 43,726,924 47,367,917 | 43,726,924 45,347,917 | 2,020,000 | 0 |
| Rock Creek School: Replacement Middletown HS: Replacement Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 0 8,058,000 43,001,819 | 50,151,186 138,340,286 50,148,273 | 50,151,186 0 7,146,454 | 0 0 43,001,819 | 0 0 0 |
| Crestwood MS: Addition Eastern Frederick ES | 11,121,191 49,616,247 | 11,848,191 52,616,247 | 727,000 3,000,000 | 11,121,191 | 1,500,000 |
| Green Valley ES Replacement/Addition Southern Frederick area elementary school Walkersville MS: Modernization Study | 40,281,065 46,116,217 200,000 | 47,058,655 48,116,217 200,000 | 6,777,590 0 0 | 40,281,065 0 0 | 0 0 0 |
| FCPS Bus Facility | 6,700,000 | 11,163,695 | 4,463,695 | 2,200,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Total: New/Modernizations | 401,398,238 | 741,639,455 | 207,958,931 | 124,226,316 | 62,345,354 |
| Systemic | | | | | |
| Systemics - Generic Limited Renovations Systemic Monocacy ES Limited Renovations Spring Ridge ES Limited Renovations Ballenger Creek ES Limited Renovations New Buses-Capacity | 14,900,000 23,250,000 3,746,000 18,206,259 17,575,944 184,000 | 15,400,000 23,377,965 14,610,610 18,206,259 17,575,944 920,000 | 500,000 127,965 10,864,610 0 0 736,000 | 1,400,000 0 3,746,000 12,713,369 12,172,000 184,000 | 2,500,000 0 5,492,890 2,198,698 0 |
| Portable Classrooms FY2024 | 5,615,000 | 5,615,000 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 723,000 |
| Total: Systemic | 83,477,203 | 95,705,778 | 12,228,575 | 32,215,369 | 10,914,588 |
| Total Expense = | 484,875,441 | 837,345,233 | 220,187,506 | 156,441,685 | 73,259,942 |
| Funding | | | | | |
| General Fund General Fund Bonds & Capital Leases Recordation Tax & Bonds Impact Fees & Bonds School Mitigation Fee Grants | 27,846,745 73,021,559 35,740,437 72,139,232 6,349,439 161,104,595 | 32,838,885 168,320,553 60,614,818 98,334,698 23,419,363 239,098,751 | 4,992,140 50,290,018 19,874,381 26,195,466 17,069,924 77,994,156 | 3,290,695 19,399,476 19,140,000 25,900,466 1,349,439 86,104,595 | 4,015,323 17,195,975 4,000,000 9,367,067 0 15,000,000 |
| Other | 108,673,434 | 214,718,165 | 23,771,421 | 1,257,014 | 23,681,577 |
| Total Funding Sources | 484,875,441 | 837,345,233 | 220,187,506 | 156,441,685 | 73,259,942 |

FY2024 - 2029 Proposed Capital Improvement Program Board of Education

| Project | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | Costs After |
|---|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| New/Modernizations | | | | | |
| Urbana ES: Replacement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northern Frederick City area ES New (Yellow Springs ES) | 2,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown Co-located ES/MS replacement | 61,569,971 | 13,150,212 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Liberty ES: Replacement | 30,615,921 | 2,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blue Heron ES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brunswick ES: Replacement/Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rock Creek School: Replacement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown HS: Replacement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,058,000 | 130,282,286 |
| Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Crestwood MS: Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eastern Frederick ES | 16,226,330 | 29,889,917 | 2,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Green Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Frederick area elementary school | 0 | 0 | 16,776,330 | 29,339,887 | 2,000,000 |
| Walkersville MS: Modernization Study | 0 | 200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FCPS Bus Facility | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total: New/Modernizations | 111,912,222 | 46,740,129 | 18,776,330 | 37,397,887 | 132,282,286 |
| Systemic | | | | | |
| Systemics - Generic | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 0 |
| Limited Renovations Systemic | 3,250,000 | 6,500,000 | 6,750,000 | 6,750,000 | 0 |
| Monocacy ES Limited Renovations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spring Ridge ES Limited Renovations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ballenger Creek ES Limited Renovations | 3,205,246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Buses-Capacity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portable Classrooms FY2024 | 723,000 | 723,000 | 723,000 | 723,000 | 0 |
| Total: Systemic | 9,678,246 | 9,723,000 | 10,473,000 | 10,473,000 | 0 |
| Total Expense | 121,590,468 | 56,463,129 | 29,249,330 | 47,870,887 | 132,282,286 |
| T. II | | | | | |
| Funding | 15 445 165 | 1 164 520 | 064.500 | 064.530 | • |
| General Fund | 17,447,167 | 1,164,520 | 964,520 | 964,520 | 0 |
| General Fund Bonds & Capital Leases | 13,972,244 | 12,991,604 | 3,495,980 | 5,966,280 | 45,008,976 |
| Recordation Tax & Bonds | 5,000,000 | 6,600,437 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Impact Fees & Bonds | 13,015,650 | 8,579,706 | 6,656,253 | 8,620,090 | 0 |
| School Mitigation Fee | 0 | 15,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 0 |
| Grants | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 0 |
| Other | 57,155,407 | 12,126,862 | 1,132,577 | 13,319,997 | 82,273,310 |
| Total Funding Sources | 121,590,468 | 56,463,129 | 29,249,330 | 47,870,887 | 132,282,286 |

