



**Public Comment Analysis<sup>1</sup>**

Date: June 24, 2011

Topic: The Proposed Co-location of a New Public Charter School, Teaching Firms of America Charter School (84K406), with Existing School P.S. 308 Clara Cardwell (16K308) in Building K308

Date of Panel Vote: June 27, 2011

---

**Summary of Proposal**

On January 8, 2011, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued an Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) proposing to site Teaching Firms of America Charter School (84K406, “Teaching Firms”), a new public charter school that will serve students in kindergarten through fifth grade, in Building K308 (“K308”), located at 616 Quincy Street, Brooklyn, NY 11221, in Community School District 16. Teaching Firms will be co-located in K308 with an existing DOE school that serves kindergarten through eighth grade, P.S. 308 Clara Cardwell (16K308, “P.S. 308”). P.S. 308 also offers one section of full-day pre-kindergarten. A “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share common spaces like the cafeteria, the library, the gymnasium, the auditorium, and the playgrounds.

The proposal to co-locate Teaching Firms with P.S. 308 in K308 was approved by the Panel for Educational Policy (“PEP”) on March 1, 2011. On May 23, 2011, the DOE issued a revised EIS and BUP. This revised EIS includes Teaching Firms’s District Borough Number, clarifies the shared spaces in K308, adjusts the projected enrollment in 2011-2012 at P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms, adjusts the projected target building utilization for K308 in 2011-2012, and adds additional information in the EIS related to the baseline footprint.

The Building Utilization Plan (“BUP”) for this proposal has also been revised in the following manner:

- the proposed shared space schedule has been adjusted;
- the correct website for the DOE’s Instructional Footprint has been included in the revised BUP;

---

<sup>1</sup> This Analysis of Public Comments reflects those public comments received to date. The DOE will continue to accept public comments until Sunday, June 26, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. If any additional comments are received, they will be addressed in an amended analysis.

- an error regarding the capacity for the cafeteria was corrected to reflect the total capacity of the cafeteria;
- and the DOE has clarified the rationale for the amount of time that each co-located school is allocated in the shared spaces under this proposal.

The details of this proposal have been released in a revised Educational Impact Statement which can be accessed here along with the revised Building Utilization Plan (“BUP”):

<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2010-2011/June2011Proposals>.

Copies of the revised EIS and BUP are also available in the main office of P.S. 308.

### **Summary of Comments Received at the Joint Public Hearings**

A joint public hearing regarding the original proposal was held at K308 on February 8, 2011. At the hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the original proposal. Approximately 130 members of the public attended the hearing and 20 people spoke. Present at the meeting were: District 16 Superintendent Evelyn Santiago; P.S. 308 Principal Renata Clement; Teaching Firms co-founders and co-school leaders Damien Dunkley and Rafiq Kalam Id-Din; P.S. 308 School Leadership Team representative Karen Shaw-Taylor; Community Education Council (CEC) 16 representative Peggy Johnson; and United Federation of Teachers Vice President Richard Farkas.

An additional joint public hearing regarding the revised proposal was held at K308 on June 14, 2011. At the hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the revised proposal. Approximately, 110 members of the public attended the hearing and 12 people spoke. Present at the meeting were: Senior Supervising Superintendent Donald Conyers; District 16 Superintendent Evelyn Santiago; P.S. 308 Principal Renata Clement; P.S. 308 School Leadership Team representatives Sandra Dudley and Jeannette Donaldson; Community Education Council (CEC) 16 representative Peggy Johnson; a representative of Public Advocate Bill de Blasio; and New York City Council Member Albert Vann.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing on February 8, 2011, on the **original** proposal:

1. The founder and Principal of Teaching Firms provided some background information on the school and expressed his support for the proposal. He also noted that Teaching Firms would be a great partner in the building and in the community.
2. New York City Council Member Albert Vann expressed his opposition for the proposal, but generally supported Teaching Firms. He noted that the community was passionately against this proposal, but he pointed out that each co-location proposal should each be judged on its own merit. He stated that he opposed the proposal to co-locate Teaching Firms in K308 because it would placed increased demands on shared space in the building, such as the cafeteria, that may negatively affect P.S. 308 students’ experiences in the building. Specifically, Council Member Vann also commented that there was a lack of space in the building’s first floor to accommodate both P.S. 308’s and Teaching Firms’s early childhood classes. He also stated that the DOE’s engagement process moved too quickly.

