



MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES PLANNERS COUNCIL

**September 11, 2026
MEETING MINUTES**

Attendees at Anne Arundel CC

Name	College / Agency
Christopher Boswell	Howard Community College
Karen Place	Fredrick Community College
Clarence Bryant	Prince Georges Community College
Joshua Gates	Community College of Baltimore County
Miriam Collins	Chesapeake Community College
Greg Grey	Wor-Wic Community College
Yuling Mei	Montgomery Community College
Jim Taylor	Anne Arundel Community College
Leah Hall	Anne Arundel Community College
Allie Montgomery	College of Southern Maryland
Laura Dyson	College of Southern Maryland
Iman Shaker	DGS

Name	College / Agency
Brad Phillips	MACC
Dan Schuster	MHEC

Officer Reports

- ❖ Chair – Yuling Mei
- ❖ Vice Chair - Chris Painter (was not in attendance)
- ❖ Secretary – Christopher Boswell
 - Technical issues preceding meeting have been addressed.
- ❖ Communications Coordinator – Travis Hopkins (was not in attendance)

- ❖ Best Practice Coordinator – John Anzinger (was not in attendance)

Agency Reports

- ❖ DGS- Iman Shaker:

DGS provided updates on current program reviews.

- FY27 Programs: Montgomery #494 – Rockville Theater Arts Renovation/Addition is nearing completion of review.
- FY28 Programs: Four projects are in the review queue: Howard CC Outdoor Sports Complex, WWCC Student Success and Wellness Center, Harford CC Regional Workforce Development Center, CSM La Plata CC/BK Renovations
- Additional Reviews: WWCC #491 – Maintenance Building Renovation (DDs and 50% CDs), Montgomery #484 – Germantown New Student Services Center (A/E and pre-construction contract awards)
- DGS reminded colleges to use the updated submission forms distributed on 3/31/2026 and to submit CPEs once the local share is met, with quarterly submissions thereafter.

- ❖ DBM Presented by Dan Schuster:

- DBM provided updates on analyst assignments following a recent retirement. Daniela will reach out to colleges in the coming weeks to introduce herself.
- Capital Budget Process: DBM is reviewing FY28 capital budget requests and has sent technical questions to all colleges. Colleges were asked to prioritize responses.
- Budget Meeting Questions: DBM will send capital-budget-meeting questions approximately one week before the September 25 virtual capital budget meeting; these are separate from the technical questions already issued.

- Scheduling: Colleges may request preferred time slots for the 9/25 meeting by emailing David and Daniela (cc Dan). DBM will accommodate when possible.

❖ **MHEC- Dan Schuster**

- FY28 capital budget process continues; DBM hearing scheduled for September 25.
The Governor's FY28 capital budget will be released no later than January 23, 2027, with General Assembly hearings in early March.
- FY28 FRG submissions were due September 1. All colleges submitted updated deferred-maintenance master lists, which MHEC is finalizing. Colleges with outstanding questions should send them to Dawn as soon as possible.
- The deferred-maintenance master list is used to justify FY28 FRG allocations and may support future expansion of the program.
- FY29 Part I/II questions were sent in June; response deadlines vary by project (September 30 or October 30).
- Cashflow reports for Q1 FY27 are due October 31.
- MHEC must submit a report to legislative committees on unspent CCCGP funds by January 1. Any funds not spent by December 1 will be counted as unspent. Colleges are encouraged to submit CPEs and closeouts before late November to reduce unspent balances.
- MHEC and DBM will work with MACC to review how CCCGP funds are awarded across colleges to improve transparency and identify priorities earlier in the process.
- The CCCGP prioritization model will be sent to presidents for review and approval.

❖ **Review of FPC FY27 Goals**

- Goal 1: Continue to exchange ideas on an ongoing basis and increase roundtable discussions on topics related to college facilities procedures.

- Goal 2: Develop procedures to constantly update FPC site, ensuring the content of the site matches with its purpose, and reflects the work of the council.
- Goal 3: Continue to request MACC input. Request MACC presence at meetings, Virtual options available for all state agencies.
- Goal 4: Encourage increase in FPC member participation.