FY2023 - 2028 Adopted Capital Improvement Program Board of Education

| Project | 6-year | Total Project | Prior | 2023 | 2024 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| New/Modernizations | | | | | |
| Waverley ES: Replacement/Addition | 0 | 52,461,859 | 52,461,859 | 0 | 0 |
| Northern Frederick City Area ES: New | 47,134,279 | 47,134,279 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown Campus Placeholder | 5,744,500 | 58,650,037 | 0 | 400,000 | 0 |
| Liberty ES: Replacement | 48,257,826 | 48,336,326 | 78,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Blue Heron ES | 0 | 43,726,924 | 43,726,924 | 0 | 0 |
| Brunswick ES: Replacement/Addition | 28,972,832 | 47,247,917 | 18,275,085 | 27,072,832 | 1,900,000 |
| Rock Creek School: Replacement | 0 | 50,151,186 | 50,151,186 | 0 | 0 |
| Green Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 49,484,533 | 49,634,723 | 150,190 | 6,777,590 | 42,706,943 |
| Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 47,216,131 | 50,148,273 | 2,932,142 | 4,214,312 | 43,001,819 |
| Crestwood MS: Addition | 11,848,191 | 11,848,191 | 0 | 727,000 | 11,121,191 |
| Eastern Frederick ES | 52,287,214 | 52,287,214 | 0 | 3,000,000 | 16,028,657 |
| Yellow Spring ES feasibility study | 200,000 | 200,000 | 0 | 200,000 | 0 |
| Land Acquisition Bus Depot | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 0 | 2,500,000 | 0 |
| Total: New/Modernizations | 293,645,506 | 514,326,929 | 167,775,886 | 44,891,734 | 114,758,610 |
| Systemic | | | | | |
| Systemics - Generic | 12,015,000 | 12,515,000 | 500,000 | 5,190,000 | 1,365,000 |
| Limited Renovations Systemic | 30,700,976 | 30,828,941 | 127,965 | 0 | 9,000,000 |
| Thurmont ES Limited Renovations | 2,823,132 | 10,678,167 | 7,855,035 | 2,823,132 | 0 |
| Monocacy ES Limited Renovations | 14,162,360 | 14,162,360 | 0 | 10,416,360 | 3,746,000 |
| New Buses-Capacity | 460,000 | 736,000 | 276,000 | 460,000 | 0 |
| Portable Classrooms FY2023 | 4,560,000 | 4,560,000 | 0 | 1,200,000 | 672,000 |
| Total: Systemic | 64,721,468 | 73,480,468 | 8,759,000 | 20,089,492 | 14,783,000 |
| Total Expense | 358,366,974 | 587,807,397 | 176,534,886 | 64,981,226 | 129,541,610 |
| | | | | | |
| Funding | | | | | |
| General Fund | 6,581,350 | 12,927,598 | 1,346,248 | 1,875,000 | 1,138,620 |
| General Fund Bonds & Capital Leases | 85,161,453 | 124,358,734 | 22,383,916 | 21,234,380 | 11,590,868 |
| Recordation Tax & Bonds | 31,700,437 | 59,352,367 | 24,651,930 | 2,000,000 | 15,900,000 |
| Impact Fees & Bonds | 74,014,799 | 103,684,883 | 29,670,084 | 8,170,987 | 34,903,470 |
| School Mitigation Fee | (1,000,000) | 15,729,424 | 16,729,424 | (3,000,000) | 2,000,000 |
| Grants | 177,583,859 | 208,700,775 | 31,116,916 | 55,226,485 | 62,357,374 |
| Other | (15,674,924) | 63,053,616 | 50,636,368 | (20,525,626) | 1,651,278 |
| Total Funding Sources | 358,366,974 | 587,807,397 | 176,534,886 | 64,981,226 | 129,541,610 |

