

Public Comment Analysis

Date: March 24, 2015

Topic: The Proposed Temporary Partial Re-siting and Co-location of P.S. 24 Andrew Jackson (25Q024) with P.S. 107 Thomas A. Dooley (25Q107) in Building Q107 for Three Years Beginning in the 2015-2016 School Year

Date of Panel Vote: March 25, 2015

Summary of Proposal

On February 5, 2015, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued an Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) describing a proposal to temporarily re-site one grade level of P.S. 24 Andrew Jackson (25Q024, “P.S. 24”) from building Q024 (“Q024”), located at 141-11 Holly Avenue, Queens, New York 11355 in Community School District 25 (“District 25”) to building Q107 (“Q107”), located at 167-02 45 Avenue, Queens, New York 11358 in District 25. If this proposal is approved, P.S. 24’s re-sited grade level would be co-located with existing district elementary school P.S. 107 Thomas A. Dooley (25Q107, “P.S. 107”) for a three-year period beginning in the 2015-2016 school year. A “re-siting” means that students will attend classes in a different building than in previous years, and a “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share common spaces, such as auditoriums, gymnasiums, libraries, and cafeterias. A project to build an addition to the Q024 building is scheduled to begin in the 2015-2016 school year, and will require P.S. 24 to temporarily re-site some of its students. If this proposal is approved, some of P.S. 24’s kindergarten students will be co-located for three years with P.S. 107 in building Q107 while the addition project is completed. The addition to Q024 will increase elementary school seats in District 25, which is in need of additional capacity.

- Extensive public engagement was conducted throughout the course of creating this proposal, which included:
 - A Community Needs Assessment Forum convened by the DOE on November 17, 2014, in which elected officials, representatives from Queens Community Education Councils (“CECs”), representatives from Queens District Presidents Councils, and community members from District 25 participated, at which potential district planning needs and priorities in Queens were discussed.
 - A walkthrough of building Q107 with Deputy Chancellor Phil Weinberg, District 25 Superintendent Danielle DiMango, and representatives from the Office of District Planning and Office of Space Planning on January 27, 2015, and a meeting before the walkthrough with the P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 principals and School Leadership Team members to discuss the proposal further, take questions and concerns from both school communities, and determine whether significant logistical or other concerns would prevent the implementation of this proposal if approved by the Panel for Educational Policy (“PEP”). CEC 25 was invited but was unable to attend.
- The DOE has offered the following public engagement opportunities:
 - Two joint public hearings – one held at building Q107 and another held at building Q024. These meetings were open to the public and attendees were encouraged to provide comment on this proposal as part of the public comment portion of the hearing.
 - Dedicated phone and email lines to accept public comment at any time following the posting of this proposal until 6 p.m. on the day before the PEP meeting. Comments can be submitted in any language by calling 212-374-7621 or emailed in any language to D25Proposals@schools.nyc.gov. All comments were received at the above noted hearing or

through phone or email lines were addressed by the DOE in this analysis of public comment, which is made available to the public after 6 p.m. on the day before the PEP meeting.

- PEP meeting at which PEP members will vote on several proposals, including this one, prior to implementation of the proposal. This meeting is also open to the public and attendees are welcomed to provide comment on this proposal.
- Information on the joint public hearing and PEP meeting can be found on the DOE website at: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2014-2015/March2015SchoolProposals>.

P.S. 24 is an existing zoned elementary school that serves students in kindergarten through fifth grades in building Q024. Additionally, P.S. 24 serves students in transportable classroom unit (“TCU”) Q936, located at the same address as building Q024. The utilization rate across both buildings for the current school year is approximately 166%, indicating the need for additional capacity for P.S. 24, which is why construction of an addition to Q024 is planned. Construction of the addition to Q024 involves demolishing TCU Q936, which has four rooms, and four rooms in main building Q024, which will require some P.S. 24 students to vacate the main building. Building Q024 does not have sufficient space to absorb the students currently served in TCU Q936 and the four rooms in the main building that must be demolished. If a portion of P.S. 24 is not re-sited next year and P.S. 24 attempts to serve all of its students in the main building, the approximate utilization rate of Q024 is projected to be 175%-186% in 2015-2016. Therefore, a temporary partial re-siting is needed in order to accommodate all P.S. 24 students while the addition is under construction. The addition is anticipated to have a capacity of approximately 500 seats, which will substantially increase the capacity of the Q024 building. The construction of the addition is anticipated to be completed prior to the start of the 2018-2019 school year, at which time the P.S. 24 students being served at Q107 will return to building Q024.