❖ FRG Presentation – Brad Phillips

- FRG in its current form has technical problems. It tops out at \$500,000 for each institution and even if MACC can acquire more than the \$80M currently allotted for CIP, no more than \$4M can be awarded amongst 8 of the 16 Maryland Community Colleges per year. Funding history shows that each year varying amounts are awarded for FRG. For example, some years the full \$80M allocation is awarded while other years only \$60M is awarded. This creates inequities in how much funding for FRG each college is given when the total amount for FRG is in flux from year to year.
- MACC has attempted to address this issue by examining how CIP is funded. They proposed that any portion of the Community College Capital Construction Grant Program that does not reach the full \$80M CIP allocation should revert to the Facilities Renewal Grant program, allowing FRG funds to be distributed to all 16 community colleges each year. However, the governor was hesitant to redirect remaining CCCCGP funds to deferred maintenance projects, and the bill was ultimately pulled to avoid a potential fiscal deficit. Although the bill was withdrawn, Senator King committed to working on the legislation over the summer. She later lost her primary, which presents challenges moving forward, but she did follow through on her commitment and met with MACC to discuss the issue and clarify MACC's goals for the FRG legislation. During this meeting, MACC outlined the needs and inequities associated with FRG funding, and the administration requested a statewide backlog of deferred maintenance projects for community colleges.

- Monica from MACC is compiling this list of deferred maintenance needs across all community colleges. The intent is to demonstrate the scale of the backlog and support restructuring the FRG legislation. This includes documenting the backlog itself and how counties support deferred maintenance, which varies significantly or may be self-funded by institutions. Please complete the survey to help provide this information.
- Dan noted that each year MHEC requests updated project lists from the community colleges, which are then sent to DBM to determine whether any unspent funds can be applied to those projects. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that all projects are included when developing these lists.
- Brad emphasized that accurately capturing the needs of each institution is critical when reporting data, because it demonstrates to the state the scale of deferred maintenance and capital needs across the community colleges. Clear and comprehensive reporting strengthens MACC's ability to advocate for funding and supports the case for restructuring FRG.
- Jim Taylor noted inconsistencies in the information requested by MACC and MHEC. MACC generally asks for broad project information, primarily focused on overall project cost, while MHEC requests projects within a defined range of \$25K to \$1M. To meet MHEC's minimum threshold, Jim often combines smaller items with similar scopes from the facilities conditions assessment, particularly those under \$25K, to create bundled projects that fall within MHEC's required range.
- Dan explained that MHEC requests projects within the \$25K–\$1M range because FRG awards are statutorily capped at \$500K per project. For projects that exceed \$1M, institutions would receive only \$500K through FRG, making it more advantageous to pursue funding as a capital project, which can receive significantly higher levels of state support through the CIP process. When projects submitted to MHEC exceed \$1M, they will often suggest phasing the work so that portions of the project fall within the FRG range and can be funded accordingly.

- Jim noted challenges with using the facilities conditions assessment list, which is often developed by a consultant who is instructed to document every deficiency. In some cases, the institution already has a capital project planned for a building that includes items appearing on the FCA list. In those situations, the institution will maintain the listed item until it can be addressed as part of the larger renovation. Smaller items with similar scopes are often combined and removed from the deferred maintenance list so they can be incorporated into a capital project instead.
- Dan suggested keeping those items on the deferred maintenance list until they have been fully developed into a capital project. Until a project is formally developed, there is no certainty that it will be funded.
- Jim noted that MACC and MHEC request different levels of detail, which can create confusion. While MHEC requires more specific information for projects, Monica's request from MACC is broader and simply asks institutions to submit all deferred maintenance items. This makes it challenging to reconcile the two approaches when preparing project lists.
- Ling Mei agreed with Jim's point, noting that because MHEC funds projects only within the \$25K–\$1M range, the list submitted to MHEC is curated specifically to meet those requirements and does not fully represent the institution's overall needs. She gave the example of MC's Rockville campus, which was built all at once in the 1970s, making campus-wide infrastructure issues, such as replacing aging pipes across the entire campus, far more extensive and costly than what fits within the FRG range, often exceeding \$1M.
- Dan explained that even if changes are made to FRG, large-scale projects like the ones discussed are unlikely to be funded through this program. FRG is not intended to support major capital projects because a separate program already exists for that purpose. He noted that colleges are funded through tuition, a sponsoring authority, and the state, and regardless of whether a match is required, FRG cannot fully fund projects of this magnitude, though it may be able to support a portion of the work.

