



December 2023

Preservation and Disposition of Maryland's Historic Complexes

Recommendations from the
Maryland Smart Growth Subcabinet



Jacob R. Day, Secretary



Rebecca L. Flora, Secretary

The Smart Growth Subcabinet acknowledges and thanks the members of the Historic Complexes Disposition & Preservation Workgroup for their work in developing this report:

Workgroup Facilitators

- Carol Gilbert, Assistant Secretary, Division of Neighborhood Revitalization (NR), Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development
- Kevin Baynes, Director, State Revitalization Programs, NR, Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development
- Melissa Archer, Preservation Officer, NR, Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development

Workgroup Members

- Will Andalora, Director of Office of Facilities Management and Development, Department of Health
- Chuck Boyd, Director of Planning Coordination, Maryland Department of Planning
- Kristin R. Fleckenstein, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Department of Planning
- Elizabeth Hughes, Director of the Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Department of Planning
- Haley Lemieux, Director of Office of Policy and Research, Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development
- Catherine Mateer, Senior Acquisition Specialist, Maryland Department of General Services
- Katie Parks, Director of Community Development, Maryland Economic Development Corporation
- Wendy Scott-Napier, Assistant Secretary, Maryland Department of General Services
- Andrew Wilson, Government Affairs Specialist, Maryland Department of Planning

Figure 1: Cover image. An aerial view of Fort Howard's Officer's Cottages, Barracks, Garrison Hospital and Veterans Administration Hospital with the Chesapeake Bay in background, 1903-1943. Courtesy of Himmelrich Associates.

Address to Governor, Senate President, and Speaker of the House

On behalf of the members of the Maryland Smart Growth Subcabinet, we are pleased to transmit this report to you in response to the requirements of [SB-783](#) from the 2023 Session of the Maryland General Assembly.

SB-783 – Preservation and Reuse of Historic Complexes Study and Alterations to the Income Tax Credit for Catalytic Revitalization – charges the Smart Growth Subcabinet (SGSC) with studying and making recommendations on an implementation plan regarding the preservation and reuse of historic complexes in the state. In the Summer of 2023, the Historic Complexes Disposition & Preservation Workgroup (the Workgroup) was convened to make recommendations to the SGSC.

Led by staff from the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the Workgroup also included representation from the Department of Planning (MDP), Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), Department of General Services (DGS), the Department of Health (MDH) and the Maryland Economic Development Corporation (MEDCo) and met regularly between September through November of this year. The Workgroup presented draft recommendations to the SGSC at its October 17, 2023 meeting and final recommendations at its December 1, 2023 meeting. This report reflects those recommendations.

Thank you for your review of this report. We look forward to continuing to work with interested elected officials and agency leaders to move these recommendations forward.

Sincerely,



A handwritten signature in blue ink that appears to read "JD".

Jake Day, Secretary
Maryland Department of Housing
and Community Development



A handwritten signature in blue ink that appears to read "RF".

Rebecca Flora, Secretary
Maryland Department of Planning

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction and Executive Summary	2
2.0 Context and Progress	6
3.0 Relevant Studies and Publications.....	10
4.0 State Property Disposition Processes.....	14
5.0 Stakeholder Input	17
6.0 Preliminary Framework for Assessing Development Potential.....	18
7.0 Appendices	28
Appendix A – SB783	28
Appendix B – Advancing the Preservation and Reuse of Maryland’s Historic Properties: Status of Recommendations as of 10/5/23	29
Appendix C – State/Federal Complex Inventory.....	33
Appendix D – State Clearinghouse Disposition Process.....	35
Appendix E – Stakeholder List for Input	36

1.0 Introduction and Executive Summary

In accordance with SB-783 (Appendix A), the Maryland Smart Growth Subcabinet is presenting this report to help guide the next steps in addressing the significant stabilization and preservation needs and economic potential of Maryland’s “excess” historic complexes and sites. These at-risk sites are either not yet disposed of or, in some cases, have transferred to a local government or the private sector.

These historic sites represent a set of irreplaceable structures and landscapes that are either listed in or likely eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. While their former use varies – mental health “asylums,” hospitals, and military armories and bases – they have all fallen into significant disrepair. The passage in 2021 of the Catalytic Revitalization Tax Credit ([SB-885](#)) housed in the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the expansion of the Maryland Historical Trust’s Revitalization Tax Credit in 2023 are important milestones that have been achieved to reclaim the economic potential of these sites. But more is needed.

After review of past recommendations and milestones on this topic (dating back to 2019), the overarching observation of the SGSC Workgroup members is that these historic complexes need earlier intensive assessment and stabilization while they are in state ownership so that they can remain physically viable for preservation and economic reuse by other parties. A number of sites that have transferred to other owners still require special effort and funding for stabilization and rehabilitation because earlier intervention and stabilization was not conducted. In a few unfortunate cases, certain sites may be past the point-of-no-return and are candidates for demolition. Earlier assessments and stabilization would help avoid such outcomes.

Another overarching observation is that state agencies do not consistently maintain an inventory of their historic buildings and complexes, such that assets that are 50 or more years of age are prioritized for stabilization and evaluation of potential eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Such an ongoing “by agency” list would be very helpful to identifying priority sites for stabilization and repurposing as well as assessment for potential National Register determination.

A third key observation is that stabilization of these properties (as early as feasible) presents an opportunity for workforce training in the preservation trades. Nonprofits such as Preservation Maryland have developed extensive training curriculum that could assist.

A fourth and final overarching observation is that some of these state-owned or formerly publicly-owned complexes have potential for supporting new residential development. Because of the urgent need to increase housing for the state's workforce in support of the state's continued economic development, it is important to encourage a mix of affordable and market rate housing at these and other state-owned sites.

The ten priority recommendations below arose from discussion of the status of the comprehensive set of recommendations made in the 2020 report entitled, "[Advancing the Preservation and Reuse of Maryland's Historic Complexes](#)." While there is a cost to act, it is important to note that there is also a cost for not acting as state agencies continue to struggle with the mothballing of aging structures or are called upon by new owners to invest in their substantial rehabilitation needs.

Summary Recommendations:

1. Establish a Historic Property Disposition & Preservation team (HPDP) with dedicated staff and funding to evaluate the condition of state-owned historic properties, conduct relevant surveys or environmental studies, conduct stabilization and mothballing activities and work closely with DGS's real estate division during the ensuing disposition process.
 - Formalize a HPDP Advisory Committee to guide and support the work of the Office and report progress to the SGSC.
 - The HPDP Advisory Committee should work in the near term to recommend where the HPDP staff team should be housed, considering state agencies and also potential partners in the nonprofit and quasi-government sectors.
 - The HPDP Advisory Committee will also work in the near term to recommend an initial scope of work and budget for the HPDP team.
2. Require state agencies to produce and maintain a list of buildings and sites they own that are more than 50 years old so that the new HPDP team can have a complete starting point for prioritizing physical assessments and, where appropriate, eligibility for the National Register. Develop a standard template for this inventory.