Building Q107, where the DOE is proposing to re-site one grade level of P.S. 24, houses P.S. 107, an existing zoned district elementary school that serves grades kindergarten through five and offers four sections of a full-day pre-kindergarten program. Building Q107 is approximately 1.2 miles away from building Q024. According to the 2013-2014 Enrollment, Capacity, Utilization Report (the “Blue Book”), building Q107 has the capacity to serve 939 students. In 2014-2015, the Q107 building serves 966 students, yielding an estimated utilization rate of 103%. If this proposal is approved, during the first year of its implementation in 2015-2016, there will be a total of 1,062-1,132 students served collectively by P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 in building Q107. This yields a projected target utilization rate of 113%-121%. During the third and final year of this proposal, in 2017-2018, P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will serve a total of 1,067-1,137 students in building Q107. This yields a projected target utilization rate of 114%-121%. Although a utilization rate in excess of 100% may suggest that a building will be over-crowded in a given year, this rate does not account for the fact that rooms may be programmed for more efficient or different uses than the standard assumptions in the utilization calculation.

The details of this proposal have been released in an EIS, which can be accessed here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2014-2015/March2015SchoolProposals>.

Copies of the EIS are also available in the main offices of P.S. 24 and P.S. 107.

Summary of Comments Received

Two joint public hearings regarding this proposal were held at the Q024 and Q107 buildings on March 10, 2015 and March 12, 2015, respectively. At these hearings, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 30 members of the public attended the hearing at Q024 on March 10, 2015 and three people spoke. Approximately 50 people attended the hearing at Q107 on March 12, 2015, at which time five people spoke. Present at the Q024 meeting were District 25 Community Superintendent Danielle DiMango; CEC 25 members President Morris Altman, Kim Montgomery, and Dawn Acevedo; P.S. 24 School Leadership Team (“SLT”) representatives Principal Debra Cassidy, Barbara Simon, and Alana Antonio; P.S. 107 SLT representative Principal Lori Cummings; and Sarah Turchin and Dean Guzman from the DOE. Present at the Q107 meeting were District 25 Community Superintendent Danielle DiMango; CEC 25 members, including President Morris Altman, Kim Montgomery, Dawn Acevedo, and Seung Gook Hwang; P.S. 24 SLT representatives, including Principal Debra



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

Cassidy and Wendy Shen; P.S. 107 SLT representatives, including Principal Lori Cummings and Marian Sherron; and Bridget Mercier and Dean Guzman from the DOE.

A community meeting was facilitated by District 25 Community Superintendent Danielle DiMango on February 24, 2015. Approximately 75 members of the public attended the meeting and 15 people spoke. At that meeting, interested parties had an additional opportunity to provide input on and ask questions about the proposal. Present at the meeting were: Principal Lori Cummings representing the P.S. 107 SLT, and Robert Carney, Chris Mangiero, and Dean Guzman of the DOE.

The following comments and remarks were made at the February 24, 2015 community meeting, March 10, 2015 joint public hearing, and/or March 12, 2015 joint public hearing regarding the proposal:

1. CEC 25 President Morris Altman made the following statements:
 - a. He supports this proposal.
 - b. His son went to P.S. 107 and thinks the P.S. 107 community should support this proposal.
 - c. P.S. 24 currently has desperate space needs. The school is holding classrooms in closets and the library and yet offers quality education.
 - d. P.S. 107 used to be more overcrowded in the past and can presently accommodate P.S. 24 students.
 - e. This co-location can work.
2. CEC 25 member Dawn Acevedo made the following statements:
 - a. She believes this proposal is a great opportunity for P.S. 24.
 - b. She supports this proposal because P.S. 24 is in desperate need of more space and P.S. 107 can provide a safe environment for all students.
 - c. She understands the fear of the unknown; however, as a CEC 25 representative, she supports proposals that benefit the entire district.
3. P.S. 24 Principal Cassidy made the following statements:
 - a. She has identified a need for more seats and capacity at P.S. 24 and therefore supports this proposal.
 - b. She feels fortunate P.S. 24 can share space with P.S. 107 during this temporary co-location.
 - c. She will work with Principal Cummings to create a great environment in the school.
4. P.S. 107 Principal Cummings made the following statements:
 - a. She stated her full support for the proposal.
 - b. She acknowledges there are concerns from both school communities.
 - c. If this proposal is passed, she is committed to all students in her building.
 - d. She will work with Principal Cassidy to ensure low impact on children and high outcomes for all children in the building.
5. P.S. 107 SLT member Marian Sherron made the following statements:
 - a. P.S. 107 has always been a family; a functional, bright, thriving family.
 - b. P.S. 107 has always welcomed new members to the community.
 - c. She states that before the P.S. 107 community welcomes new members to the community, there needs to be enough money, space and facilities available to provide for them equally along with everyone else already in the building.
 - d. She expressed the need for both schools to be treated equitably.
 - e. She expressed concerns regarding the lack of transparency and timeline of this proposal process.
 - f. She expressed a need to respect all parents and the community in their language differences.
 - g. She expressed a need to create a thorough safety plan.
 - h. She expressed a need for a third safety agent.
 - i. She expressed a need for space plan for the three years of the proposal.
 - j. She expressed a need for a transportation plan.
6. Multiple commenters expressed support for the proposal.
7. Multiple commenters expressed support for P.S. 24 to begin its construction of the addition.
8. Multiple commenters expressed support for P.S. 24 students to be re-sited in P.S.107.
9. Multiple commenters welcomed P.S. 24 students to the P.S. 107 community.
10. Multiple commenters asked how bus transportation will work for P.S. 24 students.



11. Multiple commenters expressed concern over the increased traffic that will occur at P.S. 107 for arrival and dismissal if this proposal is approved.
12. Multiple commenters asked if this proposal has been finalized, or if it “is a done deal.”
13. Multiple commenters asked how students from P.S. 24 can fit in the building.
14. Multiple commenters asked where students with disabilities will be served if this proposal is passed.
15. Multiple commenters expressed safety concerns.
16. Multiple commenters expressed a need for an additional safety officer in building Q107.
17. Multiple commenters expressed frustration regarding the lack of transparency and timeline of this proposal process.
18. Multiple commenters expressed concern that zoned P.S. 107 students will not be able to enroll at the school.
19. Multiple commenters asked what would happen if the proposal does not get approval from the PEP.
20. Multiple commenters expressed frustration with regards to the delay in translated materials about the proposal.
21. Multiple commenters expressed concern about shared spaces in building Q107.
22. Multiple commenters expressed concern that there is not enough space in the building for P.S. 24 students.
23. Multiple commenters expressed opposition to this proposal.
24. One commenter stated that co-locations exhaust resources for students and have a negative effect on schools.
25. One commenter stated that co-locations create inequitable environments for students.
26. One commenter expressed frustration that they had no input in selecting the joint public hearing or community meeting date.
27. One commenter asked what time P.S. 107 will start school during the 2015-2016 school year.
28. One commenter asked why homes surrounding P.S. 107 were not notified of this proposal.
29. One commenter asked how many students are being re-sited from P.S. 24 to P.S. 107.
30. One commenter asked how schools are allocated resources for this proposal.
31. One commenter asked which classrooms in P.S. 107 are being moved.
32. One commenter expressed concern regarding the building Q107 utilization rate being over 100%.
33. One commenter asked how space would be maximized in the building.
34. One commenter expressed concern over potentially decreased property values of their homes if this proposal was approved.
35. One commenter stated that P.S. 107 already has 32 students per class and cannot take more students in the building.
36. One commenter expressed that the onus is not on P.S. 107 to house P.S. 24 students.
37. One commenter expressed concern about the difference of the percentage of English Language Learners (“ELL”) between the two schools.
38. One commenter expressed that P.S. 107 will not be able to get a Gifted and Talented program because of this proposal.
39. One commenter suggested other schools or private buildings to house P.S. 24 students.
40. One commenter requested that residential construction in the neighborhood stop.