3. A representative of the United Federation of Teachers (“UFT”) also expressed his opposition for this proposal. He stated that P.S. 308 is being set up to fail by the DOE in order to make room for Teaching Firms in the building. He also stated that the co-location would create unsafe conditions in the building, particularly on the first floor where early childhood classes would be co-located.
4. Another representative from the UFT expressed his opposition for this proposal and commented that according to a space analysis conducted by the UFT, there was not sufficient space in the building to co-locate Teaching Firms in the building. She also stated that the building does not currently have sufficient space to serve all students.
5. A CEC 16 representative stated that Teaching Firms should consider other buildings, including buildings owned by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development for a site to hold Teaching Firms. She also stated that the building’s shared spaces do not have the capacity to serve P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms students collectively.
6. One commenter commented that P.S. 308 currently lacks the space to offer academic enrichment and extracurricular activities.
7. One commenter commented that this proposal could negatively impact P.S. 308’s ability to offer other programs, such as academic intervention support services.
8. Several commenters commented that shared spaces like the cafeteria, the gym, the library, and the auditorium do not have the capacity to serve both P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms students. They also stated that one of the full size classrooms that is currently being utilized as a physical education space lacks proper ventilation.
9. Several commenters voiced opposition to all charter schools and claimed that this was a rushed process that did not adequately include community feedback.
10. Several commenters expressed opposition for this proposal and spoke of the positive experiences their children have had at P.S. 308.
11. Several commenters stated that there is not sufficient space in P.S.308’s classrooms to serve students, which has led to overcrowding.

**The DOE did not receive any comments at the Joint Public Hearing which did not directly relate to the original proposal.**

**Summary of Issues Raised in Written and/or Oral Comments Submitted to the DOE regarding the Original Proposal**

No written or oral comments were submitted to the DOE regarding the original proposal.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing on June 14, 2011, on the revised proposal:

12. A representative of Public Advocate Bill de Blasio expressed his opposition to this co-location proposal and stated that he does not believe that there is sufficient space in building K308 for both P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms. Co-locating Teaching Firms with P.S. 308 would negatively impact P.S. 308’s instructional quality. The representative also stated the building’s gymnasium, cafeteria and auditorium already cannot accommodate P.S. 308’s students and that P.S. 308 had to convert a full-size classroom into a gymnasium in order to comply with the students’ physical educational requirements.

13. A member of the P.S. 308 School Leadership Team stated that there is not enough space in the building to serve students of two schools. The commenter also stated that there are concerns about the shared use of the common areas.
14. A commenter opposed the proposal for the following reasons:
  - a. There is not enough space in the building to co-locate Teaching Firms.
  - b. The information in the proposal, such as the number of classrooms and sizes of classrooms, has changed from one version of the proposal to another.
  - c. The commenter disagreed that the building has the capacity to serve 1,200 students.
15. A commenter cited a petition that opposed the proposal and stated that she opposed the proposal for the following reasons:
  - a. There is not enough space in the building to co-locate Teaching Firms.
  - b. Co-locating schools in a building could make students of one school feel inferior.
16. A commenter stated that co-locating another school in the building would create an unhealthy environment for all students and unsafe conditions in the event there are emergencies, such as fires, in the building.
17. A representative of the United Federation of Teachers expressed opposition to the proposal and stated that the revised Educational Impact Statement and Building Utilization Plan are no different than the original versions, that the building does not have enough space for P.S. 308 to share with Teaching Firms, and that P.S. 308 is being set up to fail by the DOE in order to make room for Teaching Firms in the building. The commenter also asked why repairs to the bathroom that have been requested in previous years have only just been fulfilled.
18. A commenter stated that co-locating Teaching Firms with P.S. 308 would negatively impact P.S. 308's instructional quality.
19. Multiple commenters related their positive experiences at P.S. 308.
20. A commenter stated that P.S. 308 could not provide physical education to kindergarten through fifth grade students until the full-size classroom was converted into a gymnasium. The commenter also stated that the rooms that P.S. 308 uses for counseling, special education, physical therapy, speech therapy, and occupational therapy would be lost as a result of the co-location. The commenter also asked why repairs to the building's light fixtures, hallways, auditorium, and bathrooms are being made before the co-location is implemented when the school has requested them in previous years.
21. A commenter asked if kindergarten students will occupy the same floor as eighth grade students.
22. A commenter expressed opposition to all charter schools.
23. New York City Council Member Albert Vann expressed his opposition to the proposal and noted that parents' feedback should be taken into account when designing co-location proposals. He also stated that the process pits two school communities against each other before they begin to share a building and that the DOE should find a different location for Teaching Firms.