3. Where appropriate, expand incentive zones like Priority Funding Areas and Sustainable Communities to provide access to geographically targeted state funding sources.
4. Expand MHT's Maryland Historic Revitalization Tax Credit as a resource for properties that have been transferred. Expand other relevant capital sources – such as DHCD revitalization programs and MHT's Capital Grant program – in order to provide access to stabilization and predevelopment funding to these sites, particularly after disposition.
5. Encourage local governments to create local incentives for these properties – for instance property tax credits – to further incentivize stabilization, preservation and redevelopment after disposition.
6. Ensure access for eligible sites to the competitive federal New Markets Tax Credits (NMTCs) allocations by expanding CDE allocations in Maryland.
7. Encourage state agencies with substantial portfolios of buildings over the age of 50 years to create a Preservation Officer position. This position would serve as a critical liaison with the Maryland Historical Trust and assist with compliance with the Maryland Historical Trust Act and National Historic Preservation Act. DHCD and MDOT are currently the only state agencies with permanent qualified cultural resource staff that have delegated authority from MHT through Programmatic Agreements.
8. Establish points-of-contacts for coordination with MHT at agencies that don't require a full-time Preservation Officer.
9. Create partnerships that result in local workforce training and jobs for the stabilization and later renovation of these properties. Connect preservation trades training to the Governor's Office of Service to develop apprenticeships.
10. Encourage residential development at historic complexes to address the State's housing shortage, including through potential density bonuses for mixed-income housing.

The remainder of this report includes:

- Summary of past measures that have addressed this issue and a summary of the status of prior recommendations (Sections 2.0 and 3.0)
- Summary of Maryland's current disposition processes (Section 4.0)
- Summary of stakeholder input (Section 5.0)
- Snapshots of development potential of selected historic complexes (Section 6.0)

2.0 Context and Progress

Context

In 2019, the Maryland General Assembly passed [SB-741](#), requiring MDP to study the various obstacles to preserving and rehabilitating former government complexes. The Department of Planning formed a steering committee in 2020 which issued a report titled, “*Advancing the Preservation and Reuse of Maryland’s Historic Complexes.*” This report included twenty-five recommendations that are fully summarized in this report’s Appendix B.

The 2020 report proposed several changes to the Maryland Historic Revitalization Tax Credit Program, including creating a special category of tax credit that would provide a larger, “catalytic” credit to assist with the adaptive reuse of these sprawling complexes. This recommendation was modified in 2021 with the passage of SB-885 and the creation of a stand-alone tax credit called the Catalytic Revitalization Tax Credit (CRTC), now administered by DHCD.

SB-885 also required the steering committee to reconvene and make recommendations on the implementation of the 2020 report. A four-page follow-up report was submitted by MDP in December of 2021 titled “Study of the Redevelopment of Historic Government Complexes.” This report identified two recommendations from the 2020 report that were the highest priorities:

- Creation of a “Historic Properties Disposition and Preservation Team” in Maryland modeled after Rhode Island’s “Integrated Facilities Management Team.”
- Increasing appropriations for the MHT Historic Revitalization Tax Credit Program

Also, in December of 2021, DHCD made the first CRTC award to Warfield Companies to support the redevelopment of the historic Springfield Hospital Center in Sykesville, also known as Warfield (see fig. 2). The Warfield property was highlighted in the 2020 report as a case study and was largely the impetus for the initial legislation.

In 2023, DHCD made the second CRTC award to Cascade Properties, LLC to assist with the redevelopment of Fort Ritchie in Washington County. The proposed development at Fort Ritchie will create a mixed-use and mixed-income community featuring hundreds of rehabilitated and new housing units, health services, commercial and light industrial businesses in a walkable, historic setting. The development at Fort Ritchie is well underway, including the imminent rehabilitation of a historic building to become a new taproom and gathering space for local residents.

In the spring of 2023, the General Assembly passed SB-783, requiring the Smart Growth Subcabinet to create this report. The bill also implemented changes to the existing CRTC program, allowing credits to be claimed for approved phases of development. This will grant the developers earlier access to tax credit capital, catalyzing additional development of the sites. DHCD may start accepting applications for Final Certificates of approved phases in December of 2023.

Definition of “Covered Properties”

The original 2019 legislation ([SB-741](#)) defined the property scope as “*complexes or campuses consisting of multiple buildings that: (i) are or were owned by the federal government or the State; and (ii) consist of at least three discrete buildings, which may be interconnected, that encompass at least 50,000 square feet in total gross floor area located on at least 3 acres of land.*”

For the purposes of this report, the Workgroup discussed this definition and reviewed available inventories of historic properties. The Workgroup also endeavored to create a list of endangered historic buildings and complexes in order to understand, to the extent possible, the scope of future work necessary to make comprehensive assessments and related stabilization investments (Appendix C). In so doing, it became clear that agency inventories are not readily available or complete.

The Workgroup determined that the most relevant property list available was a “historic buildings inventory” created by Senator Hester’s Office in 2019 which included more than 1,200 buildings owned by DGS, DNR, MDH, and DJS.



Figure 2: Warfield Complex (Springfield State Hospital Women's Facility) known as Warfield at Historic Sykesville. Courtesy of Warfield Companies.

According to DGS, a comprehensive list of state-owned buildings – including historic buildings and complexes as a subset – does not exist. So, the Workgroup used the list prepared by Senator Hester’s office as the starting point and cross referenced it with a list of properties maintained by DGS. The Workgroup refined the list by adding state armories and removing certain properties as noted below.

The Workgroup’s focused list is not to be considered complete. It does encompass state and federal properties that are known to be poised for disposition or have recently been disposed of and: a) are likely to contain more than one structure b) are over 50 years old c) have been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register or need to be evaluated for eligibility and d) are vacant, underutilized, or are likely to be divested. In other words, we omitted single properties and complexes that were previously evaluated and are not considered “historic” by the Maryland Historical Trust or historic complexes that are in active use.

The purpose of the Workgroup’s list is to get a preliminary sense for the current number of properties that are endangered and on which a new HPDP team should focus. The Workgroup’s list was narrowed significantly to exclude two large groups of properties that are considered beyond the scope and spirit of relevant legislation: historic properties owned by the MD Department of Natural Resources (approximately 1,104 sites) and also Maryland’s K-12 schools (approximately 1,532 sites).

The Workgroup is aware that DNR owns hundreds of historic properties; however, the DNR-owned properties are excluded for the following reasons:

- DNR properties are typically rural, therefore development of those lands likely does not align with smart growth principles for rural land preservation.
- DNR’s mission includes the acquisition of rural land for preservation, and, therefore, the agency is not seeking disposal of properties.



Figure 3: Crisfield Armory, 2023. Courtesy of Crisfield City Hall.

- In 2023, the Maryland General Assembly passed the Great Maryland Outdoors Act which provides funding for planning and capital improvements to help address DNR's property inventory.

The list also excludes state K-12 schools because schools are under local control and have not, nor will likely ever be owned by the state or federal government. There is also a separate school disposition process that is outlined in section 4.0 of this report.

