



BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Public Comments

Meeting Date

Wednesday, July 22, 2026

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
80 Calvert Street
Annapolis MD 21401

Department of General Services

Agenda Item 19-CGL

Edgar Bankhead Sr.: Support

Sarah Gibson with her two children escaped slavery during the Battle of Bull Run of the American Civil War 1862; settled in Cabin John Maryland with a vision to build a church and a school where her God could be glorified. The Historic Gibson Grove property will be restored with that vision

1. The Vision

- * “Why Gibson Grove?”

- * The opportunity to preserve history while preparing future generations. Educate to Repair the ills of the oppressed and marginalized

2. The Mission

- * Education

- * Innovation

- * Healing

- * Economic mobility

3. The Master Plan

- * STEM Academic Center with the Arts

- * Research evidence based remedies

- * Innovation Center

- * Entrepreneurship Center

4. The Financial Strategy

- * Construction

- * Operations

- * \$50M Endowment

- * Long-term sustainability

5. The Partnership Strategy

- * Universities
- * NASA
- * STEM Industries
- * Foundations
- * Government
- * Faith community

6. Vision to

- * Position Gibson Grove as a model that can be replicated in communities across the state of Maryland and beyond.

We thank the Honorable(s) Senator Lee, Delegate Korman, Secretary of State Love the drafters of this LBI and our Governor Wes More.

Agenda Item 26-CGL

Leah Paley: Support

To: The Honorable Wes Moore, Governor; Brooke Lierman, Comptroller; Dereck Davis, Treasurer; Maryland Board of Public Works Members

From: Anne Arundel County Food Bank, Inc.

RE: Written Comments in Support of Funding for DGS Item 22-297 (SL-397-220-038)

The Anne Arundel County Food Bank (AACFB) respectfully requests that the Department of General Services Office of State Procurement fund DGS Item 22-297 in full (\$250,000) to support the acquisition, planning, design, construction, repair, renovation, reconstruction, site improvement, and capital equipping of the Anne Arundel County Food Bank.

Work of the Anne Arundel County Food Bank

The AACFB provides essential nutrition to families in need but also addresses food justice issues. Often, low-income families do not have access to fresh produce and lean meats, relying instead on less healthy options that are shelf-stable but low in nutritional value and high in sodium and fat. Poor health outcomes, such as heart disease and diabetes, are strongly correlated with such diets. By providing fresh options to the people we serve, the AACFB is helping to ensure

healthier outcomes. Families with access to fresh foods can prepare them according to their preferences and traditions, nourishing both body and spirit. AACFB has no membership or processing fees and has served as the only county-wide food bank in Anne Arundel since 1986.

In FY 2026 (our most recent complete fiscal year, July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026), AACFB distributed 4,819,590 pounds of food (the equivalent of 4,016,325 meals) and 146,460 pounds of non-food, including diapers, wipes, and feminine hygiene products, in collaboration with its more than 70 Network Partners operating at 115 service sites across the county, and through its direct service Mobile Pantry Program. This included 1,377,262 pounds of fresh produce and 948,964 pounds of fresh and frozen lean proteins. During this time, Food Bank operations supported an average of 51,000 individual points of service each month.

A New Home for the Anne Arundel County Food Bank

In 2004, with the shuttering of the Crownsville State Hospital, the Anne Arundel County Food Bank moved to its current location on the campus, a 30,000-square-foot structure that combines a hospital storage building completed in 1951 and the hospital's central kitchen completed in 1957.

The building, as it exists today, was never designed for use as a warehouse to manage the large quantities of resources required by a food bank, and it is now, after 70 years, also in significant disrepair. Although stopgap measures have been taken over the past 22 years to slow the decline and maintain habitability, these interventions have become increasingly costly and can never achieve the changes necessary to meet the full functionality required of a modern, efficient food bank serving county-wide needs. With this in mind, the Anne Arundel County Food Bank is undertaking the development of a new building on a different parcel of land within the boundaries of the now-named Crownsville Hospital Memorial Park. This land is being transferred from the Anne Arundel County Government to the Anne Arundel County Food Bank at no cost. The new facility will allow AACFB to deepen services and expand operations, while realizing important efficiencies and cost savings over time.