**Summary of Issues Raised in Written and/or Oral Comments Submitted to the DOE regarding the Revised Proposal**

24. A petition of 244 signatures expressed opposition to the proposal and noted their positive experiences at P.S. 308.

**Analysis of Issues Raised, Significant Alternatives Proposed  
and Changes Made to the Proposal**

- Comment 1 supports this proposal, and does not need to be addressed.
- Comments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14(a), 15(a), 17, and 20 question the DOE's determination that building K308 has sufficient space to serve P.S. 308's and Teaching Firms's students if this proposal is approved. Comments 4 and 11 specifically state that K308's classrooms do not have the adequate space to serve P.S. 308's students, which would indicate that building K308 does not have the space to serve both P.S. 308's and Teaching Firms's students. Comment 14(c) questioned whether K308 actually has the capacity to serve 1,200 students.

Building space is scarce in many New York City neighborhoods. Given this reality, the DOE must use its existing buildings in the most efficient manner possible. Schools throughout the City have successfully shared space, and the DOE anticipates that P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms will be able to share building K308 as Teaching Firms phases in.

Building K308's target capacity is calculated by the School Construction Authority based on information provided by principals in the Annual Facilities Survey conducted by the School Construction Authority. The survey verifies the usage and size of rooms within each building, and the School Construction Authority's random site visits verify the information provided. In most instances, the School Construction Authority has found that the self-reported data on room usage is accurate. A fuller explanation of the School Construction Authority's methodology for calculating building capacity and utilization rate can be found in the Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization Report, which is published annually by the Department of Education. According to the School Construction Authority, building K308 has the target capacity of 1,213 seats.

As discussed in the EIS, building K308 was identified as an under-utilized building because the DOE's analysis showed that the building had at least 300 seats available in 2009-2010. Although the building has a target capacity of 1,213 seats, in the 2009-2010 school year, P.S. 308 only served 719 students in kindergarten through eighth grade and in one full-day pre-kindergarten class. Therefore, the building's utilization rate was just 59% in 2009-2010. In 2010-2011, P.S. 308 serves 649 students in kindergarten through eighth grade and in one full-day pre-kindergarten class. Therefore, this year, the building's utilization rate is only 54%. Thus, it is clear that the building is under-utilized.

In 2011-2012, the first year of the proposed co-location, Teaching Firms would enroll approximately 57 students in kindergarten and 57 students in first grade. P.S. 308 is projected to enroll approximately 600-645 students in kindergarten through eighth grade in 2011-2012. Therefore, in 2011-2012, building K308 would enroll approximately 714-759 students in kindergarten through eighth grade, which would result in an estimated building utilization rate of 63%. In 2015-2016, when Teaching Firms has completely phased in and achieved full scale, building K308 would serve approximately 880-920

students, which would yield an estimated utilization rate of 76%. Thus, building K308 will be more fully utilized than it was in 2009-2010 or 2010-2011.

The Instructional Footprint is used in the analysis and assessment of space usage in New York City Department of Education buildings. In co-location arrangements, the parameters outlined in the Footprint serves as a guideline for making decisions about the allocation of space. The Footprint represents a baseline for space allocation.

According to the Instructional Footprint, as outlined in the BUP and revised BUP, a school that serves 36 sections of students in kindergarten through eighth grade is allocated one full-size classroom for each general education or Collaborative Team Teaching section and a full-size or half-size classroom to accommodate each self-contained special education served by the school. In addition, schools that serve students in kindergarten through eighth grade would receive an allocation of cluster or specialty classrooms proportionate to the number of students enrolled that can be used at the principal's discretion and science demonstration classrooms needed to serve middle school science classes. Thus, the original BUP allocated a total of 39 full-size classrooms, 2 half-size classrooms, 10 quarter-size classrooms, and all of the designed administrative space in the building to P.S. 308 to meet the school's projected number of students. The revised BUP adjusted P.S. 308's adjusted baseline allocation of rooms to 38 rooms because P.S. 308's baseline allocation was incorrectly calculated to be 32 full-size classrooms in the original BUP. In the revised BUP, it was corrected to 31 full-size classrooms.

