



Revised Notice
April 8, 2011

Chancellor

The Revised Proposed Re-siting and Co-location of Brooklyn East Collegiate Charter School (84K780) with Existing Schools P.S. 9 (13K009) and M.S. 571 (13K571) in Building K009

I. Description of the subject and purpose of the proposed item under consideration.

On December 20, 2010, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued an Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) describing a proposal to re-site Brooklyn East Collegiate Charter School (84K780, “Brooklyn East Collegiate”), an existing public charter school that serves 80 students in fifth grade and is temporarily housed in Building K434, located at 1485 Pacific Street, Brooklyn, NY 11216 in Community School District 17, to Building K009 (“K009”), located at 80 Underhill Avenue, Brooklyn, NY, 11238, in Community School District 13. Brooklyn East Collegiate would be co-located in K009 with an existing DOE zoned elementary school serving grades kindergarten through five, P.S. 9 Teunis Bergen (“P.S. 9”), that also offers 3 sections of pre-kindergarten, and an existing DOE middle school that serves grades six through eight, M.S. 571 The Bergen Upper School (13K571, “M.S. 571”). A “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share common spaces like auditoriums, gymnasiums, and cafeterias.

The EIS was amended on January 21, 2011 to correct typographical errors and formatting, delete redundant language, and adjust projected enrollment ranges to better reflect the DOE’s enrollment projections for the schools that would be served in K009. The Panel for Education Policy (“PEP”) approved the amended EIS on February 3, 2011.

In a separate EIS published on December 20, 2010 the DOE proposed to gradually phase out and eventually close M.S. 571 because of its low performance and inability to turn around quickly to better support student needs. On January 21, 2011, that EIS was amended to correct typographical errors and formatting, delete redundant language, and adjust projected enrollment ranges to better reflect the DOE’s enrollment projections for the schools that would be served in K009. That proposal was approved by the PEP on February 3, 2011. As a result, M.S. 571 will no longer accept incoming students, and one grade will be phased out per year. M.S. 571 will close at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

On March 31, 2011, the New York State Commissioner of Education sustained in part a petition filed by P.S. 9 community members, thus annulling the PEP’s vote that approved the co-location of Brooklyn East Collegiate in K009 and prohibiting the DOE from proceeding with the co-location until the DOE complies with the Commissioner’s order and Education Law Section 2853(3)(a-

3)(2)(C) by preparing a Building Utilization Plan (“BUP”) that is consistent with the Commissioner’s decision and the statute.

The DOE has now published a revised EIS and revised BUP. The revisions to the EIS and BUP are described in detail in Section II below.

This revised notice also provides information about a new joint public hearing that will take place on this proposal. Notice will be provided once this hearing has been scheduled. The proposal will also be subject to a new vote by PEP. This revised notice also provides a new date and location for the PEP vote.

M.S. 571 admits students in the sixth grade through the District 13 Middle School Choice application process and is a district choice middle school. M.S. 571 will no longer admit sixth grade students after the conclusion of the 2010-2011 school year. One grade will be phased out per year. During the 2011-2012 school year, M.S. 571 will serve students in grades seven and eight. In 2012-2013, M.S. 571 will serve students in eighth grade only. The school will close after June 2013.

P.S. 9 is a zoned district elementary school and serves 544 students in kindergarten through fifth grade and also offers 3 sections of a pre-kindergarten program.

Brooklyn East Collegiate is an existing public charter school that currently serves students in the fifth grade at its temporary location. Brooklyn East Collegiate was not intended to remain in its current location as a permanent siting, and the current location does not have adequate space to allow for Brooklyn East Collegiate to grow to scale. If this proposal is approved, Brooklyn East Collegiate’s current fifth grade will be re-sited to K009 and, beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, Brooklyn East Collegiate will expand to serve approximately 77 students in sixth grade in K009. In 2012-13, Brooklyn East Collegiate would expand to serve approximately 73 students in seventh grade. In 2013-14, the final year of the phase-in, Brooklyn East Collegiate would expand to serve approximately 69 students in eighth grade. In 2013-14, when Brooklyn East Collegiate completes its expansion and achieves full scale, it will serve approximately 300 fifth- through eighth-grade students in K009.

Brooklyn East Collegiate would be co-located with P.S. 9 and M.S. 571 as M.S. 571 phases out and as Brooklyn East Collegiate phases in. Once Brooklyn East Collegiate has completed its expansion and M.S.571 has completed its phase-out, there will be approximately 969-1,029 students served in the building by both P.S. 9 and Brooklyn East Collegiate, yielding a target building utilization rate of 86%.