Some properties, particularly federal properties, may be missing from the Workgroup's list due to lack of available data. The Workgroup reached out to the U.S. Department of General Services to inquire about federally owned property in Maryland but did not receive a response. *To the best of our knowledge at this time, the Workgroup list that is attached as Appendix C represents the extent of historic complexes that are either still owned by the state and federal government or were previously disposed of and remain in disrepair.*

In total the Workgroup identified ten state or federally-owned complexes and eleven disposed of complexes that are threatened due to their physical condition. These complexes range from a circa 1870s tuberculosis hospital owned by the Department of Juvenile Services, to the mid-century modern State Center Complex in Baltimore City dating to 1959 (see fig. 4).



Figure 4: State Center Complex. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning.

3.0 Relevant Studies and Publications

The most relevant and comprehensive prior publication is the 2020 report titled “*Advancing the Preservation and Reuse of Maryland’s Historic Complexes*.” This report was prepared by a team of consultants and directed by a Steering Committee chaired by MDP. Status of this report’s recommendations are summarized in Appendix B.

The 2020 report made 25 recommendations that are organized into the following five broad categories:

- MD Historic Revitalization Tax Credit and other state incentive programs
- Pre-Disposition Due Diligence and Planning
- Historic Preservation Easements
- Codes, Standards and Historic Rehabilitation Treatments
- Conveyance Strategies and Terms

Of the 25 recommendations, six have already been implemented and require no further action. Of the remaining recommendations under consideration, the Workgroup identified the following measures as having the highest priority for implementation:

- Recommendation 1.2- Provide an option for (local) property tax abatement in addition to tax increment financing.
- Recommendation 1.3- Take advantage of opportunities to expand zones/designations.
- Recommendation 1.4- Increase funding for the Strategic Demolition Fund and improve access to this fund for divested government-owned properties.
- Recommendation 1.5- Support the development of Maryland-only Community Development Entities that maximize the use of the federal New Market Tax Credits Program.
- Recommendation 2.4- Establish a dedicated state-level Historic Complex Disposition Team.

Most significant of these is the creation or expansion of a state unit to be responsible for evaluating and overseeing the disposition planning of historic state complexes. This recommendation dates back to 2020 and has not been implemented due to the need to have sufficient dedicated staff capacity and funding.

The recommendations involving incentives are key to redeveloping the eleven complexes that have already been divested from state ownership but have not yet been fully redeveloped and need additional assistance to move forward. Ultimately the Workgroup's consideration of past recommendations and other issues have resulted in the following set of updated priority recommendations:

Summary Recommendations:

1. Establish a Historic Property Disposition & Preservation team (HPDP) with dedicated staff and funding to evaluate the condition of state-owned historic properties, conduct relevant surveys or environmental studies, conduct stabilization and mothballing activities and work closely with DGS's real estate division during the ensuing disposition process.
 - Formalize a HPDP Advisory Committee to guide and support the work of the Office and report progress to the SGSC.
 - The HPDP Advisory Committee should work in the near term to recommend where the HPDP staff team should be housed, considering state agencies and also potential partners in the nonprofit and quasi-government sectors.
 - The HPDP Advisory Committee will also work in the near term to recommend an initial scope of work and budget for the HPDP team.
2. Require state agencies to produce and maintain a list of buildings and sites they own that are more than 50 years old so that the new HPDP team can have a complete starting point for prioritizing physical assessments and, where appropriate, eligibility for the National Register. Develop a standard template for this inventory.



Figure 5: Baltimore City Jail Warden House, 2017. Courtesy of Baltimore Heritage.

3. Where appropriate, expand incentive zones like Priority Funding Areas and Sustainable Communities to provide access to geographically targeted state funding sources.
4. Expand MHT's Maryland Historic Revitalization Tax Credit as a resource for properties that have been transferred. Expand other relevant capital sources – such as DHCD revitalization programs and MHT's Capital Grant program – in order to provide access to stabilization and predevelopment funding to these sites, particularly after disposition.
5. Encourage local governments to create local incentives for these properties – for instance property tax credits – to further incentivize stabilization, preservation and redevelopment after disposition.
6. Ensure access for eligible sites to the competitive federal New Markets Tax Credits (NMTCs) allocations by expanding CDE allocations in Maryland.
7. Encourage state agencies with substantial portfolios of buildings over the age of 50 years to create a Preservation Officer position. This position would serve as a critical liaison with the Maryland Historical Trust and assist with compliance with the Maryland Historical Trust Act and National Historic Preservation Act. DHCD and MDOT are currently the only state agencies with permanent qualified cultural resource staff that have delegated authority from MHT through Programmatic Agreements.
8. Establish points-of-contacts for coordination with MHT at agencies that don't require a full-time Preservation Officer.
9. Create partnerships that result in local workforce training and jobs for the stabilization and later renovation of these properties. Connect preservation trades training to the Governor's Office of Service to develop apprenticeships.
10. Encourage residential development at historic complexes to address the State's housing shortage, including through potential density bonuses for mixed-income housing.

DGS Building Assessment Unit

Relevant to consideration of where to house a HPDP team is the existence of the DGS Building Assessment Unit (BAU). In the distant past, the State of Maryland had a unit dedicated to the evaluation of state-owned buildings, but the unit was eliminated in the 1990s due to budget constraints.

In FY2020, the unit was reinstated as the Building Assessment Unit (BAU) located within DGS's Design, Construction and Energy Division (DCE). The BAU was not profiled in the 2020 report; however, it plays a critical role in the state's stewardship of historic properties and could be expanded to help stabilize vacated historic complexes.

Currently, the BAU serves sixteen state agencies by performing in-depth analysis of facilities, establishing a baseline of conditions and providing recommendations for improvements, code compliance, and repairs. The assessments completed by the BAU create a complete and accurate record of capital needs and better allows the state to triage the maintenance and rehabilitation needs of state buildings.

The BAU maintains an inventory of more than 1,400 structures that are on a biennial schedule to be inspected by the BAU. The assessments conducted by the BAU help provide data in support of two programs that the DCE team manages to assist agencies with building upgrades: The Critical Maintenance Program and Facility Renewal Program.

DCE manages approximately \$10-12 million annually to address critical maintenance projects; however, they have identified a backlog of 400-500 critical maintenance projects that will cost approximately \$25-35 million in total. They also manage \$30 million annually for larger “renewal” projects (projects in the \$100,000-\$5 million range). They estimate that there is a backlog of 500-600 renewal projects with costs totaling approximately \$250-\$300 million.

It is unclear to what extent the backlogs of critical maintenance and renewal projects include the historic buildings and complexes addressed in this report. Additional research is needed to identify how state agencies inventory and plan for their vacant or surplus structures. In addition, more consideration of the pros and cons of agency location for a HPDP team and partners is needed in the near term; and, development of a scope of responsibilities and staff capacity, and associated budget is needed.