This year P.S. 308 is currently utilizing excess space above its baseline allocation of rooms, as demonstrated in the BUP. According to the revised BUP, P.S. 308 should only be allocated 38 full-size classrooms under the adjusted baseline allocation in the BUP; however P.S. 308 is currently operating out of 60 full-size classrooms. In the following year, P.S. 308 will receive 38 full-size classrooms and an additional 12 full-size rooms for a total of 50 full-size classrooms. P.S. 308 will be losing 10 full-size excess classrooms, but it will still meet the needs of all of its students as outlined in the Footprint.

Finally, class size is a continuing concern for all New York City schools. As stated in the DOE's and the School Construction Authority's annual Enrollment-Capacity-Utilization Organization Report, the target classroom capacity and utilization rate reflects aspirational goals for school buildings based on different assumptions about how classrooms are used. The target capacity for full day pre-kindergarten classrooms is 18 students, for kindergarten through third grade classrooms is 20 students, and for fourth and fifth grade classrooms is 28.

In the future, if there is an increase in student enrollment resulting from demand greater than current projections for P.S. 308 or an increase in the number of families residing in the zoned area, the Chancellor reserves the right to relocate Teaching Firms to an alternate location geographically proximate to K308. In that case, the Chancellor would certify in writing that in her judgment, the need of the school system requires the re-

acquisition of the charter school space for DOE use.

- Comments 2, 8, 12, 13, and 18 relate to the concern that this proposal may impact shared spaces in the building. Comments 3 and 16 question whether this proposal would impact students' health and safety in the building.

The Building Utilization Plan outlining how space would be allocated in K308 was drafted and attached to this proposal's Educational Impact Statement. A revised BUP was subsequently issued on May 23, 2011. A proposed shared space plan is a part of the BUP, but it does not represent a final proposal for the shared use of space; rather, it is based on the estimated duration of time each of the co-located schools will have in shared spaces such as the cafeteria. The Building Councils, which consists of principals from all of the co-located schools, in conjunction with the DOE Office of Space Planning, are free to deviate from the proportional allotment of time in the BUP to accommodate the specific programmatic needs of all special populations or groups within each school as is feasible and equitable, provided that the Building Council comes to an agreement of the final Shared Space Plan collaboratively. If such accommodation results in an alteration to the proportional distribution of space, the Building Council shall explain the basis for such alteration.

A Shared Space Committee will also meet a minimum of 4 times a year and report back to the Building Council regarding shared space questions.

All efforts will be made to assure the safety of students in the building at all times. Thus, any concerns about time in shared space may be addressed in a collaborative fashion by the Building Council and the Shared Space Committee, which may alter the shared use of space based on those concerns. The DOE does not anticipate that this proposal would result in safety concerns for any students in the building because the utilization of the building at full scale would only be 76%, which is well within the safety constraints for a building this size.

Also, as stated in the BUP, pursuant to Chancellor's Regulation A-414, every school/campus must have a School Safety Committee. The committee plays an essential role in the establishment of safety procedures, the communication of expectations and responsibilities of students and staff, and the design of prevention and intervention strategies and programs specific to the needs of the school. The committee is comprised of various members of the school community, including parents, and shall include at a minimum: principal(s) of the co-located schools; designee of all other programs operating within the building; UFT Chapter Leader; custodial engineer/designee; in-house School Safety Agent Level III/designee; local law enforcement officials; Parent Association President/designee; Dietician/designee of food services for the site; community members; local ambulance or other emergency response agencies; representative of the student body (when appropriate); and any other persons deemed appropriate by the Principal(s). The committee is responsible for addressing safety matters on an ongoing basis and making appropriate recommendations to the Principal(s) when it identifies the need for additional security measures, intervention, training, etc. The committee is also

responsible for developing a comprehensive School Safety Plan which defines the normal operations of the site and what procedures are in place in the event of an emergency. Thus, if this proposal is approved, the DOE Office of Space Planning and building K308's School Safety Committee would collaborate to ensure the safety of students during arrival, dismissal, and transition between classrooms and shared spaces such as the cafeteria.