II. Identification of all revisions, including substantial revisions to the item.

This revised EIS corrects typographical errors that incorrectly reference building K332 in the original posting instead of building K009, deletes an incorrect statement in the EIS that stated there were two gymnasiums in K009, corrects the year in which K009 was built, references the planned construction at K009 to address flooding and school yard construction, adds a footnote related to P.S. 9’s out-of-zone enrollment, adds additional text related to zoned enrollment and over-the-counter admissions at P.S. 9 in the future, clarifies the impact of this proposal on extracurricular activities at the existing schools, deletes the specific cost related to building a library and adding lockers at the building (two projects that have already been completed), includes additional information related to the use of shared spaces and the proposed shared space plan described in the Building Utilization Plan, and references the Citywide Gifted and Talented program that is currently offered at P.S. 9. Additionally,

the revised BUP that is annexed to the EIS has also been revised in the following manner:

- the room allocations for all organizations have been adjusted in order to more accurately reflect the total full-size, half-size, and quarter-size rooms in the K009 building;
- the application of the DOE Instructional Footprint was corrected for the 2010-2011 school year;
- the number of sections that each co-located school will serve in 2012-13 and 2013-14 has been adjusted and the Baseline Footprint allocation was adjusted accordingly;
- an additional table has been inserted in the BUP on page 4 for the 2010-2011 school year to clarify the total number of rooms that are unallocated amongst the schools this year;
- the proposed shared space schedule on page 13 has been adjusted 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; and
- additional information regarding the planned construction at the K009 building has been included.

III. Summary of all public comment received to date.

A joint public hearing regarding the proposal set forth in the December 20, 2010 and January 21, 2010 EISs was held at M.S. 571 on January 24, 2011. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 250 members of the public attended the hearing, and approximately 80 people spoke. Present at the meeting were Deputy Chancellor Laura Rodriguez; District 13 Superintendent James Machen; M.S. 571 Principal Santosha Troutman; P.S. 9 Principal Sandra D'Avilar; Brooklyn East Collegiate Principal Eric Green; P.S. 9 School Leadership Team representative Karen Shaw-Taylor; M.S. 571 Parent Teacher Association President Maria Salichs; Community Education Council (CEC) 13 representative Khem Irby; CEC 13 representative Renee Holmes; United Federation of Teachers Vice President Richard Farkas; Democratic District Leader for the 52nd Assembly District Chris Owens; and Democratic District Leader for the 52nd Assembly District JoAnne Simon.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearings:

1. A CEC member voiced support for all District 13 schools. She further encouraged P.S. 9 and M.S. 571 communities to work together. She commented that other arrangements or siting options should be considered for Brooklyn East Collegiate given space constraints.
2. The Principal of Brooklyn East Collegiate provided some background information on his school and explained his belief that the school would be a great partner in the building. He described Brooklyn East Collegiate's lottery process and his eagerness to work with the other school organizations in the building.
3. The PTA President of M.S. 571 commented that most of the students who attend M.S. 571 are not from District 13 and that M.S. 571 was the only school to accept her son. She questioned what would happen to the students who are not selected by lottery to attend Brooklyn East Collegiate and asked whether the M.S. 571 community wanted a public school in the building that admits students through a lottery.
4. The Vice President of the United Federation of Teachers ("UFT"), spoke on behalf of the

UFT in support of P.S. 9. The representative stated that M.S. 571 is being phased out to create space for charter schools. He then commented that the DOE has not provided M.S. 571 with enough support.