4.0 State Property Disposition Processes

The Workgroup sought to summarize the current avenues for property disposition in order to identify potential gaps. Observations from this review include:

- The state does not maintain an aggregated list of historic buildings and complexes that are 50 years or older; state agencies don't maintain their own such lists.
- The disposition process for these aged complexes happens too late to more affordably arrest physical decline.
- There is no current dedicated staff and consulting services capacity to adequately assess physical conditions and reuse potential of excess properties, nor budget to complete the necessary stabilization work.

Below are brief summaries for three main state property disposition processes. Additional information about the State Clearinghouse process is included as Appendix D. In addition, below is a brief description of Rhode Island's disposition process which was identified by the 2020 report as a best practice.

Maryland State Clearinghouse Role

The State's Clearinghouse was established in 1983 with the primary mission to determine if financial and non-financial assistance projects proposed within Maryland would be consistent with state and local policies and programs. This is accomplished by circulating requests for financial assistance, plans and development projects to state, regional and local public officials for intergovernmental review.

Additionally, the Clearinghouse serves as the intergovernmental review of state real property activities as established by various legislative actions, including Section 5-310 of the State Finance and Procurement Article, and implemented through departmental regulations as COMAR Title 34, Subtitle 2.

Overall, the disposal of State-owned real property and interests in real property are governed by:

- State Finance and Procurement Article 10-304 and 305
- State Finance and Procurement Article 5-310
- Public Safety Article 13-217 (Disposal of Armory property)
- Natural Resources Article 1-109 (Disposal of DNR property)
- Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985, as Amended
- State Finance and Procurement Article 5A-326
- BPW Advisories: 2005-3 and 2003-1



Figure 6: Elkton Armory, 2022. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development.

Maryland Armory Disposition Process

Disposition of armories follows a process similar to the State Clearinghouse process but provides a right of first refusal to counties and municipal corporations when other state agencies do not express interest during the Clearinghouse process. If the county or municipality declines to purchase, a relevant statute states that it must be sold on the open market for the highest possible price.

Maryland K-12 School Disposition Process

All Maryland K-12 school properties are governed by the regulations of the Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC). Maryland COMAR Regulations, 14.39.02.24 define “school property” as any land, school site, or school building. If a local school board determines that any school property is no longer needed for school purposes, the local board of education shall transfer the property to the county government. The local board shall submit a request to the IAC for approval to transfer the school property to the county government.

The IAC may approve, disapprove, or conditionally approve the request to transfer the school property to the county government. The local board shall affirm in the request that the county concurs with the local board’s intention to transfer the property and commits to repayment of outstanding bond debt if repayment is required. A county government may use, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of, except by gift, any former school property in accordance with IAC regulations and is encouraged to use the State Clearinghouse or similar procedures to make government agencies aware of the availability of former school property.

Disposition Models

The Historic Complex Study Report from 2020 includes an overview of Rhode Island's Integrated Facilities Management Team, itself a subdivision of the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance within the state's Department of Administration (which appears to be analogous to Maryland's Department of General Services). When a Rhode Island state agency divests a property, the Integrated Facilities Management (IFM) Team takes charge of preparing the property for sale or lease (or mothballing/maintenance) as well as the actual sale or lease. In short, the IFM Team is a dedicated subdivision within the state government whose main role is to facilitate the stewardship of such properties, regardless of their ultimate fate.

Notably, the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance and the IFM Team are fairly new, having been established in 2017. According to Maryland's 2020 Historic Complex Study, Rhode Island seems to lean toward leasing unused state complexes rather than selling them outright, which gives the state a revenue source. This method was also used by Fairfax County, Virginia for the former Lorton Prison complex summarized below.

A highly touted redevelopment project that Rhode Island has taken on in recent years is the rehabilitation/redevelopment of the Pastore Center in Cranston. Formerly a state prison (first opened in 1878) and mental hospital, the 325-acre complex with dozens of buildings was largely abandoned and neglected for many years until the state began a \$45 million redevelopment project in 2011. Today, the complex houses many of Rhode Island's state agencies and departments, including the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance. While this project did not involve a sale or lease to a private developer, it was a major undertaking that turned a largely abandoned and decrepit state campus into a valuable asset that contributes significantly to the surrounding economy.

There are a few other examples of successful reuse or redevelopment of state-owned complexes mentioned in the Historic Complex Study Report. Of particular note is the former Lorton Prison in Fairfax County, VA. To redevelop this campus, beginning in the early 2000s, Fairfax County entered into a long-term ground lease with a developer and contributed approximately \$13 million toward infrastructure improvements. The complex now is home to more than 300 housing units and 60,000 square feet of commercial/retail space.

5.0 Stakeholder Input

The Workgroup consisted of the following agencies in order to solicit stakeholder agency input: Maryland Department of Planning, Maryland Historical Trust, Department of General Services, Maryland Department of Health, and the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development. The Workgroup met ten times between September and November 2023 and also held an input session with Preservation Maryland.

At the meeting with Preservation Maryland, the Workgroup reviewed the summary list of recommendations from the 2020 report and asked for input on priorities as well as other recommendations not covered by the 2020 report. Preservation Maryland emphasized the need for the State to fundamentally change how agencies view these complexes and treat them as assets worthy of investment. The key takeaways from our conversation include:

- The state needs to make a commitment to either create a state unit dedicated to addressing these issues and/or fund other entities to do this work.
- The Governor's Office of Service should be engaged to identify opportunities to support stabilization of government complexes through workforce development apprenticeship programs and/or training workshops.
- Preservation Maryland's Campaign for the Historic Trades (modeled after the National Park Service's successful workforce development program called Traditional Trades Advancement Program) could serve as a conduit for preservation work crews to complete critical stabilization work on historic state properties. The program was recently approved by the Maryland Department of Labor as the first registered state apprenticeship program.
- There is consensus across the development community that the appropriation for the Maryland Historical Trust's Historic Revitalization Tax Credit should be increased. Preservation Maryland believes increasing the appropriation is more important than removing the cap or "carving out" credits for state complexes.

Additional outreach to stakeholders, developers, and property stewards is necessary to further refine the recommendations and concepts in this report. The workgroup created a list (Appendix E) of other stakeholders that should be engaged for additional consultation in the coming year.

6.0 Preliminary Framework for Assessing Development Potential

In order to understand what sources of information are available, relevant or required when assessing a site's development potential, the Workgroup determined it would be a helpful exercise to develop "snapshots" for four sample sites. A two-stage assessment of the properties was performed.

The "Phase 1" assessment applies the Growth and Conservation Criteria (GCC) ([page 7 of the Capital Budget Guide](#)) that DBM uses when evaluating proposed capital projects. This first stage assessment utilized an interactive mapping tool [Growth & Conservation Overlay Tool](#) for each site. The "Phase 2" assessment examines local development policies to determine consistency with local plans and allowed development potential under existing local laws and regulations.

In conducting this "sample" of assessments, it is observed that this very preliminary overview is within the capability of current state staff. However, drilling down to assessing physical rehabilitation needs, costs, and economic redevelopment potential requires substantial additional capacity that is not within current state budget capacity.