The DOE agrees that students are more likely to perform better and learn more when they are healthy and that poor health has a direct impact on a student's ability to learn and succeed in school. Currently, the Office of School Health provides a nurse to P.S. 308, and it is assumed that a nurse will continue to be assigned to the building to provide school and student health services.

- Comments 2 and 3 state that this proposal would have a detrimental effect on P.S. 308's and Teaching Firms's early childhood education classes, which would presumably be located on the building's first floor. Comment 21 asked if the revised proposal would result in kindergarten classes being held on the same floor as eighth grade students. As mentioned above, the allocation of specific classrooms will be determined by the Building Council. For example, Teaching Firms and P.S. 308 may determine that it makes more sense to share the first floor among the schools' respective early childhood education classes, or they may determine that it makes more sense to allocate a wing or an entire floor to one school organization and another wing or entire floor to the other school.
- Comment 5 questioned whether the DOE considered alternative sitings for Teaching Firms, such as buildings owned by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development. Teaching Firms conducted its search for viable buildings that may serve as a permanent location for the school, and the DOE also searched for under-utilized school buildings in District 16 that may house the charter school. Under-utilized buildings are listed in the under-utilized space memoranda and addendum, which can be accessed on the DOE's website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/planning/default.htm>. Building K308 was determined to be an under-utilized building in 2009-2010. The DOE concluded that co-locating Teaching Firms in building K308 was a potential option that would lead to a more efficient utilization of the building and would provide an additional option for families and students in the District.
- Comments 6, 7, and 20 relate to concern over whether this proposal would allow P.S. 308 to continue to offer academic enrichment classes, academic intervention services, and extracurricular activities. P.S. 308 currently offers a variety of academic enrichment programs and extracurricular activities. As noted in the EIS for this proposal, the DOE does not anticipate that the proposed co-location of Teaching Firms in the building would impact these academic intervention services, academic enrichment classes, or extracurricular activities, though the way these programs are configured may change. For example, some activities may need to share classroom space or the scheduling of these activities may change as a result of greater demands on the available space during or after school hours.

- Comments 8, 12, and 20 note that one full-size classroom in K308 has been converted to a physical education space and that Comment 8 states that the full-size classroom that has been converted lacks proper ventilation. The DOE allows schools to allocate space based on their discretion. In this case, P.S. 308's Principal allocated one full size classroom to be used as the physical education space based on her discretion. It should be noted that building K308 does have a gymnasium that has the capacity to serve 175 people and is properly ventilated. The proposed shared space schedule in the revised BUP sufficiently meets the physical education requirements of P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms students. It should be noted again that this proposed schedule does not represent a final proposal for the shared use of space. Building K308 also has an outdoor playground with a track. During the building walkthrough conducted on October 15, 2010, the Director of Space Planning did not find any violations of any building codes in the building.
- Comments 2, 9, 10, 19, 22, 23, and 24 noted that P.S. 308 provides a supportive environment for students, discuss the lack of engagement and oppose charter schools. The DOE acknowledges that P.S. 308 students and families are satisfied with their experiences at the school and that P.S. 308 continues to offer a positive environment for all students. The DOE believes that even if this proposal is approved, P.S. 308 would continue to offer a supportive and positive environment for its students in the zone.

The DOE appreciates all feedback that it has received from the community regarding this proposal. The DOE makes extensive efforts to collect and incorporate all feedback that it has received on this proposal. Before this EIS was issued, DOE staff from the Office of Portfolio met with P.S. 308's School Leadership Team and parents to collect feedback. When the EIS was issued, it was made available to the staff, faculty, and parent communities at P.S. 308 on the DOE's Web site and in P.S. 308 main office. In addition, the DOE set up a dedicated website and voicemail to collect feedback on this proposal. P.S. 308's staff, faculty, and parent community were invited to the joint public hearing to solicit further feedback.