FY2023 - 2028 Adopted Capital Improvement Program Board of Education - Continued

| Project | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Costs After |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| New/Modernizations | | | | | |
| Waverley ES: Replacement/Addition Northern Frederick City Area ES: New Middletown Campus Placeholder | 0 0 0 | 0 3,593,460 0 | 7,000,000 0 | 0 36,540,819 5,344,500 | 0 0 52,905,537 |
| Liberty ES: Replacement | 4,841,000 | 7,000,000 | 36,416,826 | 0 | 0 |
| Blue Heron ES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brunswick ES: Replacement/Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rock Creek School: Replacement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Green Valley ES Replacement/Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Valley ES Replacement/Addition Crestwood MS: Addition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eastern Frederick ES | 31,358,557 | 1,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yellow Spring ES feasibility study | 0 | 1,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Land Acquisition Bus Depot | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total: New/Modernizations | 36,199,557 | 12,493,460 | 43,416,826 | 41,885,319 | 52,905,537 |
| Systemic | | | | | |
| Systemics - Generic Limited Renovations Systemic Thurmont ES Limited Renovations | 1,365,000 5,430,483 0 | 1,365,000 6,240,573 0 | 1,365,000 5,014,960 0 | 1,365,000 5,014,960 0 | 0 0 0 |
| Monocacy ES Limited Renovations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Buses-Capacity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portable Classrooms FY2023 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 0 |
| Total: Systemic | 7,467,483 | 8,277,573 | 7,051,960 | 7,051,960 | 0 |
| Total Expense | 43,667,040 | 20,771,033 | 50,468,786 | 48,937,279 | 52,905,537 |
| Funding | | | | | |
| General Fund | 866,920 | 900,270 | 900,270 | 900,270 | 5,000,000 |
| General Fund Bonds & Capital Leases | 8,056,113 | 7,527,040 | 21,424,147 | 15,328,905 | 16,813,365 |
| Recordation Tax & Bonds | 5,800,437 | 1,500,000 | 4,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Impact Fees & Bonds | 15,040,342 | 3,400,000 | 1,500,000 | 11,000,000 | 0 |
| School Mitigation Fee | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grants | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 0 |
| Other | (1,096,772) | (7,556,277) | 7,644,369 | 4,208,104 | 28,092,172 |
| Total Funding Sources | 43,667,040 | 20,771,033 | 50,468,786 | 48,937,279 | 52,905,537 |



APPENDIX C: PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR THE EFMP AND FY2024 CAPITAL BUDGET

Source: Frederick County Public Schools, May 2023

C

RECOMMENDED CALENDAR for the EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES MASTER PLAN and the FY 2025 CAPITAL BUDGET

| June 2023 | Superintendent's Recommended Educational Facilities Master Plan presented to the Board of Education |
|------------------------------|---|
| June 2023 | Board of Education accepts public comment and takes action to adopt the Educational Facilities Master Plan and confirm FY25 priorities |
| October 2023 | Board of Education FY 2025-2030 requests for state funded projects due to the Interagency Commission (IAC) on School Construction. County Executive communicates support to IAC |
| October 2023 | FY 2025-2030 CIP requests due to county staff |
| October and November 2023 | IAC staff review of requests for state funded projects |
| December 2023 | IAC preliminary approval of school construction allocation |
| January and February 2024 | County staff workshops on CIP requests |
| April 2024 | County Executive proposed FY 2025-2030 CIP issued |
| May 2024 | County Council's public hearings on County Executive proposed FY 2025 Capital Budget and FY 2025-2030 CIP |
| June 2024 | IAC final approval of school construction allocation |
| June 2024 | County adopts FY 2025 Capital Budget and FY 2025-2030 CIP |



APPENDIX D: FREDERICK COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM POLICIES

