



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Type: Virtual

Chair: Christopher Painter

Date: September 12, 2025

Attendees (17)

Christopher Painter – Garrett College 100% 1 out of 1

Kerry B. Norberg – Montgomery College

Kristina Schramm – Montgomery College

Dong-Min Kim – Montgomery College

Shantrice McCoy – Harford Community College

Tony Hinton – Harford Community College

Andrew D. Clark – Allegany College

James M. Taylor – Anne Arundel Community College

Gregory Grey – Wor-Wic Community College

Jason J. Ludd – Cecil College

Laura Dyson – College of Southern Maryland

Allison Montgomery – College of Southern Maryland

Marvin Mills – Frederick Community College

David Koenigsburg – Department of Budget and Management (DBM)

Iman Shaker – Department of General Services (DGS)

Dan Schuster – Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC)

Monica Randall – Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC)

1. Call to Order (Virtual)

Chair: Christopher Painter

Meeting opened with quorum confirmed. Agenda approved as presented.

2. Officers' Reports

Christopher Painter:

Discussed increasing participation, meeting frequency, and agenda planning. Reminded members of the Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS) deadline (Sept. 1, with waiver through Sept. 30).

Gregory Grey:

Noted BEPS submission challenges at some colleges. Reported listserv issues—some members not receiving invites; needs IT resolution.

Travis Hopkins:

Reported staff changes and continued listserv delivery problems likely due to email firewalls. Will update and resend the contact directory and send messages via both listserv and direct email.

James Taylor:

Proposed standard timeline for agenda distribution, RSVPs, and meeting dates. Recommended conducting online meetings only when in-person attendance would be below certain levels. The decision to conduct an on-line meeting will be decided by the FPC chair once the RSVP date has passed and expected attendance is known.

Kim Dong-Min:

Confirmed difficulty verifying listserv email delivery. Will follow up after agency reports.

3. Agency Reports

DBM – David Koenigsburg:

Thanked colleges for responsiveness. Focus on budget production; follow-up meetings to be scheduled.

DGS – Iman Shaker:

Reviewing FY26 projects (Allegany, Chesapeake, CCBC #481).

Commended colleges for timely CPES submissions.

MHEC – Dan Schuster:

Hearing date: Sept. 23.

Remaining ~\$3 M in facilities renewal grants; invoices needed soon.

FY27 FRG submissions pending from some colleges.

Q1 FY26 Cash Flow Reports due Oct. 31.

Ongoing discussions with DBM and MACC on deferred maintenance funding.

MACC – Monica Randall

Written report distributed via listserv (some agencies not copied).

Kim will repost on the FPC website and forward to agencies.

Highlights:

Protect/restore CAG funding formula (27–29% FTES).

Full FY27 capital funding for 17 projects across 13 colleges; BCCC separate request.

\$2 M Cybersecurity Workforce Accelerator initiative.

Restore Promise Scholarship and expand aid programs.

Support dual enrollment leadership by community colleges.

Oppose unfunded mandates and House Bill 913 applicability to colleges.

4. Revisions to Agendas led by Lisa Aughenbaugh, Carroll Community College (Lisa was absent)

Key Points & Decisions

➤ Agenda Template

- Standardized template for all meetings.
- Includes: date, host (or “Online”), campus map if in-person, RSVP, and meeting schedule.
- One presentation per regular meeting; two only at retreats.

- Typical meeting: 9:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. (breakfast, call to order, officer/agency reports, presentation, old/new business, lunch).
- RSVP & Calendar
 - Agenda sent 10–14 days before meeting.
 - RSVP due ~1 week prior.
 - Host college manages RSVPs and logistics.
 - Calendar invites recommended; accepting counts as RSVP.
- Officer Coordination
 - Officers meet ~1 month prior to each meeting to finalize agenda and confirm presentations.
 - Example: October 17th officer meeting for November 14 meeting.
- Implementation
 - Dong-Min Kim to create editable Word template.
 - Jim Taylor to distribute template to officers.

