

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2026 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE
Third Reader - Revised

Senate Bill 31

(Senator Lam)

Education, Energy, and the Environment

Appropriations

**School Construction and Housing - School Zones and Adequate Public Facilities
Ordinances**

This bill requires each local board of education to (1) submit a student residency and school zones report to the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) and the Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC) by July 1, 2026, and each July 1 thereafter and (2) consult with relevant municipalities in developing its local educational facilities master plan. The bill also establishes that, if a county enacts an adequate public facilities ordinance (APFO) that includes a definite maximum length of time to restrict or limit housing development on the basis of school capacity, the ordinance may delay the initiation of construction, but may not delay the processing and completion of subdivision or site development plans. **The bill takes effect June 1, 2026.**

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: IAC can adopt regulations for the residency and school zones report with existing resources. IAC and MDP can likely provide technical assistance to local school systems as needed using existing resources, as discussed below. Revenues are not affected.

Local Effect: Counties with APFOs may experience operational challenges associated with the bill's provisions. Local school systems can likely report the required data to IAC and MDP and incorporate municipal consultation and data into the development of local educational facilities master plans, with existing resources. Revenues are not affected.

Small Business Effect: Potential meaningful.

Analysis

Bill Summary:

Student Residency and School Zones Report

The student residency and school zones report must include (1) the school zone boundaries and attendance area map and (2) the census tract and block data reported to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for use in the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS). The report may not include personal identifying information of a student. IAC must adopt regulations establishing formatting and submission requirements for the report.

Local Educational Facilities Master Plan – Municipal Consultation and Data

The bill requires each local board, in developing a local educational facilities master plan (required to be submitted to IAC each year, pursuant to IAC regulations), to (1) consult with each municipality located in the county that exercises planning and zoning authority and (2) incorporate data provided by the municipalities into the plan's enrollment projections and analysis of future facility needs.

Current Law:

Public School Construction and Facilities Planning

For an overview of State support for public school construction, please see the **Appendix – State Funding for Public School Construction**.

By July 1 of every year, each local school system must develop and submit to IAC a local educational facilities master plan, which is a written plan that is approved by the local school board and that includes:

- educational goals, standards, and guidelines;
- community analysis so that the plan conforms to county and municipal comprehensive plans and growth management strategies;
- an inventory and evaluation of existing school buildings;
- current and projected enrollment data;
- analysis of future school facility needs;
- policies for co-location, shared use, and shared cost of existing and planned school facilities;
- policies to address school capacity needs in planned growth areas or to address APFO requirements; and

- policies addressing current and planned transportation for students, administrators, and teachers per school.

In submitting requests for planning and funding approval to IAC, a local school board must demonstrate that the requests are consistent with the most recent educational facilities master plan.

Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances

Local governments enact APFOs to ensure that infrastructure necessary to support proposed new housing or commercial development is built concurrently with, or prior to, that new development. APFOs are an effort to time the provision of public facilities (water, sewer, schools, roads, and emergency services) to be consistent with development demand and locally adopted comprehensive plans. An APFO ties development approvals under zoning and subdivision ordinances to specifically defined public facility standards for infrastructure. MDP indicates that 14 counties and 34 municipalities have adopted some form of adequate public facilities consideration in their development review and approval process.

For a listing of citations and links to county APFOs, see the **Appendix – Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances – Counties**.

Maryland Longitudinal Data System

In General

Chapter 190 of 2010 established MLDS to contain individual-level student data and workforce data from all levels of education and the State's workforce. The purpose of the data system is to facilitate and enable the exchange of student and workforce data among agencies and institutions within the State as well as generate timely and accurate information about student achievement that can be used to improve the State's education system and guide decision makers at all levels. The MLDS Center (which administers MLDS) may only use de-identified data in the analysis, research, and reporting conducted by the center. The center may only use aggregate data in the release of data in reports and in response to data requests.

Student Home Address and Geolocation Information

Statute requires each county board to convert students' home address and geolocation information into census tract and block numbers in a manner consistent with the protocol developed by the MLDS Center. MSDE must collect the census tract and block number

information from the county boards and provide it to the MLDS Center to aid in the goal of linking student data and workforce data.

State Fiscal Effect: IAC advises that the agency can develop regulations on the submission requirements and formatting of student residency and school zones reports using existing resources. IAC further advises that, as smaller local school systems may face difficulties converting data into usable mapping files, the agency will likely need to provide technical support for those school systems. IAC advises that it can provide the required technical support using existing resources and staff.