Grant Use and Impact

The \$250,000 requested in DGS Item 22-297 will cover pre-construction costs for the new building, including environmental site assessment, architectural design and renderings, engineering services, and pre-construction oversight and management.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Leah Paley, LMSW

CEO, AA County Food Bank

Agenda Item 48-IT

Elizabeth Williams: Oppose

First, a “direct contract” with AWS is not the “only way the State can retain exclusive custody and control of its cryptographic keys.” AWS’s own policies and press releases confirm this.

AWS’s Partner Central service went live in April 2026. With this new service, the customer may gain control and ownership of its AWS Organizations management account and hold Root while the AWS partner assumes financial responsibility. The AWS Partner Central Guide provides, in relevant part:

Transferring Organization ownership

This migration path transfers root account ownership of an existing AWS Organization to your customer while maintaining billing responsibility through billing transfer.

...

7. Transfer root account ownership

Sign in to the Organization's root account and navigate to My Account in the AWS Management Console. Remove any partner MFA devices or other partner-specific security configurations. Update the root user email address to your customer's domain. The customer will receive an email to activate their root account access. Complete this step within 60 days of billing transfer going into effect.

8. Verify transfer completion

After the customer accepts ownership, verify that billing transfer remains active and your organization continues receiving invoices. The customer should now have full root access to manage their organization while billing responsibility remains with your organization through the established billing transfer.

In fact, on its own website, AWS states that “[e]nd customers” like the State of Maryland would “gain autonomy to independently manage their AWS Organizations while benefiting from

Partner value-added services such as cost optimization and service management.” AWS further explains: “This makes billing operations more efficient and scalable while individual management accounts can maintain complete security and governance autonomy over their accounts.”

Therefore, with this new AWS Partner Central service, the State of Maryland can retain exclusive custody and control of its cryptographic keys without a direct contract to AWS. And once the State takes over Root, Strategic (or any AWS partner) would not have the ability to gain access to the State’s cryptographic keys. Any conclusion to the contrary is arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable.

The current model—whereby Strategic holds Root—was implemented at inception of Strategic’s current contract at the State’s request. Strategic supports the State’s objective of maintaining exclusive control over its AWS accounts, cryptographic keys, and security policies. Strategic is ready, willing and able to adhere to both the System & Network Security Policy and the System & Communication Protection Standard referenced in the Action Agenda Item. These policies were not in effect nor were they incorporated into Strategic’s current contract through a modification, but any assertion that AWS is the only entity capable of doing so is arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable.

Second, a direct contract with AWS will not provide the State with “the best possible pricing, exceeding what is available through alternative procurement methods.” Contrary to the Action Agenda Item, the State of Maryland currently receives a 21% discount on AWS utility services. In addition, monthly credits are extended to the State which substantially exceed the co-op fee of .025%. Moreover, a lower price is not among the “examples” of circumstances in which a sole source is justified. See COMAR 21.05.05.02A.

As demonstrated above, qualified vendors, including certified small businesses, women-owned, veteran-owned, and minority business enterprises like Strategic can satisfy the State’s security and technical requirements. The technical rationale of the request for sole source, consequently, does not justify the elimination of competition and a sole source award to AWS.

Agenda Item 49-IT

Nikki Tyree: Support

Dear Board of Public Works:

On July 22nd, the Board of Public Works will be asked to approve a procurement for a new election system from ES&S, presented by the State Board of Elections (SBE). The League of Women Voters of Maryland (LWVMD) asks that, given all the circumstances, the Board of Public Works approve this acquisition without delay.

It is increasingly obvious that we are living in a constitutional crisis with the federal administration focusing much of its attention on disinformation surrounding elections. LWVMD believes that with all eyes on Maryland and growing scrutiny, it is imperative that the 2028 elections be absolutely pristine and free of any setbacks. The current system Maryland is using is outdated and, unfortunately, is already showing signs of not being able to perform in 2028. LWVMD is unwilling to risk any type of exposure to disinformation or confused voters. Therefore, we must urge you to vote in favor of this procurement. We cannot stress enough how critical it is that absolutely no one can say that any part of the election system failed to operate.