Next Steps

- Prepare November agenda: send October 31.
- RSVPs due by November 5.
- Officer check-in October 10.

5. Revisions to FPC Charter led by Lisa Aughenbaugh, Carroll Community (Lisa was absent)

Upcoming Presentations & Scheduling:

- FPC charter presentation may be postponed due to Lisa's availability:
- Green purchasing at DGS is tentatively scheduled for November 14th; presenters can present in person or online. All presentations will be set at 10:00 AM for consistency.
- College's hosting meetings should ensure rooms accommodate remote presentations.

Roundtable Discussions:

- Sustainability practices (originally listed as policies) across colleges will be discussed as a roundtable. Colleges can submit practices in advance for discussion.
- Legislative updates and potential impacts on colleges (capital requests, unfunded mandates) will be discussed post-legislation, likely around April–May.

Future Presentation Topics:

- Procurement guidelines: Identified as a high-priority topic for all colleges; coordination with procurement personnel will be initiated.
- Decarbonization & energy planning: Potential presentations by MDE or college engineers; timing may vary depending on project progress.
- Master academic planning: To be considered for April.

Action Items:

- Confirm presenter availability and preference (in-person or online).
- Ensure meeting rooms have remote presentation capabilities.
- Begin discussions with procurement teams for potential joint sessions.
- Identify MDE contacts for decarbonization/energy presentations and follow up.
- Finalize meeting dates and incorporate into the charter.

General Notes:

- Focus on aligning presentations and roundtable discussions with the group's established goals.
- Emphasis on practical sharing of experiences and practices among colleges.

Old Business

Listserv & Directory Updates

- Ongoing issues with listserv delivery; some emails blocked as spam/phishing.
- Proposed solutions: maintain a primary/secondary contact directory, send updates via listserv and direct email, verify contacts at meetings.

- Action: Travis to provide updated contact list for testing.

BEPS Reporting

- New buildings counted in inventory only after occupancy; renovations included immediately.
- Colleges facing mapping and data verification challenges; extensions granted.
- Future compliance dates and penalties noted (generally 2035–2040).

New Business

Membership & Participation

- Invite CSM Facilities Executive Director Dorian Hall to January meeting.
- Establish primary/secondary contacts per college to ensure meeting continuity.

Capital Projects & Equipment Upgrades

- Discussed HVAC replacements: in-kind gas units chosen over heat pumps due to cost; planning for future electrification and refrigerant phase-out (R-22).
- Long-term energy compliance planning emphasized for 15–20 years out.

BEPS Presentation

- Presentation shared on compliance timelines and fees; technical access issues noted.
- Action: Mei to distribute via listserv or direct email.

Next Steps / Action Items:

- Travis to provide updated email directory for verification.
- Review and confirm primary/secondary contacts at meetings.
- Continue BEPS reporting and monitor building inventories.
- Distribute BEPS presentation to all members.
- Plan capital projects considering long-term energy compliance and equipment lifecycle

6. Presentation: Capital Improvement & Facilities Renewal Grant Proposal by Monica Randall, MACC

Proposal Overview:

- Monica Randall presented a proposal to redirect unspent funds from the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to the Facilities Renewal Grant (FRG) program.
- Currently, the CIP allocates approximately \$80M annually for major construction. If underspent, the excess could be redirected to FRG.
- The redirected funds would be evenly distributed among all 16 community colleges.
- Legislative changes would be required to implement this proposal.

Key Points & Clarifications:

- The redirected funds would be in addition to the current FRG allocations, though the exact mechanism requires further clarification.
- Existing FRG limitations: only 8 colleges receive funds each year, caps at \$500,000 per college, and certain timing restrictions. These would need adjustment.
- Using G.O. bond funds rather than operating funds would provide more flexibility regarding project timelines and fund carryover.
- Legislation would aim to provide flexibility in fund distribution, rather than mandating equal distribution every year, as allocations will fluctuate depending on CIP availability.
- Colleges emphasized the importance of flexibility for planning projects with long lead times.