MDP similarly advises that the agency can help develop and maintain an intake system for reports with existing resources. Unlike IAC, MDP advises that the agency requires additional staff to the extent the agency must assist in the preparation of reports and respond to inquiries about the reports. However, the Department of Legislative Services (DLS) advises that, given the joint responsibility of MDP and IAC to receive data and the fact that IAC indicates that existing staff has the capacity to provide technical support to local school systems, MDP and IAC can likely pool existing staff and resources to ensure local school systems are able to submit data as required by the bill.

Local Fiscal Effect:

Data Reporting and Facilities Planning

Local boards of education can likely submit the required data to MDP and IAC with existing resources, although some local boards may face operational difficulties formatting data properly, especially given the July 1, 2026 deadline for initial submission. DLS assumes that IAC and MDP can provide sufficient technical support to local boards to ensure reports can be made with existing resources.

This analysis assumes that local boards of education can consult with municipalities located in their county that exercise planning and zoning authority, and incorporate data provided by the municipalities into enrollment projections and needs analyses in their local educational facilities master plans, with existing resources.

Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances

The bill does not allow county APFOs that include a definite maximum length of time to restrict or limit housing development on the basis of school capacity to delay the processing and completion of subdivision or site development plans. As the bill continues to allow affected APFOs to delay the initiation of construction, this analysis assumes the bill has no effect on the level of development allowed under an APFO (and by extension, no effect on the overall level of services or infrastructure a jurisdiction may need to supply to support

development). However, the bill may have operational effects to the extent that it results in a greater volume of subdivision and site development plan review work for local planning offices, and other affected local offices that contribute to reviews, that is otherwise delayed or not conducted (in the absence of the bill) due to a school capacity-based APFO standard.

Small Business Effect: Small businesses involved in residential housing development may benefit from being able to move forward with subdivision and site development plan review – despite a school capacity-based APFO standard that otherwise would prevent a review from proceeding – if the APFO includes a definite maximum length of time to restrict or limit housing development on the basis of school capacity.

Additional Information

Recent Prior Introductions: Similar legislation has been introduced within the last three years. See HB 38 of 2025.

Designated Cross File: HB 337 (Delegate Moon, *et al.*) - Appropriations.

Information Source(s): Interagency Commission on School Construction; Maryland Department of Planning; Anne Arundel County Public Schools; Baltimore City Public Schools; Baltimore County Public Schools; Frederick County Public Schools; Montgomery County Public Schools; Prince George’s County Public Schools; St. Mary’s County Public Schools; Wicomico County Public Schools; Maryland Association of Counties; Maryland Building Industry Association; Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - February 15, 2026
js/sdk Third Reader - April 7, 2026
Revised - Amendment(s) - April 7, 2026
Revised - Clarification - April 7, 2026

Analysis by: Michael E. Sousane

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510

Appendix – State Funding for Public School Construction

School Construction Review and Approval Process

The Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC) manages State review and approval of local school construction projects. Each year, local systems develop and submit to IAC a facilities master plan that includes an analysis of future school facility needs based on the current condition of school buildings and projected enrollment. The master plan must be approved by the local school board. Subsequently, each local school system submits a capital improvement plan to IAC that includes projects for which it seeks planning and/or funding approval for the upcoming fiscal year, which may include projects that the local system has forward funded. In addition to approval from the local school board, the request for the upcoming fiscal year must be approved by the county's governing body. Typically, the submission letter to IAC contains signatures of both the school board president and either the county executive and county council president or chair of the board of county commissioners.

Based on its assessment of the relative merit of all the project proposals it receives, and subject to the projected level of school construction funds available, IAC determines which projects to fund through the Public School Construction Program (PSCP). By December 31 of each year, IAC must approve projects comprising 75% of the preliminary school construction allocation projected to be available by the Governor for the upcoming fiscal year. Local school systems may appeal these preliminary decisions by IAC. By March 1 of each year, IAC must recommend to the General Assembly projects comprising 90% of the allocation for school construction submitted in the Governor's capital budget. Following the legislative session, IAC approves projects comprising the remaining school construction funds included in the enacted capital budget, no earlier than May 1. The final allocations are not subject to appeal.