5. Multiple commenters spoke of the positive experiences their children have had at Brooklyn East Collegiate and voiced support for the school's relocation to Building K009.
6. Multiple commenters, including a representative for New York City Council member Letitia James, a member of the P.S. 9 School Leadership Team, multiple students and Chris Owens, State Committee member for the New York State Democratic Party, spoke of their positive experiences at P.S. 9, referred to P.S. 9's track record of success, expressed concerns about the impact of Brooklyn East Collegiate's co-location in K009, and requested that P.S. 9 should be granted time and space to expand its grades and enrollment.
 - a. Mr. Owens also commented that Brooklyn East Collegiate would likely serve less special needs and English Language Learner ("ELL") students than M.S. 571 did.
 - b. A commenter expressed concerns about sharing resources during the period when all three schools would be co-located in K009. She also emphasized that P.S. 9 parents are very involved in the school.
 - c. A commenter voiced concerns that there might be safety issues during the time three schools are co-located in the building and spoke about the positive experiences her children have had in the school.
 - d. A commenter voiced skepticism around the DOE's plan for space allocation as described in the EIS for this proposal and expressed his opposition to the co-location.
 - e. One commenter expressed concern about the impact on the learning environment in the building once Brooklyn East Collegiate is co-located in K009.
 - f. One commenter expressed concern that there might be issues with the three schools having to work collaboratively during the co-location, and specifically expressed concerns about funding for and enrollment at after-school programs.
7. A representative of New York State Assembly member Hakeem Jeffries to voice opposition to the phase-out of M.S. 571 and the relocation of Brooklyn East Collegiate.
8. Several commenters noted that Brooklyn East Collegiate was admirable and encouraged the school to advocate for more space. However, the commenters were opposed to the proposal to relocate Brooklyn East Collegiate to Building K009.
9. One commenter expressed dissatisfaction with the level of support the DOE has provided M.S. 571 and P.S. 9.
10. One commenter voiced opposition to all charter schools, questioning their efficacy and citing attrition statistics.
11. Several commenters voiced their opposition to the proposal and claimed that this was a rushed process that didn't adequately include community voices. In particular, one commenter referred to "11th hour changes," arguing that the Department of Education had not considered the situation thoughtfully or carefully. She questioned the accuracy of the EIS for this proposal.
12. A commenter asked what it means that Brooklyn East Collegiate was approved for District 23, but may be housed in District 13 and whether approval is district related.
13. A commenter questioned whether Brooklyn East Collegiate is the best option for the District.

14. Multiple commenters questioned the changes made to the EIS, as noted in the amended EIS.
 - a. A commenter asked why the “revised” EIS lacked a previous footnote about restrictions on P.S. 9’s ability to accept out-of-zone students.
 - b. A commenter asked why, in the “revision”, the section explaining the impact on P.S. 9 was folded into a larger section evaluating impact, making it more difficult to find.
 - c. A commenter asked why the EIS and BUP were amended with so little time before the hearing. The commenter also asked what kind of analysis went into compiling and revising the data.
 - d. A commenter asked whether the hearing should be postponed in light of the revisions to the EIS, asserting that significant changes to data and policy were made in the “revision”, which was released just three days before the hearing.
15. Multiple commenters asked for clarification on the EIS for this proposal. Commenters asked:
 - a. A commenter asked why the EIS states Brooklyn East Collegiate will have 80 students per grade.
 - b. A commenter asked how a full-size classroom is defined and whether some rooms designated full size are too small to hold 30 students.
 - c. A commenter asked whether there are concerns about problems caused by grouping P.S. 9 and M.S. 571 students together for lunch periods, especially given all the effort to keep them separate.
 - d. A commenter asked why there is not sufficient time between lunch periods scheduled for clearing the cafeteria.
 - e. A commenter asked why the DOE projects only 36 classrooms for P.S. 9, even though the school has six kindergarten classes, which means it will need to accommodate six classes per grade, which means that it will need 44 classrooms minimum.
 - f. A commenter asked why only 35 classrooms will be given to P.S. 9 next year, fewer than it occupies in the current year, despite projected enrollment growth.
 - g. A commenter asks if the EIS accounts for the additional growth at P.S. 9 of 35 students through 2015.
 - h. A commenter asked who the DOE plans to kick out of P.S. 9, considering that the EIS projects declining enrollment for P.S. 9 in the EIS.
 - i. A commenter asked why the DOE plans to cap P.S. 9 fifth grade enrollment at 85 students and what would happen when fifth grade enrollment reaches 120 students in 2015.
 - j. A commenter asked if the DOE accounts for a projected decrease in enrollment between fourth and fifth grade at P.S. 9 with the assumption that P.S. 9 students would move on to Brooklyn East Collegiate.
 - k. A commenter asked why the EIS projects that Brooklyn East Collegiate will lose 11 students over the projected years that it phases in. The commenters asks whether the school will counsel unsuccessful students out and how newly opened seats would be filled.
 - l. A commenter asked how students with special needs were considered in the proposal.