Phase 1 and 2 assessments include:

Phase 1 Assessment: Growth Policy Criteria

- Policy Planning Area (Targeted Area, Established Community, Large Lot or Rural Resources)
- Priority Preservation for Agriculture Overlay (Yes or No)
- Natural Resource Overlay (Yes or No)
- Water Resource Overlay (Yes or No)
- Historic & Cultural Overlay (Yes or No)
- Climate Change Impact Overlay (Yes or No)
- CRAB Area (Yes or No)



Figure 7: Exterior of Towson Armory, a former National Guard Armory building.
Courtesy of Towson University.

Phase 2 Assessment: Development Potential Criteria

- PFA (Inside or Outside)
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use
- Zoning (Suggest we use the Generalized Zoning if you can)
- Sewer Service Area (served, planned or not planned)
- Water Service Area (served, planned or not planned)
- A general summary statement on the type of development allowed on the site.



Figure 8: Interior of Towson Armory, a former National Guard Armory building.
Courtesy of Towson University.

DBM Growth and Conservation Criteria (GCC)

Per [DBM's Guide](#), the GCC for Capital Budgeting requires State investments to encourage sustainable growth. The guidance is very relevant for consideration of historic complexes and includes:

Under the Local and State Targeted Growth and Conservation Areas, Maryland will be able to better coordinate the smart growth efforts and programs of State government. The Smart Growth Subcabinet agencies collaborate with local governments to identify locations where targeted investments can promote growth and protect other areas where preservation and conservation should be a priority. DBM has developed GCC Guidelines for capital budgeting. All State agencies must consider these guidelines in their capital budget requests when prioritizing projects to be funded and when siting new capital projects.

GCC Guidelines for Capital Budgeting are:

- Use State investment in capital improvements to encourage development, redevelopment, and economic growth in locations best suited to accommodate growth and achieve GCC goals and objectives.
- Minimize State investments that may compromise or damage historic, cultural, and natural resources or environmentally sensitive lands. Encourage use or rehabilitation of available existing historic buildings where practicable and feasible when allocating State resources for capital projects.
- State-funded capital improvements for new construction will be guided by departmental plans and consistent with GCC goals. To the extent practicable, State capital investments should be made according to the following priority sequence:

- Protection of public health and safety.
- Infrastructure maintenance and system preservation.
- Redevelopment, enhancement improvements, and capacity expansions in Targeted Growth and Revitalization Planning Areas.
- Enhancement improvements in Established Community Areas in Priority Funding Areas (PFAs).
- Enhancement improvements in communities outside PFAs.

Coast Smart Construction Program: [DBM's Capital Budget Guide on page 8 states:](#)

The Coast Smart Construction Program was developed by the Coast Smart Council under authority provided in Section 3-1001:1018 of the Natural Resources article. The program establishes siting and design criteria to address sea level rise and coastal flood impacts on capital projects. All State and local capital projects that are at least 50 percent funded with State funds and have a total project cost of \$500,000 or more must be constructed in compliance with the Coast Smart Construction Program siting and design criteria. These criteria apply to all capital projects that include construction or reconstruction of a structure, or the construction of a highway facility. The Local and State Targeted Growth and Conservation Areas interactive map provides an initial screening of whether the location of the capital project is within the Coast Smart-Climate Ready Action Boundary (CS-CRAB). For those projects initially identified as "CRAB - Yes" in the interactive map, a more detailed CS-CRAB Interactive GIS Map can assist agencies in screening projects. Agencies can access the [Coast Smart Construction Program](#) and [Project Screening Form](#) and [the Coast Smart CRAB map](#) on the OCB website, with additional information found on the [Coast Smart Council website](#).

Development Potential of Historic Complexes: Sample Assessments

Pikesville Armory, Baltimore County

The Pikesville Armory is Maryland's second oldest armory building, dating to 1903 (see fig. 9-12). It was constructed for use by the 110th Field Artillery, a horse artillery unit of the Maryland National Guard. The Armory has been targeted for redevelopment by the nonprofit Pikesville Armory Foundation, which has worked extensively with community stakeholders to create a vision for redevelopment of the site which is estimated at just over \$100 million. The plan calls for the site to be developed as a multi-purpose center for recreation, art, and other community programming. While the site could accommodate a significant amount of housing, that use is not envisioned at this time. MHT holds an historic preservation easement on the site. While rehabilitation costs will be significant due to the large amount of square footage across five primary structures, most of the buildings are relatively stable.

Growth Policy Criteria

- Policy Planning Area: Targeted growth and revitalization
- Priority Preservation for Agriculture Overlay: No
- Natural Resource Overlay: No
- Water Resource Overlay: No
- Historic & Cultural Overlay: Yes
- Climate Change Impact Overlay: No
- CRAB Area: No

Development Potential Criteria

- PFA: Inside
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use: Institution
- Zoning: Medium Density Residential (Gen Zoning) / DR 5.5 (Actual)
- Sewer Service Area: S-1-existing service
- Water Service Area: W-1-existing service



Figure 9: An aerial view of Pikesville Armory. Courtesy of Pikesville Armory Foundation.



Figure 10: *Pikesville Armory*. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning – Maryland Historical Trust.



Figure 11: *Pikesville Armory's NCO Club*. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning – Maryland Historical Trust.



Figure 12: *Pikesville Armory's Admin. Building 2 (Bernard D. Merson Building)*. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning – Maryland Historical Trust.

Fort Ritchie, Washington County

Fort Ritchie was established in 1926 as a Maryland National Guard summer training camp (see fig. 13-16). During World War II it became a critical Military Intelligence Training Center where Jewish refugees, Japanese Nisei, and other specially trained troops learned battlefield intelligence, interrogation, surveillance and other related skills.

In 1998, Fort Ritchie military base in Cascade was closed as part of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) recommendations. Because of its previous use as a military base on which military households lived, the area mimics that of a small town. Available infrastructure in the area includes public water, public sewer, natural gas, and a private internal road network. MHT holds an historic preservation easement on a portion of the property.

To help facilitate the redevelopment of the site, the County rezoned the land encompassing the former Fort with a Special Economic Development district. It is also located in part of Foreign Trade Zone. Since its closure, the former base has had a variety of groups interested in redevelopment. The property is now privately owned and being redeveloped through public and private investment. The principal function of a Special Economic Development District is to provide a mixed-use zoning classification. Because of the nature of the facility and past developmental patterns, a mixed-use designation helps optimize the overall land use potential.

There are numerous structures on the site that are currently being renovated and adapted for modern use such as Lakeside Hall (former officers club), the Castle (former Colonel's headquarters), the former youth center, dining hall, post exchange, and commissary. The site's historic buildings have different levels of physical condition; the more modern era buildings are in good condition. The site also includes a significant amount of existing rental housing which the owner recently rehabilitated. New infill housing is planned to include homeownership opportunities. While the site is surrounded by rural lands, its relatively close access to job centers in and around Hagerstown are a positive factor for the viability of redevelopment.