- Brad emphasized that the advantage of Facilities Renewal Grant funding is that it does not need to go through the capital construction grant program. FRG gives institutions the ability to address priority campus needs more quickly and provides a more immediate avenue for obtaining funding for smaller-scale renewal projects.
- Jim noted that facilities condition assessments generate extensive lists of prioritized projects, including items that may not require attention for several years. He explained that while FCAs categorize needs by urgency, institutions do not address items solely because they appear on the list. As a result, FCA lists often include long-term needs that remain deferred until they align with capital planning, funding availability, or broader renovation strategies.
- Dan noted that only deferred maintenance should be included, meaning the list should capture items from the present date backward. He explained that if equipment is scheduled for replacement at a future date, it may appear on the list as an upcoming-need, but once that date passes, the item should be added to the deferred maintenance list.
- Jim noted that it would be highly beneficial for MACC and MHEC to clearly define what qualifies as deferred maintenance, as consistent definitions would help institutions prepare project lists more accurately and reduce confusion across reporting requirements.
- Brad emphasized that while FRG funding is helpful, it is not sufficient to meet the tremendous needs across the colleges. The advantage of FRG is that it bypasses the capital construction grant process and allows institutions to address priority items more quickly, but only eight colleges receive funding each year, which limits equity across the system. He noted that MACC's goal is to use the collected data to demonstrate the scale of statewide needs and inform what future legislation should look like. Brad added that MACC has explored creative approaches in the past, including identifying funding that is already appropriated but not fully utilized, such as portions of the \$80M CIP allocation that may remain unspent, to determine whether

those funds could be redirected to support deferred maintenance. This concept was examined during last year's legislation's fact-finding.

- Dan noted that DBM repurposes any unused CIP funds for other needs within the state. He explained that DBM is constantly looking for available funding, which is why they are hesitant about mandates from the Governor's Office that restrict how funds must be used. If a capital project does not require its full allocation, DBM can redirect the remaining funds to support another project that may have exceeded its budget.
- Brad stated that MACC would like to see the Facilities Renewal Grant program expanded by increasing the current 5% allocation of the Capital Construction Program to 10%. Under this model, FRG funds would be distributed evenly to all 16 community colleges, allowing each institution to apply its share toward as few or as many renewal projects as the funding could support.
- Dan noted that distributing FRG funds evenly across all community colleges may not be equitable, as institutions have different levels of need. While he agreed that every college should receive some funding each year, he emphasized that colleges with larger or more complex campuses may require a greater share of the resources to maintain their facilities appropriately.
- Jim agreed, noting that institutions with older campuses face significantly different maintenance demands than those with newer or recently renovated facilities. He added that there is currently no standardized approach to how FCAs are conducted across colleges, which leads to inconsistent data. Jim explained that cost estimates provided through some FCA processes can be significantly lower than actual project costs, resulting in inaccurate numbers being reported to the state.
- Clarence Bryant noted that consultants have been valuable in providing PGCC with practical tools. He explained that during a previous master planning effort, the consultant supplied a spreadsheet that allowed PGCC to adjust projected costs annually based on economic factors. He added that most consultants now provide only reports, rather than tools that support ongoing cost updates.

- Jim cited an example at AACC where the college planned to replace four AHUs on the Arundel Mills building. Although replacing all units at once would have been more efficient and cost-effective, the college could not secure enough funding to do so. He noted that the FCA list estimated each unit at approximately \$200K, but actual bids came in at \$530K per unit, highlighting the significant discrepancies between FCA estimates and real project costs. Jim added that the planning timeline also presents challenges, as the time required to move a project from concept to completion makes the timing of funding awards critical. Receiving FRG funding only every other year complicates this process, since it is often more cost-effective to combine related projects and complete them at once.
- Brad cautioned that striving for a perfect bill may ultimately hinder progress, given the General Assembly's limited appetite for complex or technical legislation. He emphasized that a simple bill, one that removes a few provisions, adjusts a percentage, and builds on legislation that has already passed, has a much higher likelihood of moving forward. He added that legislators will primarily be concerned with the overall impact on the budget.
- Brad added that the level of funding awarded to four-year institutions far exceeds what community colleges receive, even as community colleges face a substantial backlog of deferred maintenance. He noted that it would be more beneficial for the state to fund these projects through FRG rather than waiting for them to move into the capital construction grant program, where costs are significantly higher. Doing so would extend the useful life of existing facilities and allow colleges to complete projects more efficiently.
- Brad and Dan discussed prior efforts to adjust FRG funding and the challenges associated with advancing legislation. Brad noted that earlier attempts required extensive conversations with stakeholders but ultimately resulted in an additional \$4 million for FRG. He explained that success often depends on engaging the right individuals who understand the scope and purpose of the request, as well as