Summary of Issues Raised in Written and/or Oral Comments Submitted to the DOE

The DOE received the 12 written comments via email and 4 oral comments via phone:

41. Community Board 7 voted unanimously in support of this proposal.
42. Multiple commenters do not support this proposal.
43. Multiple commenters expressed concern over the increased traffic that will occur at P.S. 107 for arrival and dismissal if this proposal is approved.
44. Multiple commenters expressed concern about shared spaces in building Q107 such as the auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria, and library.
45. Multiple commenters expressed concern that there is not enough space in the building for P.S. 24 students.
46. Multiple commenters expressed frustration over the timeline of this proposal and how communication occurred with the P.S. 107 community.



47. Two commenters expressed frustration that the community meeting duration was only an hour and some parents did not have an opportunity to speak.
48. Two commenters expressed that during the community meeting, panel members' answers to questions about the proposal were not adequate.
49. One commenter expressed that P.S. 107 will not be able to get a Gifted and Talented program because of this proposal.
50. One commenter suggested other schools or private buildings to house P.S. 24 students.
51. One commenter asked for the names and contact information of the PEP members.
52. One commenter asked what staff at P.S. 107 will be used by P.S. 24.
53. One commenter asked what additional funding will be provided for additional staff during this proposal.
54. One commenter asked if P.S. 107 will use the entire building after the re-siting is done or if this co-location will be permanent.
55. One commenter asked if the EIS will be translated.
56. One commenter asked where the EIS is located for distribution.
57. One commenter expressed frustration that P.S. 24 kindergarten students cannot be guaranteed to be re-sited to P.S. 107.
58. One commenter expressed frustration that P.S. 24 will ultimately decide which grade to send to P.S. 24.
59. One commenter believes this proposal will be a distraction for the P.S. 107 principal.
60. One commenter expressed that this proposal will affect school culture at P.S. 107.
61. One commenter expressed concern about the differences between the percentages of ELLs served at each of the two schools.
62. One commenter expressed safety concerns.

Analysis of Issues Raised, Significant Alternatives Proposed

Comments 1a-e, 2a-c, 3a-c, 4a, 4c-d, 5a-b, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 41 are in favor of the proposal and do not require a response.

Comments 34 and 40 are unrelated to the proposal and do not require a response.

Comment 5c, 5d, and 30 express a need for resources and support at P.S. 107 during this proposed co-location. Comments 37 and 61 related directly with the concern and need for support for ELLs at both schools. Comments 5c and 53 express a need for additional funding during this proposed re-siting and temporary co-location.

The DOE commends the school staff for their hard work and dedication to the students and families of P.S. 24 and P.S. 107. The DOE recognizes the collaborative role that principals and staff take in developing schools. Schools throughout the city are not just educational institutions but rich and tight-knit communities. P.S. 24 and P.S. 107, like all DOE schools, will continue to receive support and assistance from their superintendent.

In regards to comment 5c, as stated in the EIS, the estimated cost to temporarily relocate a portion of P.S. 24 to Q107 and back to Q024 is up to approximately \$26,853.75 for each re-siting. This cost will include moving some existing materials and furniture from the current site to Q107 and back to Q024 after the completion of the addition.

This proposal is not expected to otherwise impact the operating budget or costs of instruction at P.S. 24 or P.S. 107. Most funding in schools' budgets is allocated on a per pupil basis, based on current Fair Student Funding ("FSF") per capita allocation levels. Schools receive additional funds for students with disabilities, ELLs, and those with other supplemental academic needs.

Please refer to the FSF Guide and FY15 School Allocation Memorandum for additional information on cost of instruction and how the changes to FSF funding and other school allocations will be impacted as a result of register changes at P.S. 24 and P.S. 107. Staffing changes are at the discretion of the school within the limits of contractual and mandated obligations.

The FSF Guide can be accessed at:

http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy14_15/FY15_PDF/sam01_1b.pdf.



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

The FY15 School Allocation Memorandum is available at:

http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy14_15/FY15_PDF/sam33.pdf.

Should this proposal create a need for additional administrative space or function, the cost of voice and data lines will be fully covered by the DOE. This allocation is subject to approval by the Office of Space Planning.

Comments 4b, 23, 24, 25, 36, 42, 59, and 60 express general opposition to this proposal and co-locations. Comments 39 and 50 suggest using other buildings for this proposal. Comment 54 asks if this co-location is temporary or permanent.

