



COMMUNITY EDUCATION COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

154 West 93rd Street New York, New York 10025 - Room 204 Tel (212) 678-2782 Fax (212) 678-2804 Email: CEC3@schools.nyc.gov

Joseph A. Fiordaliso
President

Nan Eileen Mead
First Vice President

Zoe G. Foundotos
Second Vice President

Kristen Berger
Secretary

Kimberly Watkins
Treasurer

Council Members: Noah Gotbaum Theresa L.C. Hammonds Pradnya Joshi Daniel Katz
Lucas Liu Vacant, *ELL Member* Vacant, *Student Member*

Ilene Altschul
District 3 Community Superintendent

DRAFT Meeting Minutes – Zoning Committee

Thursday, October 15th (9:00 am – 12:00 pm)

Joan of Arc Complex 154 West 93rd Street

Attendance: 43 members of the community including 5 CEC members, Superintendent Altschul, Sarah Turchin from DOE District Planning, and four elected official representatives.

Chair reminded the group that the session was being taped and that to hear recorded podcasts of the Zoning Committee, visit www.spreaker.com/user/8322048.

Reminders also that on Saturday, October 17 at PS191, the second public hearing will take place. On Monday, November 2nd, at Joan of Arc, the DOE will make final presentation to community. This triggers the 45 day window for the CEC to vote. Thursday, November 19 is the Calendar Meeting of the CEC, during which members will vote on a plan. This meeting takes place at PS87.

With the goal of the meeting to dissect the DOE draft rezoning plan, the group began a discussion of the major themes since its unveiling for the first time on September 28 at the last committee meeting and the first public hearing on October 7.

Though many members of the community have expressed the desire for more time to understand the zoning process, meetings and events have been very well attended so far. 150 members of community present at last week's first public hearing; 50 people spoke. The most abundantly clear message that the community offers is that very few stakeholders favor this proposal as it is currently constructed.

CEC members have been mining the data of online comments and on CEC3 website questionnaire and emails sent. The following recurring themes have been posted:

1. Timing of this rezoning – asking for more time, which is an option. The CEC could simply vote to reject the DOE's plan but that would carry with it a number of consequences, including the untenable overcrowding at PS199 and the under-enrollment at PS191. It could, in fact, have an impact on the entire district, as other schools would absorb the waitlist families.
2. Desire to determine zone lines based on older buildings, coops/older buildings, etc. The DOE has stated publicly that they do not draw lines based on owned v rented units and the age of a building; further representatives reminded us that the lines must be contiguous, so the map lines where a building is simply zoned out because it is new, or an old building is zoned in because it's been around for a long time are not necessarily possible.
3. What to do about making 191 a place where everyone wants to send their children, especially given proposed larger zone size?

Sarah Turchin then took the group through the proposal again with the one difference that the superzone map now includes the “bowtie” portion set to be rezoned to PS452, as that school expressed the desire to increase its size to conform to its original school structural plan (with three classes per grade).

Dialog re “bow tie” at 71st street and Broadway/7th Avenue/Amsterdam (slide 10)

Request for additional data (on actual enrollments vs. residents in the zone); Sarah will try to get this information ASAP (based on what can be shared with privacy laws, etc.)

School	Zone Enrollment (% of students from within the zone)	Zone Retention (kindergarten residents that have entered in the DOE system)
199	98%	89%
191	67%	56%
452	77%	70%

Shifts to existing zones would be done for 2016 school year
 Something larger in scope (e.g., super zone) would not be done for 2016 school year
 New slides flesh out “shared zone”
 Tried to have all residents within 0.5 mile where possible within 3 zone rezoning proposal – not possible with shared zone. (Also, some are outside of 0.5 mile, but tried to minimize)
 Shared zone would require kids to walk further
 With shared zone proposal, if got an offer and attended school, would not have option to go to more preferred school, except could pull from waitlist if slots open up (199), so more desirable school will always be full (and have sizable waitlist)
 Could look into do
 Group discussion
 Grandfathering
 CEC hasn’t yet taken position (but will)
 Precedent based on prior conversations/decision – grandfathered is favored
 Shared zone
 Critique – elimination of neighborhood school
 452 kindergarten
 Today, gets a lot of students from out of zone to fill slots
 With proposal, would fill slots more with in-zone students (vs. out of zone)
 342 incubation
 Typically takes 2 years to get school online – not time to incubate for next school year
 Has new construction (new buildings) been taken into account?
 Yes
 Does it include “50 story building” – 69th and Amsterdam?
 170 Amsterdam and 200 Amsterdam are new buildings
 Persistently Dangerous ranking
 Hope will be off by end of the year
 Per Ilene Altschul... Until goes away, families have “option” to transfer under state law, but not guaranteed transfer
 [Out of the room with Ilene Altschul for 5-10 minutes]
 She does not support pairing approach
 Has taken it off the table
 She controls what proposals get into the table. She does not control the vote... but doesn’t think it will provide educational continuity, and would
 Paired schools
 Not supported by Ilene Altschul
 Not supported by senior city administration
 342 doesn’t come online until 2018 school year
 Improving 191
 What would it take to improve 191?
 Diversity stats
 Also have access to free/reduced lunch stats – but not true parental income stats
 Pairing – is it off the table?
 She will take it back to Deputy Chancellor
 But will defer to Ilene Altschul as the superintendent
 CEC requests the data that DOE are making decision on

Projections

Slide 11 and 13

Some is violation of privacy – could potentially if over 10

Dan's (one member of CEC) factors that he believes are critical

Has to make building better

Enable schools to be better

Cannot take crowding problem and move to another building

Capacity vs. enrollment

School	Zone Enrollment (% of students from within the zone)	Zone Retention (kindergarten residents that have entered in the DOE system)
O'Shea	1191	TBD
199	738	912
191	644	425

Additional data that is needed

Have 5-6 year projections. Can share that with Dan per his request

As well as underlying assumptions

Impact of plan...

Segregation will continue

Solutions to 191

Phase out 191 middle school

DOE prefers K-5

To 342?

199 wasn't supposed to be K-8 (per prior principal)

Expand 191 early childhood/Pre-K

Pairing (191/342 or 199/191/342)

Create subcommittee of CEC to explore

Move 191 into new building

Integrate Amsterdam Housing into 3 schools

Get more information on incidents at 191 to put parents more at ease

CEC is trying. Officials have requested redacted and have been stonewalled

Add Gifted & Talented at 191

Make deal with developer at 200 Amsterdam

Insert school into bottom floors

Give developer even more floors as bonus

Need to have critical mass of parents into 191

Eliminate rental loophole for 199

DOE has looked at "address fraud" and feels it isn't problem

Parents at 199 know it is

Create guiding principles for CEC

CEC has never sat down and documented principles

Create stronger math curriculum for 191

Add bilingual education in 191

Problems with proposed solution... what do we think would actually happen on the ground

Conditions at O'Shea

Exodus from 191/342 zone

Committee will do SurveyMonkey to get additional insights