16. A commenter asked whether Brooklyn East Collegiate may remain where it is currently located, especially given the fact since the school's average class size is low.
17. A commenter asked whether the DOE has conducted analysis on whether there are significantly more 1, 2, and 3 year olds in Prospect Heights than current school-aged children, and, therefore, P.S. 9 may see an increase in demand.
18. A commenter notes the hard work and significant improvements P.S. 9 families have contributed to the physical infrastructure to the school, particularly to the library and playground and asked whether the DOE intends to discourage parents from making such contributions considering that so little time has been allotted for P.S. 9 students to access these improved features.
19. A commenter asked how after-school programming for P.S. 9 students would be impacted by the co-location, especially in regards to access to the gym, cafeteria, auditorium, and other shared spaces.
20. A commenter asked how many hours a day young P.S. 9 children would be prevented from using the bathroom near their classrooms in the basement, given that they are not able to use them while middle school students are eating lunch.
21. A commenter asked why the principal of P.S. 9 was not offered a chance to voice her opinions in regards to this proposal.
22. A commenter asked if the DOE anticipated continued growing demand for P.S. 9 given the fact that there are 120 zoned families, and what the DOE's plan is for P.S.9 if all 120 zoned families choose to send their kindergarten students to P.S. 9 next year, especially given that 104 applications have already been submitted for the kindergarten at P.S. 9.
23. A commenter asked how the overlap between fifth grade applicants to Brooklyn East Collegiate and P.S. 9 would be handled.
24. A commenter asked how the comments at the hearing would impact the Panel for Educational Policy's ("PEP") final decision.
25. A commenter asked whether the proposal to phase-out M.S. 571 would be considered separately from the proposal to co-locate Brooklyn East Collegiate.

The DOE received comments at the Joint Public Hearing which did not directly relate to the proposal, and, therefore, will not be addressed.

- A commenter voiced dissatisfaction with Mayor Bloomberg and called for an investigation into the mayor's personal finances. He issued a call to lower the voting age from 18 to 16 and declared a new political movement.
- One commenter advocated for after school sports teams and clubs.
- One commenter asked whether the building would receive a new library and librarian, stating that the proposals had overshadowed these other considerations in Building K009.

The DOE also received comments through its established written and oral mechanisms.

26. New York City Council member Letitia James wrote that Brooklyn East Collegiate should serve students in District 23, where there is a need, and thereby allow P.S. 9 to expand its programming. She said that a two-year moratorium should be put on the proposal to monitor the growth of P.S. 9. Additionally, Brooklyn East Collegiate has enough space in its current location to continue being sited there.
27. Approximately 276 commenters expressed opposition to the proposal. In addition, a petition against the proposal with 195 signatures and an electronic list of 623 individuals' names was submitted. The reasons and opinions put forth in opposition of the proposal

were:

- a. Rather than co-locating Brooklyn East Collegiate in K009, the space made available by M.S. 571's phase-out should be allocated to P.S. 9 to allow P.S. 9 to expand, based on growing demand and improved educational quality in recent years.
- b. The proposed shared space usage plan, specifically the hours allocated to P.S. 9 for the library and gymnasium are detrimental to P.S. 9 students.
- c. There are concerns about elementary school age students sharing facilities with middle school age students.
- d. P.S. 9 should host an Italian dual-language program for District 13 students.
- e. Co-locating Brooklyn East Collegiate in K009 would hamper P.S. 9's ability to enroll out of zone students.
- f. District 13 is saturated with charter schools already.
- g. Community Roots Charter School, which is already located in District 13, should be re-sited to K009 instead of Brooklyn East Collegiate, which will be re-sited from District 17. With three schools in the building, students will have to eat lunch at inconvenient times, like 10:30 a.m., which would interfere with instruction and cause health problems.
- h. Expanding P.S. 9 to eighth grade students would better fill the community's desire for high-quality middle school seats.
- i. The building is already cramped.
- j. The local community should be served by P.S. 9, instead of co-locating a charter school that would be open through a boroughwide lottery.
- k. Pre-existing problems from sharing space with a middle school will only be made worse by this proposal.
- l. Several hundred parents who showed up at the hearing are opposed to the proposal.
- m. Brooklyn East Collegiate's move is wasteful and risky. After all, the school is already in a building with plenty of space, co-located with a school run by the same charter operator.
- n. The DOE would not actually move Brooklyn East Collegiate again in two years. It would be left in the building.
- o. Putting multiple schools in one building creates excessive costs to expand shared spaces and create more specialized cluster rooms.
- p. The DOE is implementing this plan without input from impacted community members.
- q. If P.S. 9 grew to 900 students, which it could do, middle and elementary school students would eventually have to share the same floors, which would be bad for the elementary students.
- r. Allowing P.S. 9 to grow instead of siting Brooklyn East Collegiate would prevent middle school students from a separate organization (Brooklyn East Collegiate) feeling second-class to the larger school in the building (P.S. 9), because in that case, the students would belong to the same school.
- s. The charter school's fifth grade would compete with P.S. 9's fifth grade.
- t. The City should support low-risk, middle class families by doing things like expanding P.S. 9, and re sultingly keeping those students in the system.
- u. P.S. 9 should be allowed to expand because the current growth of enrollment is