Source: Frederick County Budget Office, September 2022

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM POLICIES

The Frederick County, Maryland Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a schedule of public improvement projects planned by the County Government to occur over a six-year period and includes project descriptions, estimated costs and sources of funding. The Capital Budget is the first year of the CIP and includes those projects for which funds have been appropriated. The following CIP policies are intended to guide funding decisions during the CIP review process:

- 1. The County will prepare and adopt a six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP), update it annually, and make all capital improvements in accordance with the Capital Budget.
- 2. The County will attempt to budget pay-go funding for capital improvements at an amount equal to 7% of General Fund operating revenues. All pay-go sources will be considered in total in reaching this goal except for direct third party donations or grants. Other capital funding will be obtained by general obligation bonds/leases state and federal grants, enterprise fund resources and other sources.
- 3. The Budget Office will annually review the County's debt affordability standards, update the study to keep within the Fixed Cost Policy, and compare to the County's peer group. The results will be submitted to the County Executive for review.
- 4. It shall be the goal of each six-year CIP to provide sufficient funding to achieve a County-wide school capacity equal to 90% of the state-rated school capacity based on six-year projected enrollments system-wide.
- 5. The County will attempt to utilize funds collected through the school construction fee option (§ 1-20-62 of the Frederick County Code) for school improvements within the feeder pattern where the fee was collected.
- 6. A capital project in the CIP shall have the following characteristics:
 - a. The project will add to the government's public infrastructure OR

The project will result in a major repair of a fixed asset that significantly adds to or preserves the life of the original asset

OR

The project will establish or enhance internal computer/program systems. This excludes routine expenses such as maintenance, license renewals, etc.

OR

The project will meet long-term regulatory requirements

- b. The project will have an estimated individual project cost totaling \$100,000 or more. Projects of less than \$100,000 will only be permitted when required for State or Federal funding. Multiple projects in a single category, that total \$100,000 or more will also be considered if they meet all other characteristics.
- c. Acquisition of land for future projects (land banking) will be eligible when it has been identified as a need in the six-year CIP, in the Livable Frederick Master Plan or associated planning documents, or when it can be shown as necessary in the implementation of community and corridor plans or other County policies.
- d. Municipal projects will be considered if the project is not exclusively for municipal residents or if the project is a cooperative effort by municipal, county and/or state agencies.
- 7. Eligible capital costs will include Land Acquisition, Real Estate, Site Improvements, Planning, Design, Construction, Inspection/Overhead, Technology Equipment/Infrastructure, Capital and Non-Capital Equipment/Vehicles (related to start-up costs or comprehensive replacement plan), and Project Management.
- 8. All capital costs listed in the CIP will be in current dollars and updated annually when submitted for inclusion in the CIP. Any change in project costs from the previously approved CIP must be justified in writing and include a new project summary form along with the reasons for the change in the project cost.
- 9. Construction of a project must be forecast within two years of completion of design work before funding for design will be approved, unless the nature of the project warrants otherwise. Some examples are large purchases of land easements and state concurrence on project documents.
- 10. A project's construction bid process must be anticipated to begin in the upcoming fiscal year for it to be funded in the Capital Budget.
- 11. When construction funds are approved and construction is not undertaken within two years, the project will be evaluated for possible dis-appropriation in the Capital Budget and re-appropriation in the revised construction year. Under §512 of the County Charter, a capital project is considered abandoned if 3 fiscal years elapse without any expenditure from or encumbrance of the appropriation.
- 12. All capital projects will be reviewed and approved in accordance with Annotated Code of Maryland Land Use Article § 3-205 regarding consistency with the Livable Frederick Master Plan and associated implementation documents. The Livable Frederick Technical Committee may be consulted to provide input regarding consistency determinations. The Planning Commission will vote on the consistency based on the County Executive's proposed budget.