Built to Learn Act

The Built to Learn Act (Chapter 20 of 2020) authorizes the Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA) to issue up to \$2.2 billion in revenue bonds, backed by annual payments from the Education Trust Fund (ETF) beginning in fiscal 2022, for public school construction projects in the State, including to support a public-private partnership (P3) agreement to build six new schools in Prince George's County (the P3 agreement in place is actually for eight schools). Proceeds from the revenue bonds are in addition to funding available from PSCP and are allocated among local school systems as shown in **Exhibit 1** (based on MSA's most recent projection of anticipated revenues of \$1.7 billion given increases in interest rates since the program's enactment).

Exhibit 1
Allocation of Built to Learn Bond Sale Proceeds
(\$ in Millions)

	<u>Percent of Total</u>	<u>Proceeds</u>
Anne Arundel	12.5%	\$212.5
Baltimore City	21.0%	357.0
Baltimore	21.0%	357.0
Frederick	5.1%	86.7
Howard	6.6%	112.2
Montgomery	21.0%	357.0
Prince George's	*	*
All Other Counties	11.5%	195.5
Unallocated/Maryland Stadium Authority	1.3%	22.1
Total	100.0%	\$1,700.0

* Under Chapter 20 of 2020, as amended by Chapter 679 of 2023, Prince George's County receives \$27.0 million annually for up to 30 years to supplement local funds for an availability payment if it enters into a public-private partnership agreement, subject to other provisions in the Act.

Source: Department of Legislative Services

The Built to Learn Act also (1) extends mandated funding for the Healthy School Facility Fund by three years, through fiscal 2024, with Chapter 32 of 2022 subsequently extending funding to at least \$90.0 million in fiscal 2024 through 2026; (2) raises the mandated annual funding level for the Enrollment Growth or Relocatable Classrooms (EGRC) program from \$40.0 million to \$80.0 million beginning in fiscal 2027; and (3) creates the Public School Facilities Priority Fund (PSFPF), later renamed by Chapter 32 to be the Nancy K. Kopp Public Schools Facilities Priority Fund) to provide State funds to address the facility needs of the highest priority schools identified by the statewide facilities assessment completed by IAC. Under Chapter 354 of 2024 and only for fiscal 2027, the purpose of PSFPF is to provide State funds to address the severity of issues in a school, including (among other things) air conditioning, heating, and plumbing. In accordance with funding amounts updated by Chapter 354, beginning in fiscal 2027, the Governor must appropriate at least \$70.0 million to the fund annually.

Prior to distributing funds under the Built to Learn program, MSA must enter into a program memorandum of understanding (MOU) with IAC (which is in place), and each county, local school board, and MSA must enter into a project MOU for each project seeking funding from the program. All projects receiving Built to Learn funds must be

approved by IAC using the same process it uses for PSCP. As of January 2026, IAC has approved 59 projects and committed more than \$1.5 billion in funding to those projects.

Eligible School Construction Costs

IAC establishes a range of appropriate per-student, square-foot allocations for elementary, middle, and high schools as well as for special education students, career and technology students, and specialized programs. IAC updated the space allocations in 2019 and renamed them gross area baselines. IAC also establishes, on an annual basis, a *cost per square foot* that is applicable to major school construction projects. For calendar 2026, the cost per square foot is \$431 for new construction *without* site development (up from \$416 in calendar 2025) and \$513 for new construction *with* site development (up from \$495 in calendar 2025). In general, multiplying the cost per square foot by the applicable gross area baseline for each proposed project (based primarily on the State-rated capacity of a building) yields the maximum allowable cost that is subject to the State/local cost-share formula. Thus, any portion of a project that exceeds the gross area baseline is not eligible for State funding and must be paid for by the local school system.

The cost of acquiring land may not be considered an eligible construction cost and may not be paid by the State. Otherwise, regulations specify public school construction-related costs that are eligible and ineligible for State funding. Chapter 20 expanded the costs eligible for State funding. In general, the following costs are now included among *eligible* expenses:

- planning and design costs (including architectural and engineering fees);
- construction of a new facility, renovation of a new facility, an addition to an existing facility, or a replacement of an existing building or building portion (*i.e.*, “bricks and mortar”);
- building and site development;
- replacement of building systems, including roofs; windows; and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (*i.e.*, “systemic renovations”);
- modular construction that meets specified standards;
- State-owned relocatable facilities and temporary facilities that are required to be on site during construction; and
- furniture, fixtures, and equipment with a median useful life of at least 15 years.

Among the major items explicitly *not eligible* for State funding under current law (besides site acquisition) are (1) master plans and feasibility studies; (2) projects or systemic renovations for buildings and systems that have been replaced, upgraded, or renovated within the last 15 years; and (3) items that do not have a useful life of at least 15 years.