Figure 13: *Fort Ritchie Finger Buildings*. Courtesy of Ritchie History Museum.

Growth Policy Criteria

- Policy Planning Area: Targeted Growth and Revitalization
- Priority Preservation for Agriculture Overlay: No
- Natural Resource Overlay: Yes
- Water Resource Overlay: Yes
- Historic & Cultural Overlay: None identified
- Climate Change Impact Overlay: No
- CRAB Area: No

Development Potential Criteria

- PFA: Inside
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use: SED (Special Economic Development)
- Zoning: Mixed Use under Generalized Zoning
- Sewer Service Area: Private Service
- Water Service Area: Private Service



Figure 14: Fort Ritchie Finger Buildings. Courtesy of Ritchie History Museum.



Figure 15: Fort Ritchie History Museum. Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development.



Figure 16: Castle of Fort Ritchie, Military Intelligence Training Center during WWII (former Colonel's headquarters). Courtesy of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development.

Fort Howard, Baltimore County

Fort Howard is a community in far southeast Baltimore County on the end of a peninsula. It shares a name with the county park it neighbors, which was originally a War of 1812 era defensive fort until it was transferred from the federal government in the 1970s. The site has breathtaking views of the water. Buildings include a large five-story former VA hospital (see fig. 1 & 17) built in the 1940s which is in significant disrepair. The site also includes a number of supporting buildings such as a former bakery building. Potential challenges to redevelopment include its geographic location at the end of a fairly narrow road, climate factors related to sea level rise, and low-density existing zoning. The developer is currently working towards zoning changes that would allow more residential density.

Growth Policy Criteria

- Policy Planning Area: Established Community
- Priority Preservation for Agriculture Overlay: No
- Natural Resource Overlay: Yes, slight overlap from Fort Howard Park
- Water Resource Overlay: No
- Historic & Cultural Overlay: No
- Climate Change Impact Overlay: Yes
- CRAB Area: Yes

Development Potential Criteria

- PFA: Inside
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use: Not Included
- Zoning: Medium Density Residential
(Gen Zoning): DR1 – 1 unit/acre (actual)
- Sewer Service Area: S-1 (existing)
- Water Service Area: W-1 (existing)



Figure 17: The Fort Howard Veterans Administration Hospital campus, 2022. Courtesy of Himmelrich Associates.

Glenn Dale Hospital, Prince George's County

The Glenn Dale Hospital site was originally a Tuberculosis Hospital and Sanatorium opened in the 1930s (see fig. 18-23). It is located at 5201 Glenn Dale Road within the boundaries of the municipality of Glenn Dale, an ethnically diverse community of moderate-income households and in almost entirely single-family homes, 70% of which were built after 2000.

The 210-acre former hospital was conveyed by the District of Columbia to M-NCPPC in 1995 and consists of 21 buildings concentrated in the central portion of the property. Construction of the hospital buildings dates from 1933 to 1959. The hospital was operational until 1982, and the buildings are currently vacant. Many are severely deteriorated.

In 1994, prior to the formal conveyance of the property to M-NCPPC, the Maryland General Assembly approved House Bill-113 requiring that 150 undeveloped acres of the property be retained as park land. Surrounding parcels provide opportunity for aggregation into an even larger parcel for development and/or for more open space.

The property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2018, thereby enabling a potential developer to access state and federal historic tax credits to offset the costs of adaptive reuse and renovation.

According to the 2010 [Master Plan: Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham and Vicinity Approved Sector Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment](#),

"The former Glenn Dale Hospital property is adjacent to the 70-acre former USDA Plant Introduction Site, the 15.5-acre Dudley property and 4.5-acre Sampson property (See Map 12 on page 95). Together, these properties form a unique opportunity to create a new 240-acre park to serve residents of the surrounding Glenn Dale, Seabrook, and Lanham communities and Prince George's County. The regional park would also provide a passive and open space setting for a future CCRC. M-NCPPC is currently seeking the conveyance of the USDA property. The Dudley and Sampson properties form future acquisition opportunities. Coordinating park facility planning, design, and



Figure 18: An aerial view of The Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Adult Hospital and Sanitarium, 2016. Courtesy of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC).

programming for the former Glenn Dale Hospital property and adjoining USDA and private properties will be essential, including the potential development of an internally located and privately managed CCRC.

Pursuant to HB 113, M-NCPPC may in the future release a Request for Proposal (RFP) seeking a qualified CCRC developer. The RFP would address both the relationship of the subject 60-acre CCRC development opportunity with the surrounding future park and the results and potential application of the preliminary National Register nomination.” (p. 94)

Growth Policy Criteria

- Policy Planning Area (Established Community)
- Priority Preservation for Agriculture Overlay: No
- Natural Resource Overlay: No
- Water Resource Overlay: No
- Historic & Cultural Overlay
(Yes, the site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the inventory of Maryland Historic resources)
- Climate Change Impact Overlay: No
- CRAB Area: No

Development Potential Criteria

- PFA: Inside
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use: Rural and Agriculture
- Zoning: O/S
- Sewer Service Area: Existing community service
- Water Service Area: W-3 community service



Figure 19: Exterior of a building on the campus of Glenn Dale Hospital, 2016. Courtesy of M-NCPPC.



Figure 22: Interior of a building on the campus of Glenn Dale Hospital, 2016. Courtesy of M-NCPPC.



Figure 20: Glenn Dale Hospital, 2015. Courtesy of Preservation Maryland.



Figure 21: A building on the campus of Glenn Dale Hospital, 2015. Courtesy of Preservation Maryland.



Figure 23: Glenn Dale Hospital, 2015. Courtesy of Preservation Maryland.

7.0 Appendices

Appendix A – SB783

(a) The Smart Growth Subcabinet established under § 9–1406 of the State Government Article shall study and make recommendations about an implementation plan to address the preservation and reuse of historic complexes in the State.

(b) In conducting the study and making the recommendations, the Smart Growth Subcabinet shall:

1. Evaluate relevant studies and publications;
2. Analyze the economic impact of the implementation plan;
3. Identify regulatory and policy issues for the implementation plan;
4. and solicit input from interested parties including:
 - i. government agencies; and
 - ii. relevant public and private organizations.

(c) On or before December 31, 2023, the Smart Growth Subcabinet shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly.