- 13. A Capital Improvements Program Committee shall be established and managed by the Budget Office. At a minimum a representative from the Budget Office, Finance Division, Planning and Permitting Division, and the County Executive's Office shall serve on the committee.
- 14. The Capital Improvements Program Committee will evaluate the merits of each requested project and recommend to the County Executive projects for inclusion in the County Executive Proposed Budget based on the following criteria:
 - a. The project supports the "Development Framework" of the Livable Frederick Master Plan by directing capital investments to designated growth areas.
 - b. The project implements a component of an approved Community, Corridor, Large Area or Functional Plan, or an approved facility or master plan.
 - c. The project is consistent with and timed with other capital projects.
 - d. The project does not duplicate service areas of other public facilities or services.
 - e. The project will be implemented in a timely manner.
 - f. The project reduces the cost of operations or energy consumption whenever possible.
 - g. The project provides for the health, safety, and welfare of the community.
 - h. The project meets regulatory requirements.
- 15. Projects scheduled in previously approved CIP's should be considered when establishing priorities for future CIP programs.
- 16. Every project will have a designated division or agency responsible for the execution and management of the project. For projects funded under the categories of Community College, Board of Education, and Municipalities those respective organizations will be responsible for the execution and management of their projects.
- 17. Following adoption of the CIP a project may be split into "sub-projects" for tracking and accounting purposes. However, the adopted project will retain the definition of a "project" as it relates to County policies, the County Code, and the County Charter.
- 18. Following completion of a project, any and all remaining surplus of County capital funds will revert to an unallocated account until reallocated through the Annual Budget process or through an amendment to the Capital Budget as provided in §513 of the County Charter.

D

- 19. The County will attempt to match timing of bond issues with construction needs. Use of General Fund surplus to forward fund projects will be minimized to the extent possible. The feasibility of establishing lines-of-credit and other short-term borrowings will be investigated to control cash flow requirements in accordance with existing policies, procedures and legislation.
- 20. Any new capital project proposed outside of the annual CIP process may only be considered as an amendment to the capital budget, must comply with §513 of the County Charter, and must adhere to the characteristics of a capital project as stated in policy #6 and #7.



APPENDIX E: STATE IAC FUNDING PRIORITIES

Source: Maryland Interagency Committee on School Construction, Administrative Procedures Guide, September 27, 2013, Amended August 20, 2020

Amended August 20, 2020

- (2) Amendments must follow the same procedural steps as the original requests. The appropriate forms must be completed showing the amendments and must be clearly marked as amendments. All forms affected by the amendment must be revised, including Form 102.4.
- (3) If amendments change the priority order of projects, submit the projects in new priority order, and change the Table of Contents and Form 102.4 appropriately.
- b. All amendments must be approved by the local board of education. A cover letter signed by the superintendent indicating local board approval is sufficient.
- c. The letter of support from the local government (see Section 102.1.B.6) must address all amended as well as unchanged project requests.
- d. Late submission of extensive amendments to the scope or priority of projects, or inclusion of new projects, may jeopardize the inclusion of these projects in the recommendations that the PSCP staff will make to the IAC in early December for January approval by the BPW.
- 2. Amendments to an Approved Capital Improvement Program
 - a. Amendments to an approved CIP may be requested at any time.
 - b. The LEA should prepare the appropriate Forms 102.1, 102.2, and 102.4, and submit them along with appropriate justification and back-up information.
 - (1) Forms shall be clearly marked "Amendment," dated, and must be approved in writing by the board of education and the local government.
 - (2) After review, the LEA will be informed of IAC staff recommendations and IAC and BPW action. Opportunities for LEA appeal before the IAC and the BPW are the same as for the normal CIP approval process.

102.5 EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECT REQUESTS

A. General

- 1. Projects will generally be evaluated on the basis of past and projected enrollments, not only at the school in question, but at adjacent or nearby schools, and on consistency with the EFMP.
 - a. Projects for additional capacity may not be recommended for planning approval or funding where adequate capacity is available at adjacent schools. See Section 102.4.B.2. and 102.4.B.4.b.
 - b. In most cases, enrollment projections of the subject and adjacent schools must show that the school will be at least 50% occupied at the completion of the project and will be fully utilized within seven years of the date of project submission.

2. Priority Order.

a. Although the LEA establishes priorities for its local capital program, the evaluation of these priorities with respect to other projects in the State and the limited State funds available is a function of the IAC and the BPW.

Amended August 20, 2020

- b. Generally, the IAC will follow the local priority order to the extent that projects are eligible and funds are anticipated to be available. Exceptions may be made:
 - (1) To approve projects that address State statutory mandates (e.g. full day kindergarten or prekindergarten for economically disadvantaged children) or State initiatives (e.g. high school science classroom renovations).
 - (2) At the request of the local Board, with concurrence by the local government.
- c. Projects may be recommended for deferral or modification so that the most critically needed projects in the subdivision or in other subdivisions may proceed.
- d. The IAC may also place a higher priority on projects that respond to State mandates or initiatives.