State Share of Eligible Costs

The State pays at least 50% of eligible costs of school construction and renovation projects, based on a funding formula that takes into account numerous factors, including each local school system’s wealth and ability to pay. State law requires that the cost-share formula be recalculated every two years. **Exhibit 2** shows the State share of eligible school construction costs for all Maryland jurisdictions for fiscal 2026 through 2028, as approved by IAC. When updating the cost-share calculations every two years, Chapter 32 requires IAC to limit the percentage decrease in the State share for any county to 5%.

Exhibit 2
State Share of Eligible School Construction Costs
Fiscal 2026-2028

<u>County</u>	<u>FY 2026</u>	<u>FY 2027</u>	<u>FY 2028</u>
Allegany	89%	95%	95%
Anne Arundel	50%	50%	50%
Baltimore City	91%	91%	91%
Baltimore	57%	56%	56%
Calvert	56%	54%	51%
Caroline	94%	97%	97%
Carroll	54%	57%	57%
Cecil	61%	63%	63%
Charles	64%	66%	66%
Dorchester	98%	97%	97%
Frederick	67%	69%	69%
Garrett	89%	95%	95%
Harford	58%	59%	59%
Howard	51%	50%	50%
Kent	50%	50%	50%
Montgomery	50%	50%	50%
Prince George’s	68%	67%	67%
Queen Anne’s	50%	50%	50%
St. Mary’s	58%	58%	58%
Somerset	100%	98%	95%
Talbot	50%	50%	50%
Washington	78%	82%	82%
Wicomico	95%	99%	99%
Worcester	50%	50%	50%
Maryland School for the Blind*	100%	100%	100%

* Chapter 192 of 2024 establishes the State share at 100% for Maryland School for the Blind for all eligible school construction projects.

Source: Interagency Commission on School Construction

State Funding Levels

Chapter 14 of 2018, the 21st Century School Facilities Act, established the State's intent to provide at least \$400.0 million annually, within current debt affordability guidelines. Chapter 32 increased the legislature's intended annual funding level to \$450.0 million beginning in fiscal 2023. Chapter 354 clarifies that the intended threshold does not include funding provided through the Built to Learn program. The State surpassed the intended thresholds in fiscal 2019 and 2021 through 2025; the State would have surpassed \$400.0 million in fiscal 2020, but the \$10.0 million allocation for the School Safety Grant Program (SSGP) was canceled by the Board of Public Works for cost-containment reasons. Chapter 679 of 2023 repeals the Aging Schools Program beginning in fiscal 2027 with the intent that funding be transferred to PSFPP, which takes effect that year. Although Chapter 679 also repealed SSGP beginning fiscal 2027, Chapter 354 subsequently retained the \$10.0 million funding mandate for the program indefinitely. **Exhibit 3** shows annual State public school construction funding from fiscal 2022 through 2026, by county.

The fiscal 2027 operating and capital budgets as introduced provide funding that, not including the Prince George's County P3 funding under Built to Learn, meets the \$450.0 million statutory goal. State support for school construction is divided among general obligation (GO) bond funding and special funds as follows:

- \$300.0 million in GO bonds for PSCP;
- \$80.0 million in GO bonds for EGRC;
- \$70.0 million in GO bonds for PSFPP
- \$69.0 million in special funds for the P3 to construct and maintain schools in Prince George's County (of which \$27.0 million are State funds from ETF and the remainder are local funds).

Exhibit 3
State Public School Construction Funding
Fiscal 2022-2026
(\$ in Thousands)