bringing new diversity to the school.

- v. The uncertainty caused by this plan will drive parents away from P.S. 9.
 - w. P.S. 9 did not receive a fair opportunity to propose expansion of their school because the school's proposal deadline took place before the DOE announced the proposal to phase-out M.S. 571.
 - x. Allowing P.S. 9 to expand would prevent the early transfer of P.S. 9 students to intermediate schools outside their neighborhood, which is not as beneficial as going to the same school from kindergarten to eighth grade.
 - y. Opening new schools and closing old ones does not change or fix anything because the DOE does not nurture existing schools.
 - z. With a separate school in the building, planning use of shared spaces will be nightmarish.
 - aa. The proposal would constrain a good school with Soviet style decisions and trample on a growing community.
 - bb. The plan is the result of short-sightedness and is a least-effort solution to make a problem go away without regard for the consequences.
 - cc. The plan would require P.S. 9 to turn away non-zone students, which violates the spirit of the "Children First," which celebrates parental choice.
 - dd. Brooklyn East Collegiate's style of teaching to the test, giving merits and demerits, not allowing a PTA or PTO, and discouraging parental involvement are not appealing to families in the community.
 - ee. P.S. 9 should be allowed to expand so it can be a leading example for surrounding communities like Fort Greene and Park Slope.
 - ff. P.S. 9 should be allowed to expand because it has a coveted Gifted and Talented program.
 - gg. If P.S. 9 can't expand and continue to thrive, the young families that have been moving into Prospect Heights will begin to move out.
 - hh. Charter schools, which admit students through lotteries and are funded by corporate monies, are not the solution to the City's education problems.
28. Multiple commenters stated that there are numerous flaws in the DOE's proposal, including:
- a. The EIS erroneously states there are two gymnasiums in K009.
 - b. Not enough classroom space is allocated to P.S. 9.
 - c. The EIS does not account for increasing demand for seats in P.S. 9.
 - d. Time needed to clean the cafeteria between lunch groups is not accounted for.
 - e. No plan for repurposing rooms currently in use is offered.
 - f. The classroom allocations for P.S. 9 are based on the unrealistic expectation to fit 24 children into every classroom.
 - g. Brooklyn East Collegiate students are given far more access to the gymnasium and library and the most desirable time slot for use of the cafeteria.
 - h. The "revisions" in the EIS underscore the issues with the proposal.
 - i. The proposal allots very little time for P.S. 9 students to use the library, even though P.S. 9 families funded its creation, not the DOE.
 - j. There has been no discussion of a Gifted and Talented program at P.S. 9.
 - k. The EIS does not provide a realistic analysis of the proposal's impact on P.S. 9 students.