The joint public hearing regarding the original proposal was held on February 8, 2011, and all comments made at the joint public hearing were included in the original analysis of public comment and this analysis. A joint public hearing regarding the revised proposal was held on June 14, 2011, and all comments made at that joint public hearing have been included in this analysis of public comment. The Panel for Educational Policy approved the original proposal on March 1, 2011, and it will vote on various proposals, including this revised proposal, on June 27, 2011. There will a period designated for public comment at that hearing when the vote is scheduled.

There are currently 125 charter schools in New York City. Charter schools are held accountable, through the terms of five-year performance contracts called "charters," for high student achievement. Charter schools must meet the same Regents' performance standards established for all public schools as well as the goals established in their charter. If a charter school fails to meet those terms, it can be closed. There are currently 6 charter schools in District 16: Excellence Charter School of Bedford Stuyvesant, Bedford Stuyvesant Collegiate Charter School, La Cima Charter School, Excellence Girls

Charter School, Brooklyn Excelsior Charter, and Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School. The DOE believes that, by siting Teaching Firms in District 16, it will introduce another high quality option for families and students in District 16. If the proposal is approved, the school would enroll students through a lottery with a preference for students who reside in District 16. As discussed in the EIS for this proposal, building K308 does have space to accommodate P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms when at full scale because the target building utilization rate will only be 76% at that point.

- Comment 14(b) stated information in the information in the different versions of the proposal is not consistent. Comment 17 stated that the revised EIS and BUP are not different than the original EIS and BUP. As stated in the revised EIS and revised BUP, the EIS was revised to include Teaching Firms's District Borough Number, clarify the shared spaces in K308, adjust the projected enrollment in 2011-2012 at P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms, adjust the projected target building utilization for K308 in 2011-2012, and add additional information in the EIS related to the baseline footprint. Specifically, the projected enrollment at P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms were adjusted to bring them into alignment with the DOE's budget register projections for enrollment at both schools. This adjustment then led to an update of the projected building utilization for K308 in 2011-2012. The BUP was revised to include an adjusted proposed shared space schedule, correct the website for the DOE's Instructional Footprint, reflect the total capacity of the cafeteria in K308, and clarify the rationale for the amount of time that each co-located school is allocated in the shared spaces under this proposal.
- Comment 15(b) stated that co-locations result in students in some schools feeling inferior to students in other schools. The DOE is confident that P.S. 308's and Teaching Firms's principals will be able to create a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in building K308.
- Comments 17 and 20 questioned why repairs to the building, such as the bathrooms tiles, that the school has requested in previous years have only just been fulfilled. As stated in the revised EIS, the only project in K308 proposed in the capital plan is installation of Internet protocol surveillance cameras. According to the Division of School Facilities, there are no other projects planned to repair or upgrade K308's facilities at this time.

The 2009-2010 Building Architectural Condition Assessment Survey outlined various deficiencies in building K308's condition. In particular, the survey indicated that there were broken or missing tiles in various parts of the building, including the staff's and students' toilet rooms. It should be noted, though, that the survey also indicated that the urgency of repair projects would be ranked priority 3 and purpose would be ranked level 2. The School Construction Authority's key for the Building Condition Assessment Survey indicates that a priority 3 project is of middle priority, and a level 2 rank indicates that it is of the second lowest priority. The survey and the School Construction Authority's key for the Building Condition Assessment Survey can be found on the DOE's website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/16/K308/AboutUs/Statistics/facilities.htm>.

### **Changes Made to the Proposal**

On May 23, 2011, the DOE revised this proposal in response to public comments to this and other proposals. The DOE has published a revised EIS and BUP. The revised BUP makes the following changes:

- the proposed shared space schedule has been adjusted;
- the correct website for the DOE's Instructional Footnote has been included in the revised BUP;
- an error regarding the capacity for the cafeteria was corrected to reflect the total capacity of the cafeteria;
- and the DOE has clarified the rationale for the amount of time that each co-located school is allocated in the shared spaces under this proposal.

The EIS was revised to reflect the changes to the BUP. This revised EIS includes Teaching Firms's District Borough Number, clarifies the shared spaces in K308, adjusts the projected enrollment in 2011-2012 at P.S. 308 and Teaching Firms, adjusts the projected target building utilization for K308 in 2011-2012, and adds additional information in the EIS related to the baseline footprint.