<u>County</u>	<u>FY 2022</u>	<u>FY 2023</u>	<u>FY 2024</u>	<u>FY 2025</u>	<u>FY 2026</u>
Allegany	\$2,613	\$4,116	\$5,742	\$12,308	\$9,854
Anne Arundel	170,456	76,974	58,141	88,551	44,641
Baltimore City	83,293	327,001	154,841	282,068	79,863
Baltimore	258,315	127,687	75,823	201,151	63,917
Calvert	13,454	8,678	18,737	8,250	10,585
Caroline	4,791	7,059	4,469	5,967	4,546
Carroll	38,831	20,955	16,609	16,417	18,179
Cecil	5,508	19,590	42,912	5,490	7,684
Charles	35,892	35,237	21,031	22,982	17,058
Dorchester	6,616	4,670	6,114	3,992	6,853
Frederick	109,454	48,808	43,608	21,131	29,313
Garrett	12,185	11,065	18,479	23,802	9,420
Harford	47,453	16,911	33,455	18,238	22,517
Howard	70,378	69,797	26,993	19,642	28,230
Kent	158	2,331	3,242	406	8,885
Montgomery	305,449	50,233	198,048	57,636	53,730
Prince George's	51,147	124,264	76,967	52,782	63,786
Queen Anne's	2,368	4,526	6,934	784	16,168
St. Mary's	5,773	7,878	15,951	7,073	24,698
Somerset	815	266	9,409	6,813	13,195
Talbot	1,380	1,129	6,202	6,438	3,701
Washington	8,804	10,413	14,903	27,890	14,909
Wicomico	26,169	33,416	22,072	7,861	11,584
Worcester	5,014	308	689	8,202	7,293
Maryland School for the Blind	2,021	9,100	13,605	4,595	11,328
Statewide	6,500	4,279	63	9,033	1,849
Total	\$1,274,837	\$1,026,691	\$895,038	\$919,501	\$583,784

Notes: Includes general obligation bonds, Built to Learn revenue bonds, pay-as-you-go funds, and reallocated funds that were previously authorized (as shown in IAC Capital Improvement Program 100% Allocation reports). Allocated funds include the Enrollment Growth or Relocatable Classroom program, School Safety grants, and Healthy School Facility grants. Statewide funds include unallocated discretionary funds, contractual costs for external reviews, and funds reserved for unforeseen contingencies. Columns may not sum to total due to rounding.

Source: Interagency Commission on School Construction; Department of Legislative Services

Appendix – Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances - Counties

January 2026

An adequate public facilities ordinance (APFO) is a growth management tool that attempts to link the timing of new development to the availability of public facilities capacity needed to serve the development. The list below identifies, for the 14 counties that have enacted an APFO, (1) the ordinance citation(s); (2) the types of public facilities the ordinance covers; (3) links to exemptions from the ordinance's requirements; and (4) links to more information (if available).

Anne Arundel

Ordinance: Anne Arundel County Code, [§ 17-5-101 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Fire suppression – [§ 17-5-301](#)
- Roads – [§ 17-5-401 et seq.](#)
- Schools – [§ 17-5-501 et seq.](#)
- Sewerage – [§ 17-5-601](#)
- Storm drain – [§ 17-5-701 et seq.](#)
- Water supply – [§ 17-5-801](#)

Exemptions: [§ 17-5-201](#), [§ 17-5-207](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities webpage](#)

Baltimore

Ordinance: Baltimore County Code, [§ 32-6-101 et seq.](#)

Regulation: Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, [§ 4A02](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Schools – [§ 32-6-103](#)
- Transportation – [§ 32-6-104](#)
- Water – [§ 32-6-105](#)
- Sewer – [§ 32-6-106](#)
- Stormwater – [§ 32-6-107](#)
- Open space – [§ 32-6-108](#)

Exemptions: [§ 32-6-103\(b\)](#), [§ 4A02.4.E](#), [§ 32-6-108\(b\)](#)

More information: [Adequate public school facilities](#)

Calvert

Ordinance: Calvert County Code, [§ 3-1 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Fire and emergency medical services – [§ 3-4 et seq.](#)
- Roads – [§ 3-6 et seq.](#)
- Schools – [§ 3-8 et seq.](#)
- Solid waste – [§ 3-10 et seq.](#)
- Storm drainage – [§ 3-12 et seq.](#)
- Water and sewer – [§ 3-14 et seq.](#)

Exemptions: [§ 3-1D](#)

More information: [Adequate Public Facilities Report for Schools](#)

Caroline

Ordinance: Caroline County Code, [§ 162-38 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 162-39](#)
- Drainage outlets – [§ 162-40](#)
- Schools – [§ 162-41](#)
- Fire protection – [§ 162-42](#)
- Solid waste collection – [§ 162-43](#)

Carroll

Ordinance: Carroll County Code, [§ 156.01 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Schools – [§ 156.05\(D\)\(1\)\(a\), \(2\)\(a\), and \(3\)\(a\)](#)
- Roads – [§ 156.05\(D\)\(1\)\(b\), \(2\)\(b\), and \(3\)\(b\)](#)
- Fire and emergency medical services – [§ 156.05\(D\)\(1\)\(c\), \(2\)\(c\), and \(3\)\(c\)](#)
- Police – [§ 156.05\(D\)\(1\)\(d\), \(2\)\(d\), and \(3\)\(d\)](#)
- Water and sewer – [§ 156.05\(D\)\(1\)\(e\), \(2\)\(e\), and \(3\)\(e\)](#)