Appendix B – Advancing the Preservation and Reuse of Maryland’s Historic Properties: Status of Recommendations as of 10/5/23

- 1. Adopt New Provisions in the Maryland Historic Revitalization Tax Credit Specifically Targeted to Divested Government-Owned Complexes:** Adjust existing programs to ‘move the needle’ on financing the redevelopment of divested historic complexes:

	Recommendation	Status	Next Steps
1.1.1	Provide incentives in the MD Historic Revitalization Tax Credit program specifically targeted to the redevelopment of state-owned historic complexes by eliminating the per project and annual appropriation dollar caps.	2022 legislation increased, but did not eliminate, per project caps to \$5M for all types of projects and increased the annual competitive commercial appropriation to \$20M annually.	Follow the FY25 budget process and advocate for an increase to the annual appropriation.
1.1.2	Increase the MD Historic Revitalization Tax Credit by 5 percentage points from 20% to 25% for divested government-owned historic complexes.	No action taken.	No further action.
1.1.3	Establish a “catalytic category” in the MD Historic Revitalization Tax Credit program patterned after Ohio’s state historic tax credit.	Stand alone “Catalytic Tax Credit” providing \$15M to a single project every two years was created at DHCD during 2021 legislative session.	DHCD has prepared legislation for the 2024 session of the MGA that would further improve the utility of the catalytic tax credit.
1.1.4	Permit the MD historic revitalization tax credit to be transferred by developers to third parties.	Accomplished in 2020 legislative session	No further action needed.
1.2	Provide an option for property tax abatement in addition to tax increment financing.	If there is to be an exemption from property taxes to incentivize redevelopment of historic complexes, the exemption will have to be enacted by the General Assembly. Rather than a blanket exemption authorization for these types of projects, consideration on a case-by-case basis is likely desirable. The 2021 Committee observed that a property tax abatement for these historic complexes could serve as a disincentive, since the economic return to the state resulting from redevelopment of these properties is often described as an increase in state and local tax revenues. No action taken.	Decision on whether or not to explore this legislative action should be taken on a case by case basis in advance of deaccessioning by the state. This analysis should be part of the planning process for each property.

1.3	Take advantage of opportunities to expand zones/designations.	Opportunity zones, enterprise zones, sustainable community and PFA designations were reviewed by the 2021 Committee. The Committee agreed that seeking to expand opportunity or enterprise zones to encompass these types of complexes would not be significantly impactful.	The DHCD Revitalization Zone mapping tool shows that Glenn Dale Hospital, Tome School, and Warfield are already in PFAs; all but Glenn Dale are in sustainable communities. Expansion of the sustainable communities' designation to include historic state government complexes may be desirable in order to secure access to DHCD's Community Legacy and Strategic Demolition Fund programs. This action must be approved by the Smart Growth Subcabinet. Explore legislative expansion of PFA designation to include historic state government complexes so that "sustainable community" designation may be sought and access to DHCD's Community Legacy and Strategic Demolition Fund programs may be secured.
1.4	Increase funding for the Strategic Demolition Fund and improve access to this fund for divested government-owned properties.	The 2021 Committee considered whether a legislative change should be made to allow for-profit entities to access these funds but decided against this approach as there is a path already for developers to partner with or create their own CDCs that may apply for these funds. In FY 2021, DHCD's statewide SDF budget increased from \$3,400,000 to 7,500,000. Further increases were seen in FY2022 and FY2023 reaching a high of \$9,000,00, but in FY2024 the program was cut to \$5,000,000, half of which was restricted to special projects through legislation.	Follow the FY25 budget process and advocate for increased funding for SDF Statewide and elimination of legislatively restricted funds.
1.5	Support the development of Maryland-only Community Development Entities that maximize the use of the federal New Market Tax Credits Program.	Federal NMTCs are available only to projects located in low-income census tracts. None of the historic state government complexes under review in 2021 are located in these areas. The 2021 Committee determined that the cost and effort necessary to create a CDE capable of leveraging NMTCs – which may or may not be beneficial to future projects – was not a priority at that time.	No action at this time.
1.6	Explore the creation of a MD New Markets Tax Credit Program.	Senator Hester took the lead on this recommendation. While viewed as having value, the 2021 Committee decided to defer until 2023 or later in order to focus legislative efforts on improvements to the Historic Revitalization Tax Credit Program instead.	No action at this time.

1.7	Explore the creation of a PACE program targeting the use of private capital to finance rehabilitation and remediation of formerly state-owned historic complexes.	MD-PACE program expanded during 2021 legislative session to include resiliency and environmental remediation projects, such as lead paint removal and asbestos remediation.	No further action.
1.8	Explore partnering with Preservation Maryland and its recently launched Campaign for Historic Trades.	No action. To be explored by the Historic Property Disposition Team as per former Sec. Holt memo dated 9/21/21.	Revisit opportunity to partner with Preservation Maryland on this initiative following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.

2. Pre-Disposition Due Diligence and Planning: To expedite disposition of historic complexes in a cost-effective manner and generate value to Maryland, a consistent, adequately funded approach should be established:

	Recommendation	Status	Next Steps
2.1	Use or rehabilitation of available existing historic buildings instead of acquisition, new construction or leasing when practical as mandated by the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985 ("the Act").	No action	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
2.2	Conduct preservation maintenance, including mothballing to limit asset degradation per the Act.	No action	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
2.3	Conduct historic property surveys, condition assessments, monitoring and reporting.	No action	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
2.4	Establish a dedicated state-level Historic Complex Disposition Team.	Former DHCD Secretary Holt seeks to create this team via memo dated 9/21/21.	Establish Team responsive to requirements of SB783.
2.5	Adequately fund due-diligence and pre-disposition planning.	No action	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
2.6	Mandate timelines and standards for planning redevelopment.	No action	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.

3. MHT Easement Program: Build upon recommendations set forth in MHT's December 2018 Report on historic easements:

	Recommendation	Status	Next Steps
3.1	Revise if, when, and how historic easements are formulated – target formulation during due diligence and planning phase prior to conveyance.	Ongoing	Currently considered on a case by case basis as properties are surplused. No action needed.

3.2	Formulate a preservation or mitigation strategy to satisfy the needs and conditions of individual properties.	Ongoing	Currently considered on a case by case basis as properties are surplus. No action needed.
------------	---	---------	---

4. Codes, Standards, and Historic Rehabilitation Treatments: It is important to resolve potential conflicts among codes, historic preservation requirements, and Historic Revitalization Tax Credit guidelines prior to conveyance. Doing so streamlines compliance for the developer.

	Recommendation	Status	Next Steps
4.1	Establish project-specific guide to codes, standards, and historic rehabilitation treatments.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
4.2	Prepare a thermal and moisture protection model of a representative building as part of the pre-disposition planning process.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
4.3	Determine in the pre-disposition phase the extent of deterioration and whether dangerous conditions, distinct life-safety risk, or substantial structural damage exists, on a per building basis.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
4.4	Prepare in the pre-design phase a Fire and Life Safety assessment with guidance for the expected range of occupancies.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.

5. Conveyance Strategies and Terms: Maryland should formulate a disposition strategy, utilizing a variety of conveyance mechanism:

	Recommendation	Status	Next Steps
5.1	Explore ground leasing historic complexes as the state's preferred conveyance.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.
5.2	When the state or a locality invests in a redevelopment project, sales agreements or long-term leases can be structured for potential back end participation in the financial success of the project.	No action; to be considered on a case by case basis.	Revisit following re-establishment of Historic Property Disposition Team.