- l. The EIS does not account for the changing demographic in Prospect Heights, which would not be served by a charter school.
 - m. The proposal does not clarify how much the DOE will allow P.S. 9 to expand.
 - n. The EIS does not project P.S. 9 enrollment growth past three years into the future, which is when the greatest population growth is certain to occur.
 - o. That the DOE has failed to explain the flaws in the EIS indicates that they have reverse-engineered the facts to fit the DOE's own purposes.
 - p. The EIS unfairly apportions more square-footage to Brooklyn East Collegiate students than is apportioned to P.S. 9 students.
 - q. The DOE has stated it does not currently have access to figures for enrollment applications for next year's kindergarten, which would confirm the trend of the greatly increasing demand for those seats; however, the DOE could easily get those figures if it wanted to. After all, certain parents were able to procure the figures in just two phone calls, and after sharing them with the DOE, the DOE never even asked for the source.
 - r. The DOE's plans reflect a philosophy of using data they currently have, whether or not it displays the whole picture or is based on assumptions, and letting the Building Council figure everything out later.
 - s. Responses to concerns about the shared space plan that state it is just a suggestion and should be worked out by the Building Council do not address whether a feasible shared space plan could actually be arranged; rather, they seem to suggest there is no way to create a feasible shared space plan.
29. A commenter stated that the proposal indicates the City's desire to open more charter schools and move to a corporate model, even though this is not what every parents want.
 30. A commenter stated that the expansion of P.S. 9 should have been considered before this proposal was put forth.
 31. A commenter stated the proposal occurred because of political pressure to open more charter schools and because the DOE is trying to find extra space during a time of budget shortages.
 32. A commenter asked whether Brooklyn East Collegiate could be kept where it is for another year to allow for a more careful and collegial planning process, especially since the school's average class size is very low at its current location.
 33. A commenter noted P.S. 9 should be given a fair hearing for its proposal to expand. Implementing this proposal would prevent P.S. 9 from implementing its own proposal.
 34. A commenter expressed support for allowing Brooklyn East Collegiate to grow, but stated that the charter should be located somewhere else in order to allow P.S. 9 to expand.
 35. New York State Assembly Member Hakeem Jeffries wrote that P.S. 9 should be allowed to expand in the building in order to meet the growing needs of the community.
 36. A commenter noted that the proposal is invalid according to State Education Law (Section 2590-G(8)(b)) because the "revised" EIS was released only one working day ahead of the hearing, and less than 15 days before the PEP vote. Given so little time, opponents of the proposal are not able to properly analyze the revised data or reach out to public officials.
 37. A commenter submitted P.S. 9's activities and lunch calendars to underscore the request to expand P.S. 9.
 38. A commenter noted that the DOE has not sufficiently responded to the community's

concerns about the EIS and “revised” EIS since it was published.

39. A commenter asserted that contrary to claims by the DOE that over half of P.S. 9 students come from out of zone, fully 60% of P.S. 9 students reside within the school’s zone. In the lower grades, the proportion is even higher.
40. A commenter asserted that contrary to claims by the DOE, there is not enough space to accommodate all families zoned to P.S. 9 should all those families choose to send their children to the school.
41. A commenter asserted that contrary to claims by the DOE, the building Brooklyn East Collegiate currently occupies is also occupied by other schools within the same charter network, and the DOE is listed in building records as one of the owners of this building. Moreover, keeping Brooklyn East Collegiate in that same building would afford that school more square footage of space per child than K009 would.
42. A commenter suggested that the DOE should reverse its decision following the original PEP vote approving this proposal.
43. A commenter suggested the DOE’s perceived misstatements during the PEP meeting on February 3, 2011 and in published documents invalidate the vote on that day to approve the proposal.

IV. Information regarding where the full text of the proposed item may be obtained.

The revised Educational Impact Statement and revised Building Utilization Plan can be found on the Department of Education’s Web site:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2010-2011/May182011Proposals>

Copies of the revised EIS and revised Building Utilization Plan are also available in the main offices of M.S. 571, P.S. 9, and Brooklyn East Collegiate.

V. Submission of public comment.

Written comments can be sent to D13Proposals@schools.nyc.gov.

Oral comments can be left at 212-374-0208.

VI. The name, office, address, email and telephone number of the city district representative, knowledgeable on the item under consideration, from whom information may be obtained concerning the item.

Name: Benjamin Taylor
Office: Division of Portfolio Planning
Address: 52 Chambers St
Email: D13Proposals@schools.nyc.gov
Phone: 212-374-0208

VII. Date, time and place of joint public hearings for this proposal.

A joint public hearing regarding the original proposal was held at M.S. 571 on January 24, 2011. A full transcript of this hearing can be found here:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/community/planning/changes/brooklyn/MS571>

A new joint public hearing will be held to gather public comment on this proposal:

To Be Determined
M.S. 571 / P.S. 9
80 Underhill Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11238

Notice will be provided once the hearing has been scheduled. Questions about the proposal can be directed as indicated in section VI above.

Speaker sign-up will begin 30 minutes before the hearing and will close 15 minutes after the start. To request interpretation services, please contact Mr. Taylor at the e-mail address or telephone number above.

VIII. Date, time and place of the Panel for Educational Policy meeting at which the Panel will vote on the proposed item.

May 18, 2011 at 6:00 p.m.
Long Island City High School
14-30 Broadway, Queens, NY 11106