Exemptions: [§ 156.03\(B\) and \(C\)\(1\)](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities webpage](#)

Charles

Ordinance: Charles County Code, [§ 297-255 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 297-257](#)
- Schools – [§ 297-258](#)
- Water supply – [§ 297-260](#)
- Fire suppression for rural areas – [§ 297-261](#)

Exemptions: [§ 297-256B](#), [§ 297-256C](#), [§ 297-257B](#), [§ 297-258A](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities manual](#)

Frederick

Ordinance: Frederick County Code, [§ 1-20-1 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 1-20-30 et seq.](#)
- Water supply – [§ 1-20-40 et seq.](#)
- Sewerage – [§ 1-20-50 et seq.](#)
- Schools – [§ 1-20-60 et seq.](#)

Exemptions: [§ 1-20-7](#), [§ 1-20-30\(A\)](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities webpage](#)

Harford

Ordinance: Harford County Code, [§ 267-126](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Schools – [§ 267-126B\(2\)\(a\)](#)
- Sewerage – [§ 267-126B\(2\)\(b\)](#) and [\(3\)\(a\)](#)
- Water – [§ 267-126B\(2\)\(c\)](#) and [\(3\)\(b\)](#)
- Roads – [§ 267-126B\(2\)\(d\)](#) and [\(3\)\(c\)](#)

Exemptions: [§ 267-126B\(2\)\(a\)\(4\)](#)

More information: [County annual growth report](#)

Howard

Ordinance: Howard County Code, [§ 16.1100 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 16.1101](#)
- Schools – [§ 16.1103](#)
- Water, sewer, stormwater, and solid waste – [§ 16.1111](#)

* Also see: Housing unit allocation concept – [§ 16.1102](#)

Exemptions: [§ 16.1107](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities webpage](#)

Montgomery

Ordinance: Montgomery County Code, [§§ 8-30 - 8-32](#), [§ 14-7](#), [§ 33A-15](#), [§ 50.4.3.J](#), [§ 50.10.3](#); [County 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Schools – [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, S1 through S5](#)
- Motor vehicle – [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, TL1](#)
- Non-motor vehicle – [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, TL2](#)
- Water and sewerage – [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, p. 20](#)
- Police, fire, and health – [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, p. 20](#)

Exemptions: Montgomery County Code, [§ 50.4.3.J.3](#); [Growth and Infrastructure Policy, S3.2.1 and TL3](#)

More information: [County growth and infrastructure policy webpage](#)

Prince George's

Ordinance: Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, [§ 24-4501 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Transportation – [§ 24-4505](#)
- Pedestrian and bikeway – [§ 24-4506](#)
- Parks and recreation – [§ 24-4507](#)
- Police – [§ 24-4508](#)
- Fire and rescue – [§ 24-4509](#)
- Schools – [§ 24-4510](#)

Exemptions: [§ 24-4510\(a\)\(3\)](#)

More information: [Planning department subdivision webpage](#)

Queen Anne's

Ordinance: Queen Anne's County Code, [§ 28-1 et seq.](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Water – [§ 28-7A](#)
- Sewer – [§ 28-7B](#)
- Schools – [§ 28-7C](#)
- Transportation – [§ 28-7D](#)

Exemptions: [§ 28-4](#)

More information: [County adequate public facilities ordinance webpage](#)

St. Mary's

Ordinance: St. Mary's County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, [§ 70.1 et seq.](#)
(page 70-1)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 70.7](#)
- Sewerage – [§ 70.8](#)
- Water – [§ 70.9](#)
- Storm drainage – [§ 70.10](#)
- Schools – [§ 70.11](#)
- Fire prevention and suppression – [§ 70.12](#)

Exemptions: [§ 70.3](#), [§ 70.11.1](#)

Washington

Ordinance: [Washington County Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance](#)

Types of Public Facilities Covered:

- Roads – [§ 4.1 et seq.](#)
- Schools – [§ 5.1 et seq.](#)
- Sewage – [§ 6.1 et seq.](#)
- Water – [§ 7.1 et seq.](#)
- Fire protection – [§ 8.1 et seq.](#)

Exemptions: [§ 3.5](#), [§ 4.1](#), [§ 5.2](#)

More information: [Subdivision and Site Plan Review](#)