B. Procedure

- 1. Projects will be evaluated and assigned a project status code of "A," "B," "C," or "D." Project approval status is determined and assigned to a project based upon an evaluation of project merit and a number of technical factors specific to the project type, as follows:
 - a. "A" Approved for planning or construction funding. All PSCP and LEA staff questions, problems, or comments are currently resolved; the project is approved; and project development should proceed. (Note: Projects will be shown as "A" in CIP documents submitted to the BPW following IAC approval, pending approval by the BPW.)
 - b. "B" Deferred but eligible for planning or construction funding. All PSCP and LEA staff questions, problems, or comments are resolved; the project is eligible for funding but is deferred due to fiscal constraints.
 - c. "C" Deferred based on issues yet to be resolved. The project as currently proposed or as it currently stands in the planning process is not eligible for approval until outstanding technical questions or problems have been resolved. Problem areas differ for different types of projects, and may include but are not necessarily limited to: site approval, capacity/enrollment, scope, estimated cost, availability of local funds, alternative solutions available, master plan inconsistency, other agency approvals, and progress of educational specifications or design documents,.
 - d. "D" Denied: Ineligible project. The Project does not meet PSCP funding guidelines and is therefore ineligible for State approval of planning or funding. Typical causes for denial include but are not limited to:
 - (1) Systemic Renovation project has a total construction value less than the required minimum;
 - (2) Project type does not correspond to a CIP category (Section 102.1.C). The project may be eligible through another State funding program.
 - (3) School was renovated or system was installed too recently (Section 102.1.C.1)
- All projects will be reviewed periodically prior to mid-April based on the stated criteria in order to be considered for planning approval or funding in the next fiscal year. New information submitted by the LEA may be considered for reclassification of project approval status. LEAs will be regularly notified of project status and outstanding issues of concern through formal and informal communications.

Amended August 20, 2020

- All requests will be reviewed for consistency with existing State and local priorities, rules, regulations, procedures, and laws that are applicable to State funded public school construction projects.
- C. State Prioritization Methodology for Planning Requests
 - 1. Steps in the Planning Prioritization Process
 - a. For each submitted CIP project that is eligible for planning approval (Project Status Code B, see above Section 102.5.B.1), a numerical score will be calculated based on the factors in 2. below, and the criteria factors that involve judgment outlined in 3. below will also be reviewed.
 - b. The points are intended to provide guidance to the staff of the Program in developing recommendations for consideration by the IAC. Other factors, including the judgment factors cited below as well as knowledge of each school system's needs and priorities, will influence the recommendations.
 - c. For each LEA that submits a request for planning, the eligible project that has the highest local priority will be assessed in order to ensure that each LEA that makes a request for planning approval receives consideration for at least one project.
 - d. The prioritized list that results from Step (3) will be continually revised until early April to incorporate new project information received during the CIP process as well as new estimates of total project funding.
 - 2. Quantifiable Planning Criteria (each factor has a range of 1 to 5 (low to high))
 - a. State Educational Priority. Reflects scope of the project in terms of minor or major impact on educational programs and numbers of students, and whether the project addresses State educational mandates or initiatives, such as full day kindergarten, pre-kindergarten for economically disadvantaged children, or high school science.
 - b. Enrollment Priority. This factor measures the degree of overcrowding at a proposed school and its adjacent schools.
 - (1) For a renovation or addition project, the projected enrollment of the school for the seventh school year following the year of submission is divided by the current State Rated Capacity (SRC) to arrive at a decimal figure.
 - (2) For new schools, the aggregate projected enrollment of the adjacent schools for the seventh school year as shown in Form 102.2 is divided by their respective SRCs.
 - (3) The highest points go to the 20% of projects that have the greatest impacts, with lower point values awarded similarly by quintiles.
 - c. State Planning Goals. Reflects the impact that the proposed project will have on statewide planning goals to foster communities and mitigate sprawl. The possible points are awarded for school location as follows:

5 points: Community location (within Designated Neighborhoods or within corporate limits).