Appendix C – State/Federal Complex Inventory

State/Federal Property- potentially threatened

Property Name	Address/Area	City	Building Dates	Status	MHIP	Ownership/Agency	Notes
Waterloo Barracks	7751 Washington Blvd.	Jessup	1938	Partially vacant	HO-569	MSP	NR Eligible
Charles H. Hickey, Jr. School	9700 Old Harford Road	Parkville	1910	Partially vacant	BA-2182	DJS	Not Evaluated
Victor Cullen Center	6000 Cullen Dr.	Sabillasville	1907	Partially vacant	F-6-21	DJS	Former TB hospital; one building listed in NR (F-6-21B)
Fort Howard	9500 North Point Road	Baltimore	1900-1955	Vacant	BA-939	VA	NR Eligible
Catonsville Readiness Center	130 Mellor Avenue	Catonsville	1951	Vacant	BA-3300	State of Maryland	NR Eligible
Greenbelt Maryland National Guard Armory	7100 Greenbelt Road	Greenbelt	1955	Unknown	PG:67-36	State of Maryland	NR Eligible
State Center	201 W Preston St.	Baltimore City Council	1960	Occupied		State of Maryland	Not Surveyed
Springfield Hospital Center	6655 Sykesville Road	Sykesville	1898-1950	Partially vacant	CARR-1197	MDH	Not Evaluated
Greenridge Y.C.	10700 Fifteen Mile Creek Rd.	Flinstone	1932-1997	Unknown	AL-I-A-055	DJS	NR Eligible
Tome School for Boys	On Bainbridge Naval Training Center Site	Port Deposit	1900-1905	Vacant	CE-1285	Bainbridge Development Corp.	NR Listed, but integrity of district has been compromised

Former State/Federal Property- potentially threatened

Property Name	Address/Area	City	Building Dates	Status	MHIP	Ownership/Agency	Notes
Elkton Armory	101 Railroad Ave.	Elkton	1915	Vacant	CE-1035	Town of Elkton	NR Listed; Easement
La Plata Armory	14 W. Hawthorne Road	La Plata	1951	Vacant	CH-548	Charles County	NR Eligible
Crisfield Armory	99 E. Main Street	Crisfield	1927	Vacant- rehab planned	S-118	City of Crisfield	NR Listed; Easement
Old National Guard Armory	300 Second Street	Pocomoke City	1924	Vacant	WO-391	Pocomoke City	Contributes to NR District
Pikesville Armory	610 Reisterstown Road	Pikesville	1903	Vacant- rehab planned	BA-2080	Pikesville Armory Foundation, Inc.	NR Listed
Spring Grove Hospital	55 Wade Avenue	Catonsville	1878-1953	Partially vacant	BA-2319	UMBC	NR Eligible
Warfield Complex	6933 Warfield Ave.	Sykesville	1898-1939	Rehab in progress	CARR-1643	Warfield Companies	NR
Crownsville Hospital	1520 Crownsville Road	Crownsville	1913-1959	Vacant	AA-961	Anne Arundel Co.	NR Eligible
Camp Ritchie	25009 Lake Wastler Drive	Cascade	1926-1945	Rehab in progress	WA-IV-262	Cascade Properties LLC	NR Eligible; Easement
Glenn Dale Hospital	5201 Glenn Dale Road	Glenn Dale	1933-1931	Vacant	PG:70-50	MNCPPC	NR Listed
Pocomoke Armory	300 Second Street	Pocomoke City	1972	Vacant	WO-187	Pocomoke City	Contributes to NR District

Appendix D – State Clearinghouse Disposition Process

Summary of Property Disposition Process (Provided by DGS Office of Real Estate)

1. The controlling agency informs DGS Office of Real Estate (ORE) that the property is excess to its needs and requests that DGS ORE dispose of the property.
2. Clearinghouse review is requested for all disposals in fee simple and for those disposals that meet the criteria of BPW Advisory 2003-1. Other disposals are reviewed through the Clearinghouse process on a case-by-case basis.
3. As needed, site visits and evaluations are done to determine the condition of the property. Discussions are held with the controlling agency to determine the timeline of the disposal.
4. Once Clearinghouse review is completed and a recommendation made, appraisals are procured according to BPW Advisory 2005-3. Appraisals are required according to guidelines and statute and are the responsibility of the disposing agency. Appraisals are procured using the DGS ORE Valuation Unit standard scope of work and with the guidance of the Valuation Unit / Appraisal Chief.
5. Any due diligence items (i.e. environmental studies, survey, etc.) requested by the potential acquiring entity is done.
6. Upon Clearinghouse recommendation, an agenda item requesting approval from the Board of Public Works to declare the property either excess to the needs of the controlling agency or surplus to the needs of the State is prepared and scheduled for the next available Board meeting. Excess to the needs of the agency if the property will be transferred to another State agency. Surplus to the needs of the State if it will be transferred out of State ownership.
7. If property is to be sold out of State ownership, and no acquiring entity is identified during the Clearinghouse review, then the property is offered for sale through an Invitation for Bids (IFB) process.
8. If a property is subject to the Maryland Historical Trust Act and SF&P 5A 325-326, DGS ORE and the disposing agency consult with MHT regarding necessary steps to abide by these requirements. MHT holds negotiations with the acquiring entity as part of the transfer process. If the property is being sold through an IFB, MHT coordinates with DGS ORE to meet with potential purchasers and establish the MHT requirements. This may necessitate a Request for Proposals process rather than an IFB.
9. Once appraisals have been completed and reviewed, and a recommended value has been provided to the Assistant Secretary for Real Estate, negotiations with the acquiring entity are held. Once negotiations are concluded, an Agreement of Sale is prepared by DGS OAG.
10. Once the final terms of the transaction have been agreed, notice of the transfer is sent to the Legislature as outlined in SF&P 10-305.

11. No sooner than 45 days after legislative notice has been sent, the transaction can be scheduled for approval by the Board of Public Works.
12. Once legislative notice has been sent and prior to BPW approval of the transfer, deeds are prepared and finalized and signed by the disposing agency.
13. If the property is to be subject to an MHT Preservation Easement, that is negotiated between MHT and the acquiring entity so that approval of the Easement can be included in the BPW item. The Easement document needs to be prepared so that it can be signed by the BPW members at the same time as the deed.
14. Upon approval of the BPW, settlement is coordinated between DGS and the purchaser with review and guidance from DGS OAG.

Appendix E – Stakeholder List for Input

Government and quasi-government agencies; (in addition to workgroup)

- MEDA member agencies that are most relevant due to having a complex nearby (including Main Streets).
- MACo and MML reps

Organizations

- Preservation Maryland
- Community Development Network
- Preservation oriented developers (Cross Street Partners, Seawall, etc.)

Property Stewards

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Town of Elkton- Elkton Armory● Charles County- La Plata Armory● City of Crisfield- Crisfield Armory● Pocomoke City- Pocomoke City Armory● Baltimore County- Pikesville Armory | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● UMBC- Spring Grove Hospital● Anne Arundel County- Crownsville Hospital● Bainbridge Development Corp.- Tome School● MNCPPC- Glenn Dale Hospital |
|---|---|