navigating periods of fiscal constraint when the community college system may only get one major priority funded, typically through the Cade formula. Brad stated that Cade is currently positioned for a 3% increase, and if that holds, MACC could focus on FRG, which draws from a different funding stream. He emphasized that progress may take multiple years of repeated discussions.

- Brad noted that upcoming committee assignment changes present uncertainty, as the subcommittee lost Senators Nancy King and Joanne Benson, and leadership is expected to appoint new members. He suggested that Senator Zucker, chair of the Capital Budget Committee and a strong advocate for community colleges, may be a positive partner moving forward.
- Brad concluded that a simple, straightforward bill has the best chance of success, as overly technical legislation risks losing support. He emphasized that MACC should avoid overcomplicating the proposal and instead focus on a clear, incremental approach that can be reintroduced and refined over multiple sessions if needed.
- Jim noted that project timelines vary significantly depending on the scope of work, and that receiving funds without a strict completion deadline provides needed flexibility. He explained that some projects, such as HVAC replacements or control system upgrades, require substantial planning, design, and procurement time, making it difficult to complete them within a single year. Smaller projects, such as masonry repairs, can be completed more quickly.
- Dan added that maintaining flexibility in how funds can be used is beneficial, and that colleges can continue to work within the current structure even if the funding is categorized within the operating budget.
- Ling noted that unexpected equipment failures can occur earlier than anticipated, even when consultants attempt to project lifecycle timelines. She explained that urgent repairs or replacements often cannot wait for the capital project process, making flexible funding essential.

- Brad agreed, stating that FRG funding is designed to provide that flexibility, particularly because colleges can rely on receiving it annually rather than every other year as it is currently structured. He added that the advantage of FRG is that institutions do not need to issue long-term bonds for these projects and can instead address needs as they arise.
- Karen Place asked whether FRG funds are allocated to specific projects. Dan responded that colleges submit their proposed projects to MHEC, which determines eligibility. He noted that FRG funds may be used for any project that appears on the approved list, and that if a project changes, colleges must submit updated forms to ensure the revised scope remains eligible for the program.
- Karen highlighted the benefit of having a guaranteed minimum allocation each year, noting that institutions can manage multi-year projects more effectively when they can rely on receiving additional FRG funds in the following fiscal year. She explained that this predictability allows colleges to continue work on a two-year project without needing to secure all funding upfront.
- Jim asked whether different phases of a project can be funded through FRG, noting that a project is still a single project regardless of whether funds are used for design or construction. Dan confirmed that FRG funds may be used for design, programming, and related pre-construction costs. Karen added that institutions should be cautious about phasing too far ahead, as insufficient funding in later years may require redesigning the project, which can add time and cost.
- Ling stated that she would prefer receiving a larger allocation every two years rather than a smaller amount annually, noting that this approach is more efficient in terms of both cost and staff resources. She explained that the college's deferred maintenance list has grown so large that completing numerous small projects individually is no longer practical. Ling emphasized that, without the ability to bundle smaller needs into a single larger project, the building would deteriorate faster than repairs could be

made. For her institution to be successful, she must consolidate smaller projects into one comprehensive project.