Co-location is the everyday experience of more than half the schools in New York City. Of all district schools, approximately two-thirds are co-located with another school, most with another district school. As stated in the EIS, P.S. 24 is an existing zoned elementary school that serves students in kindergarten through fifth grades in building Q024. Additionally, P.S. 24 serves students in TCU Q936, located at the same address as building Q024. The utilization rate across both buildings for the current school year is approximately 166%, indicating the need for additional capacity for P.S. 24, which is why construction of an addition to Q024 is planned. Construction of the addition to Q024 involves demolishing TCU Q936, which has four rooms, and four rooms in main building Q024, which will require some P.S. 24 students to vacate the main building. Building Q024 does not have sufficient space to absorb the students currently served in TCU Q936 and the four rooms in the main building that must be demolished. If a portion of P.S. 24 is not re-sited next year and P.S. 24 attempts to serve all of its students in the main building, the approximate utilization rate of Q024 is projected to be 175%-186% in 2015-2016. Therefore, a temporary partial re-siting is needed in order to accommodate all P.S. 24 students while the addition is under construction. The addition is anticipated to have a capacity of approximately 500 seats, which will substantially increase the capacity of the Q024 building. The construction of the addition is anticipated to be completed prior to the start of the 2018-2019 school year, at which time the P.S. 24 students being served at Q107 will return to building Q024.

In regards to comments 39 and 50, co-locations allow us to use our limited facilities efficiently while simultaneously, in the case of this proposal, create additional capacity to serve District 25's students and improve learning conditions. In this case, P.S. 107 was the closest available option to temporarily re-site and co-locate a portion of P.S. 24 as other district schools or buildings in the area did not have adequate space to accommodate the portion of P.S. 24 students.

In regards to comment 54, in addition, as stated in the EIS, the DOE is proposing to temporarily re-site one grade level of P.S. 24 to building Q107 for a three-year period beginning in the 2015-2016 school year. This proposal is not proposing a permanent co-location.

Comments 13, 22, 32, 33, and 45 express concern regarding space in Q107 during this temporary co-location. Comment 35 expresses concern that P.S. 107's class size will increase as a result of this proposal. Comment 18 relates to P.S. 107's ability to enroll all zoned students.

As stated in the EIS, if this proposal is approved, there will be sufficient space to accommodate the instructional needs of P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 in the Q107 building, pursuant to the Citywide Instructional Footprint (the "Footprint"). Please visit the DOE Web site to access the Footprint, which guides space allocation and use in City schools: http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/961D691C-641D-4918-9798-8BA2C0A761FF/0/DOEFootprint_91114newlogo.pdf. The DOE believes that the Q107 building is sufficient to meet the instructional needs of P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 students during the 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018 school years.

In 2014-2015, the Q107 building serves 966 students, yielding an estimated utilization rate of 103%. If this proposal is approved, during the first year of its implementation in 2015-2016, there will be a total of 1,062-1,132 students served collectively by P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 in building Q107. This yields a projected target utilization rate of 113% - 121%. During the third and final year of this proposal, in 2017-2018, P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will serve a total of 1,067-1,137 students in building Q107. This yields a projected target utilization rate of 114% - 121%.



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

In regards to comment 32, although a utilization rate in excess of 100% may suggest that a building will be overcrowded in a given year, this rate does not account for the fact that rooms may be programmed for more efficient or different uses than the standard assumptions in the utilization calculation.

In regards to comments 18 and 35, as stated in the EIS, the proposed temporary partial re-siting and co-location of P.S. 24 in the Q107 building is not expected to impact the admissions, enrollment, or educational options of students currently attending P.S. 24 or P.S. 107. P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will continue to give priority to students who live in their zones, as they have in the past, and in accordance with Chancellor's Regulation A-101. Furthermore, the DOE believes that P.S. 107 will be able to continue accommodating its zoned demand throughout the duration of this proposal.

Comments 21 and 44 concern the shared space scheduling in the building with particular concern for the auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria, and library. Comments 5i, 14, and 31 specifically relate to the space plan for the next three years in Q107.

As in other situations where schools are co-located, the schools will need to share large common and specialty rooms in the building, such as the cafeteria, the gymnasium, the auditorium, and the library. Specific decisions regarding the allocation of the shared spaces will be made by the Building Council, consisting of principals from all co-located schools, in conjunction with the DOE's Office of Space Planning.