With that said, LWVMD acknowledges where we are in democracy. It is unknown what will become of the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), which jeopardizes the certification of the VVSG 2.0 pathway that SBE has requested. LWVMD firmly believes that in an ideal world, SBE would request an expedited emergency procurement process, whereas VVSG 1.0 is secured and 2.0 is not included until after it has been certified by the EAC—if it can be certified by the EAC. However, we do not live in an ideal world, and at this time, we have little faith that an emergency procurement would move fast enough for the 2028 elections.

While there has been opposition to the 2.0 pathway, the League believes it is important to note that, as written, it is a mandate to deliver, not a mandate to implement. SBE can be asked not to implement until 2032.

In conclusion, LWVMD asks that the Board of Public Works approve this procurement and ensure Maryland is set up for the best possible elections in 2028. We must not allow anything to distract from what will be verified and secure election results.

Sincerely,

Nikki Tyree

Executive Director, League of Women Voters of Maryland

121 Cathedral St. Suite 2B

Annapolis, MD 21401

443-534-8773

ntyree@lwwmd.org

Rebecca Wilson: Oppose

Honorable Members of the Board of Public Works,

About a year ago the State Elections Administrator released a RFP for a new statewide voting system that he said would be built to modern security standards. The federal agency that tests and certifies voting systems, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), released its first set of standards in 2005 (VVSG 1.0) and then updated them in 2021 (VVSG 2.0). As one might imagine, a lot had changed in the world of cybersecurity in those years so this was a much needed overhaul of those outdated standards.

We wholeheartedly support the goal of procuring a new voting system certified to the new upgraded standards, but the proposed contract before you does not do that. Instead it would procure a system almost identical to the one we are already using and certified only to the same 2005 standards, with a promise of a future upgrade to a new system that would meet the new standards. But no one has seen that new system yet, it has not been publicly demonstrated, has not been certified, and has not even been submitted yet for testing to the new standards, a process that usually takes about two years.

This upgrade would supposedly be “free” but the price tag in this contract is far higher than other states have paid for the same equipment Maryland initially would be buying so the costs of the upgrade are built into the pricing in this proposal. And although the vendor, ES&S, says that “core” hardware would not have to be replaced, they also say that the exact version of Maryland's future 2.0-compliant system has not yet been determined, and the RFP provides for contract modifications at the time of that upgrade. What would be the future costs of the new equipment, supplies, and training that would be needed for this upgrade?

In short, this contract would commit Maryland sight unseen to a voting system still under development at a premium price with unforeseeable future costs.

Maryland laws and regulations require that before a voting system can be procured it must be federally certified and demonstrated to the public. The “upgraded” system in this contract does not meet those requirements.

This contract also includes the procurement of an additional voting system that has never been certified or publicly demonstrated or even discussed in a public SBE meeting. It would replace

Maryland's current online ballot delivery and remote ballot marking system that provides ballots to voters over the internet. In this proposal the primary contractor, ES&S, would subcontract that system to a different vendor, Enhanced Voting. This electronic delivery/remote ballot marking system would be completely separate from the system ES&S is supplying. It is unclear why this system is in this contract and whether ES&S is taking on full responsibility for its functionality, quality, performance, and security.

We respectfully urge the Board of Public Works not to approve the proposal before you, and to ask the SBE to strip out the two voting systems that have not been certified or publicly demonstrated: the "upgrade" to VVSG 2.0 standards and the online ballot delivery & marking system. We have no concerns about the voting system that the state would be initially procuring in this contract which has been federally and state certified and publicly demonstrated. But based on what other jurisdictions have paid for the same equipment, the price should be less than half the cost of this proposal.

That would allow the SBE to have a new system in place for the 2028 elections. Then when the 2.0 version has been certified and the costs are clearer they could go through the proper procurement process to replace or upgrade the new equipment.

Respectfully,

Rebecca Wilson & Robert Ferraro, Co-Directors

SAVE our Votes: Secure, Accessible, Verifiable Elections for Maryland