- Brad explained that institutions would receive the same overall amount of FRG funding, but it would be distributed annually rather than every other year. He noted that the actual amount colleges receive depends on the projects included in their CCCGP submissions, because FRG is tied directly to those project lists, institutions that submit fewer eligible projects will receive less funding than in years when they submit enough projects to utilize the full allocation.
- Brad reiterated MACC's goals for revising the FRG statute: doubling the program, removing the current \$500,000 cap so colleges could eventually receive up to \$1 million, and allowing CIP funds to be shifted forward in future years to grow the FRG allocation. He explained that eliminating the \$500,000 cap and increasing the maximum to \$1 million would support these objectives. Brad noted that while institutions cannot run full design, construction, and completion phases as deferred-maintenance projects, any project listed on an institution's deferred-maintenance inventory is eligible for FRG funding. He summarized the proposal as a straightforward update to the existing statute.
- Jim explained that receiving funds on July 1 creates challenges for summer-timed projects, such as AHU replacements, because design work must begin well in advance. Without early funding, the college may miss the narrow summer installation window. Brad responded that institutions know by mid-April that FRG funds will be available in July, which should allow design work to begin earlier. Dan added that once project forms are submitted to MHEC, colleges are typically notified quickly if eligibility issues exist, and projects on the approved list are generally funded, meaning design could begin ahead of July.
- Karen noted that even with April awareness, colleges must still complete procurement for design services, hire engineers, complete design, and bid the project, steps that push work into mid-summer and compress the schedule. Jim

emphasized that colleges cannot commit to design or order long-lead mechanical equipment without certainty about the amount of funding they will receive. Karen added that this uncertainty makes institutions reluctant to begin work early.

- Jim explained that equipment often must be ordered 12–16 weeks before installation, creating additional pressure when funding amounts are unknown. Karen stated that annual funding would alleviate these timing issues by allowing colleges to phase projects over multiple fiscal years and maintain momentum, as long as the funding pool is not tied to specific projects and can support multi-year work.
- Brad noted that, despite the timeline challenges raised, the advantages of having FRG funded through the operating budget far outweigh those concerns. He explained that while the timing of design and procurement can be difficult, the flexibility provided by operating budget funding is essential. Without it, many projects would not be eligible for FRG in the first place. Brad emphasized that maintaining FRG within the operating budget remains a significant benefit for colleges.
- Jim explained that colleges receive a limited amount of emergency funding each year, which they must reserve for unexpected failures such as broken gas lines. Because emergencies are unpredictable, institutions typically hold a portion of those funds in case urgent issues arise. He noted that compressed project timelines sometimes force colleges to take the risk of using some of their emergency funds to replace equipment when necessary. Jim added that the overall process (procurement, design, studies, and bidding) takes significant time, and colleges can be two years into the process before they are able to complete a replacement.

❖ Lunch Break

❖ Old Business

- Review goals for upcoming year:
 - Goal 1: expanded to include roundtable discussions on topics related to college facilities procedures.

- Goal 2: Amended to “Develop procedures to constantly update FPC site, ensuring the content of the site matches with its purpose, and reflects the work of the council.”
- Goal 3: No changes made
- Goal 4: State agencies have participated in and presented at FPC meetings. It was noted that the council should focus on encouraging active member engagement to strengthen collaboration and ensure broad representation across institutions.

❖ **New Business**

➤ Topics for future meetings:

Topics for round table discussions will be selected at each meeting for the following meeting.

- Facilities operations
 - How do different institutions handle work orders and asset relocation procedures?
 - Staffing/workflow
 - Work order software/ developing reports to justify staffing
 - Compare procedures between institutions
- Addressing turnover
 - Challenges with retaining staff
 - Salary constraints and their relationship to turnover
- Procurement process and thresholds
 - IQID lists and how they relate to procurement
 - RFP process: comparing institutional evaluation methods and whether the process can be expedited

- Efficient preparation of scopes and initiating documents for procurement
- Campus standards
 - Restroom standards
 - Interior glass and safety standards

➤ FCP Teams Hub

- Purpose: To create an easier way to distribute information among FPC members
- Folder structure: Folders kept under general tab
- Permissions:
 - An Officers-Only channel will be created for working drafts (agendas, minutes, etc.).
 - Once documents are finalized, they will be copied into the General Channel, where all FPC members have read only access.
- Membership question: Should state agencies be on the Teams contact list?

❖ Upcoming Meetings

- **October 16, 2026** – Officers Only Meeting (Teams Call)
- **November 13, 2026** – Howard CC
- **December 11, 2026** – Officers Only Meeting (Teams Call)
- **January 8, 2027** – CSM
- **February 12, 2027** – Officers Only Meeting (Teams Call)
- **April 9, 2027** – PGCC
- **May 7, 2027** – Officers Only Meeting (Teams Call)
- **June 3 & 4, 2027** – Retreat @ Wor-Wic Community College