- 4 points: Certified Priority Funding Area adjacent to residential development.
- 3 points: Certified Priority Funding Area not adjacent to residential development.
- 2 points: County Growth Area with water and sewer planned.
- 1 point: Rural Area

Amended August 20, 2020

- d. Average Age of Building Area This factor gives priority to older buildings. In order to determine the average age of the square footage for each building, the date of each addition and renovation is listed with its respective square footage. To determine the average of square footage:
 - (1) The proportion of area built or renovated in each year, based on the total square footage, is calculated.
 - (2) The age of each area of the building is multiplied by the proportion of total area it represents; the sum of these calculations is the average age of the building.
- e. Special Populations Beyond a certain threshold for each category of student, this factor reflects the percentage of students at the school who are receiving special education services outside the regular classroom, are eligible for free and reduced price meals (FRPM), and/or are English language learners reported as Limited English Proficient (LEP). The respective thresholds are:
 - (1) Greater than 10% of students receive special education services outside of the regular classroom more than 60% of the time;
 - (2) Greater than 40% of students receive FRPM; and/or
 - (3) Greater than 10% of students are LEP.
- f. Other factors determined by the IAC, e.g.: One additional point for capacity projects that remove adequate public facility ordinance closure of housing in designated growth areas.
- 3. Planning Factors That Entail Judgment.
 - a. LEA's Backlog of Previously Approved Projects. If an LEA has a large backlog of projects to which the State has committed funds, additional projects will generally not be added to the list. If, however, the LEA is able to carry projects in the backlog to construction without immediate reimbursement from the State, planning approval for pressing new projects may be considered. Planning approval may also be considered to ensure that all LEAs that need them have future projects at some stage of development.
 - b. Local Capacity to Proceed with the Project. Some LEAs and local governments may have the capacity to proceed with the design of a project even if they do not receive State planning approval; others may require the commitment of funding implicit in State planning approval before they will proceed.
 - c. Total Cost of the Project, and When State Funds Will Be Required. A very large project, although it has a high priority, may block several other projects of lower priority; in this case, the State may, in consultation with the LEA, consider by passing the higher priority project. On the other hand, it may be that the costly project will extend over several years, and the impact on State funds will be relatively small in any one funding year.
 - d. Eligibility for State Reimbursement Using Bond Proceeds. For a locally funded project that is submitted for both planning and funding approval, if a project schedule indicates that delayed approval will require the use of State Pay-go funds rather than bond proceeds for reimbursement, the project may receive higher consideration. However, a locally funded project that has been completed and is only eligible for reimbursement with State Pay-go funds will generally receive lower consideration, based on an assessment of Pay-go fund availability.

Amended August 20, 2020

- e. Impact on Local Growth Outside of Priority Funding Areas. A capacity project in a countydesignated growth area that is currently closed because of a local Adequate Public Facility Ordinance restriction may receive higher consideration.
- f. Other. Other factors will be considered that may be specific to a school system or to a particular school project. These may include the impact that the proposed school project will have on the fiscal viability of the school district; the effect of the project on significant student behavior and/or achievement issues; the requirements of rural schools; and schools where a safety issue is present.

2.6 STATE MAXIMUM CONSTRUCTION ALLOCATION

Maximum Gross Area Allowance

1. General

- a. The Maximum Gross Area Allowance is the size of the facility that, in the judgment of the IAC, can reasonably accommodate the number of students and the educational program.
- b. The Maximum Gross Area Allowance is the product of the approved student enrollment and the maximum gross area allowance per student.
 - (1) The maximum gross area allowance per student is set by the Board of Public works upon recommendation of the IAC.
 - (2) The PSCP will periodically review the allocation of area per student for different grade levels and for different educational programs and may recommend changes to the IAC. The review will be based on current educational practice.
 - (3) See Appendix 102-B for:
 - i. Currently approved gross area allowance per student.
 - ii. Gross area allowance for specific program elements.
- c. The maximum gross area allowance is the limit for State participation in a project. Costs of that part of a project which exceeds the maximum gross area allowance will be a local responsibility.
- d. The maximum gross area allowance shall not be considered a minimum State space design standard. An LEA may build a school to a size larger or smaller than that determined through the calculation of the Maximum Gross Area Allowance.
 - (1) If the project area is larger than the Maximum Gross Area Allowance, the excess area is ineligible for State participation.
 - (2) If the project area is smaller than the Maximum Gross Area Allowance, the State participation will be based on the actual size of the project.
- e. In some circumstances, the IAC may approve a Maximum Gross Area Allowance in excess of that derived from the Capacity and Space Formula. Examples include but are not limited to:
 - (1) Additions for programmatic purposes that result in a building that is larger than the