Principals from each school organization co-located in a building serve on a Building Council to make decisions about overall use of the shared space and shared space schedules including the use of the cafeteria and scheduling of lunch periods for students in each co-located school organization. If the principals are unable to agree upon a schedule for shared spaces, there is a mediation process outlined in the Campus Policy Memo, which is available at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/campusgov>.

In regards to comments 5i, 14, and 31, if this proposal is approved, the Office of Space Planning will work with the Building Council to ensure an equitable allocation of the space in Q107, including designated space for students with disabilities. In determining an equitable allocation, the Office of Space Planning may consider factors such as the relative enrollments of the co-located schools, the instructional and programmatic needs of the co-located schools, and the physical location of the space within the building.

Comment 27 relates to safety concerns in Q107 relating to arrival and dismissal times on campus. Comments 5j and 10 relate to the plan and safety of students regarding transportation. Comments 11 and 43 relate to traffic concerns during arrival and dismissal.

Pursuant to Chancellor's Regulation A-414, every school/campus is mandated to form a School Safety Committee, which is responsible for developing a comprehensive School Safety Plan that defines the normal operations of the site and what procedures are in place in the event of an emergency. The School Safety Plan is updated annually by the Committee to meet changing security needs, changes in organization and building conditions and any other factors; these updates could also be made at any other time when it is necessary to address security concerns. The Committee will also address safety matters on an ongoing basis and make appropriate recommendations to the Principals when it identifies the need for additional security measures.

As stated at the community meeting on February 24, 2015, if this approval is approved, the school leadership of both P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will work together to create a transportation plan and determine start and dismissal times prior to the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. Transportation will continue to be provided according to Chancellor's Regulation A-801: <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/21A1B11A-886B-4F74-9546-E875EE82A14C/40303/A801.pdf>.

Comments 5g, 15, and 62 express safety concerns between the two schools during this temporary co-location. Comments 5h and 16 refer to the need for additional safety officers.

As stated at the community meeting on February 24, 2015, if this approval is approved, the school leadership of both P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will work together to create a safety plan.

Additionally, as stated in the EIS, if this proposal is approved, P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will develop a safety and security plan for Q107 prior to the first day of school in September 2015. This plan will have changes, as needed, to account for the additional grade levels.

In regards to comments 5h and 16, the School Safety Committee will also address safety matters on an ongoing basis and make appropriate recommendations to the principals when it identifies the need for additional security measures such as safety officers.

The DOE makes available the following supports to schools relating to safety and security:

- Providing “Best Practices Standards for Creating and Sustaining a Safe and Supportive School,” as a resource guide;
- Reviewing and monitoring school occurrence data and crime data (in conjunction with the Criminal Justice Coordinator and the New York City Police Department);
- Providing technical assistance via the Borough Safety Directors when incidents occur;
- Providing professional development and kits for Building Response Teams; and
- Monitoring and certifying School Safety Plans annually.

Comments 38 and 49 relate to P.S. 107’s ability to establish a Gifted and Talented program.

P.S. 107 has not formally requested to add a new Gifted and Talented program in District 25. Although the number of available rooms is taken into consideration when opening a new Gifted and Talented program, other factors include demand in the area and across the district. This proposal will not preclude the DOE from considering future programmatic opportunities at P.S. 107 in the future.

Comment 12 suggests that a decision has already been made regarding this proposal.

While the DOE supports the proposed temporary partial re-siting and co-location of P.S. 24 with P.S. 107 in building Q107, the DOE notes that no decision has been made on this proposal and the DOE will continue to collect public feedback on this proposal before the PEP votes. Any proposed change to school utilization must go through the process outlined by Chancellor’s Regulation A-190 and be approved by the PEP before it can take effect.

Comments 5e, 17, 26, and 46 concern engagement with the P.S. 107 community about this proposal. Comment 28 concerns the notification of neighboring buildings regarding the community meeting and joint public hearings. Comments 47 and 48 refers to the length of the community meeting and the panel’s ability to answer all questions from the audience. Comments 5f, 20, and 55 refer to accessibility and timing of translated materials for this proposal.