Next Steps:

- MACC will draft proposed legislation.
- Draft will be shared with the group for feedback before submission.
- A small workgroup may be formed to provide input and facilitate the process.
- Colleges indicated general support for the proposal, emphasizing collaboration in shaping legislation.

Action Items:

- MACC to begin drafting legislation and consult with stakeholders.

- Formation of a committee/workgroup within the colleges to assist and provide feedback.

Committee Formation:

- A committee will be formed to review proposed legislation related to Facilities Renewal Grant (FRG) funding.
- Christopher Painter will represent small colleges, Kristina Schramm large colleges, and James Taylor as a large college representative. Medium college representation is still being confirmed.
- Additional members may be added based on availability and expertise.

Legislation & Funding Flexibility:

- Discussion emphasized maintaining flexibility in any proposed legislative changes to avoid rigid timelines or funding constraints.
- Dan Schuster clarified that current legislation does not impose a June 30 completion requirement and that project funding type (operating vs. G.O. bond funds) may impact timelines.
- Quick expenditure of funds is encouraged to ensure eligibility for future allocations, though the FRG process allows for predictable biannual funding.

Alternative Funding Approaches:

- Dan Schuster discussed potential alternatives to FRG for distributing funds, including Community College Construction Grant programs, but noted administrative complexities and equity concerns.
- Participants agreed that using FRG guidelines with legislative adjustments is the preferred approach.

Capital Project Funding & Design Budgeting:

- Kristina Schramm raised concerns about reductions in Governor's recommended funding for design and construction for the R-MT Library project.
- Dan Schuster explained that DBM reallocates funds based on actual project costs and reimburses accordingly, ensuring projects receive sufficient funding if documented properly.

Next Steps:

- The group will await the formal proposal and engage with Dan Schuster and other stakeholders for input.
- Committee members will finalize participation, and Travis Hopkins will confirm additional medium college representation.

FPC FY26 Goals

Goal 1: Evaluate Success of Membership Expansion & Exchange of Information (100% Participation)

- Discussion centered on forming a committee to manage potential legislative changes and funding allocation.
 - Committee composition agreed:
 - Small Colleges: Christopher Painter
 - Large Colleges: Kristina Schramm
 - Medium Colleges: Pending (discussion with Shelly suggested for participation)
 - James Taylor volunteered to assist as needed.
 - Emphasis on balancing representation across small, medium, and large colleges.
-

Goal 2: Hold Educational Sessions (Best Practices/Roundtable/Presentations)

- Discussion on managing FRG funds and legislative proposals served as a knowledge-sharing opportunity for committee members.
- Key topics covered:
 - Flexibility in project timelines and funding allocation.
 - Reimbursement vs. pre-authorization for design and construction funding.
 - Strategies for ensuring projects receive adequate funding despite potential reductions.

- Real-world examples from colleges' experiences with design and construction budgets.
 - Action: Participants shared best practices for planning and requesting funds effectively.
-

Goal 3: Review & Update Charter Throughout FY2026

- Committee responsibilities and potential legislative involvement discussed:
 - Committee will review proposed legislation to ensure FRG process is flexible and equitable.
 - Focus on developing recommendations for legislative language that facilitates smooth administration of funds.
 - Committee will await proposals from relevant parties and provide input.
-

Other Business / Discussion (continued)

- Issues related to project funding adjustments:
 - Examples shared of projects experiencing reduced design and construction funds in the Governor's budget recommendations.
 - Clarification from Dan Schuster (MHEC) that actual costs, contracts, and proper documentation ensure colleges receive appropriate funding.
 - Importance of early planning and keeping projects "shovel-ready" emphasized.
-

Action Items

- Christopher Painter to represent small colleges on the committee.
 - Kristina Schramm to represent large colleges.
 - Medium college representative to be confirmed (Travis Hopkins to follow up with Shelly).
 - Committee to review any proposed legislative changes affecting FRG funding and recommend modifications.
 - Dong-Min Kim to document committee members and minutes.
-

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 1:02 PM.