The DOE is committed to engaging with the community for all proposals to implement a significant change in school utilization, as detailed in Chancellor’s Regulation A-190. Chancellor’s Regulation A-190 sets out the public review and comment process that the DOE undertakes with respect to all such proposals by the Chancellor, including co-locations. The DOE appreciates all feedback from the community regarding a proposal.

As stated in the EIS, extensive public engagement was conducted throughout the course of creating this proposal, which included:

- A Community Needs Assessment Forum convened by the DOE on November 17, 2014, in which elected officials, representatives from Queens CECs, representatives from Queens District Presidents Councils, and community members from District 25 participated, at which potential district planning needs and priorities in Queens were discussed.
- A walkthrough of building Q107 with Deputy Chancellor Phil Weinberg, District 25 Superintendent Danielle DiMango, and representatives from the Office of District Planning and Office of Space



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

Planning on January 27, 2015, and a meeting before the walkthrough with the P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 principals and School Leadership Team members to discuss the proposal further, take questions and concerns from both school communities, and determine whether significant logistical or other concerns would prevent the implementation of this proposal if approved by the PEP. CEC 25 was invited but was unable to attend.

- A community meeting facilitated by District 25 Community Superintendent Danielle DiMango on February 24, 2015. Approximately 75 members of the public attended the meeting and 5 people spoke. At that meeting, interested parties had an additional opportunity to provide input on and ask questions about the proposal. Present at the meeting were: Principal Lori Cummings representing the P.S. 107 SLT; and Robert Carney, Chris Mangiero, and Dean Guzman of the DOE.
- Two joint public hearings – one held at building Q107 and another held at building Q024. These meetings were open to the public and attendees were encouraged to provide comment on this proposal as part of the public comment portion of the hearing.

Although the DOE recognizes that some members in the community oppose this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the schools' communities at P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships.

In regards to comments 47 and 48, the community meeting was facilitated by the Community School District Superintendent Danielle DiMango, who also answered questions from the community, and, as stated at the community meeting on February 24, 2015, the meeting was called to an end due to the disruptive behavior of the audience. The facilitation of the community meeting is at the discretion of the facilitator as there are no mandatory guidelines in regards to the community meeting in Chancellor's Regulation A-190.

In regards to comments 5f, 20, and 55, the DOE is committed to providing translated materials upon request. Spanish and Chinese translated materials were sent to P.S. 24 leadership to be made available for distribution for the P.S. 24 community. Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic translated materials were sent to P.S. 107 leadership to be made available for distribution for the P.S. 107 community. Translated materials were also provided at the two joint public hearings regarding this proposal at the Q024 and Q107 buildings on March 10, 2015 and March 12, 2015, respectively.

Comment 29 asks how many students will be re-sited from P.S. 24 to building Q107.

The DOE is proposing to re-site one grade level of P.S. 24, approximately 115-125 students, to building Q107 for a three-year period beginning in the 2015-2016 school year.

Comment 56 refers to the location of the EIS for distribution.

The details of this proposal have been released in an EIS, which can be accessed here:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2014-2015/March2015SchoolProposals>.

Copies of the EIS are also available in the main offices of P.S. 24 and P.S. 107.

Comment 51 refers to the names and contact information of the PEP members.

The names and contact information of the PEP members are publicly available and can be accessed here:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/members/default.htm>.

Comment 19 refers to the DOE's plans if this proposal is not approved by the PEP.

If this proposal is not approved by the PEP, the DOE may issue a new proposal for an alternative siting plan in accordance with Chancellor's Regulation A-190.



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

Comments 57 and 58 refer to the footnote regarding P.S. 24 being the sole decision maker of what grade level will be re-sited to Q107 if this proposal was approved.

As stated at the community meeting on February 24, 2015, if this approval is approved, the school leadership of both P.S. 24 and P.S. 107 have committed to work together to determine which grade level should be re-sited to Q107. However, as stated in the EIS, the leadership of P.S. 24 may ultimately decide to send fewer students or portions of kindergarten, or a different grade, to Q107 during the period of the co-location,

Comment 52 asks what staff at P.S. 107 will be used by P.S. 24.

Staff at both schools will continue to teach and work in their respective schools.

Changes Made to the Proposal

No changes have been made to the proposal.