1	CHARTER SCHOOL APPEAL COMMISSION
2	FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
3	**************
4	IN RE: NAL-003, INC., D/B/A NAVIGATOR ACADEMY OF LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DAVENPORT
5	
6	VS.
7	THE BOARD OF POLK COUNTY, FLORIDA
8	
9	
10	
11	DATE: Monday, December 4th, 2023
12	TIME: Commenced at 9:00 a.m. Concluded at 2:29 p.m.
13	LOCATION: 325 West Gaines Street
14	Room 1721/25 Tallahassee, Florida
15	REPORTED BY: MICHELLE SUBIA, RPR, CCR
16	Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
17	State of Florida at Large
18	
19	
20	* * *
21	
22	
23	
24	(850) 766-5831
25	michellesubia@gmail.com

1	COMMISSION MEMBERS APPEARING:
2	AMANDA GAY, CHAIR
3	KIA SWEENEY-SCOTT, Ph.D.
4	OSVALDO GARCIA
5	TIFFANIE PAULINE
6	ASHLEY BARBER
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIR GAY: Good morning, everyone. 3 meeting of the Charter School Appeal Commission. 4 Today is December 4th, 2023. 5 My name is Amanda Gay, and I'm the 6 Commissioner's designee to Chair the Commission. 7 We appreciate everyone being here today and in traveling up here. Thank you to the parties 8 9 for your submissions. 10 And I want to go ahead and thank the 11 Commission Members for your work leading up to and 12 also in this meeting today. We've got a great 13 team here. 14 Also here for the Department are Jamie Braun, the counsel for our Commission; Vicki Pineda, our 15 16 Charter School Director; Adam Emerson, our Executive Director for the Office of Independent 17 18 Education and Parental Choice; Andrew King, our General Counsel. And we also have Karen 19 20 Hines-Henry, our Commission Executive Assistant. 21 Karen, would you go ahead and call the roll 22 for the Commission Members, please. 23 MS. HINES-HENRY: Ashley Barber. 24 MS. BARBER: Here.

MS. HINES-HENRY: Osvaldo Garcia.

25

MR. GARCIA: Here. MS. HINES-HENRY: Tiffanie Pauline. 2 3 MS. PAULINE: Here. MS. HINES-HENRY: Kia Sweeney-Scott. 4 5 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Here. 6 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. 7 As required by statute, our panel here today 8 is made of two Members representing school 9 districts and two Members representing charter 10 schools, so we have a balanced panel. And I will 11 only vote if there is a tie. 12 Some housekeeping matters before we get into 13 the appeal. We have a court reporter here. 14 is documenting everything for the record today. 15 She can only hear one person at a time, so if you 16 talk over one another, I will ask you to stop and take turns speaking. 17 18 Some special requests is if you are reading 19 from a document, please make sure you slow down 20 your reading pace. Sometimes we run through our 21 words when reading. 22 And, please, each time you approach the 23 microphone, identify yourself. Even if you've 24 spoken several times, please go ahead and identify

yourself again, which leads me to my next point is

25

if you are addressing the Commission, please come to the microphone. It will help facilitate all of this and make for a cleaner record.

The next bit, before we start, is to explain how the procedure is going to work today. So when we begin the appeal, I will permit each party ten minutes to explain their position in this case, starting with the Applicant and then finishing with the School District.

Once the opening arguments have been made, we will then go through each issue on the motion sheet that everyone has been provided in advance.

So for each issue, we will have the same procedure where each party will get three minutes to explain kind of your opening argument, if you will, for that issue, starting with the Applicant and then moving to the School District.

And then the Commission Members will have the opportunity to ask questions specific to that issue. Once the questions are fulfilled, then we will move into a motion.

And I did want to highlight to the Commission Members that I want to try to approach the motion and discussion a little bit differently. In the past, our motion has included the reasons why

articulated in the motion, and it got a little cumbersome.

So what I want to try to do today is we will have a motion and then a second, so our motion will be pending. And then I'll open the floor for discussion, supporting the reasons why of the motion before we vote.

What will happen then basically is when we are writing our written recommendation, we will be able to take from the record those reasons and put down our facts that way. So we don't have to put it into the motion. Sometimes that got a little unwieldy. That's the way we're going to try it today. So please bear with me as we work through that process.

So then I mentioned that based on the proceedings today, we will then prepare a written recommendation for the State Board's consideration. I will schedule a telephone conference with all the parties and the Commission Members to revise or approve the final version of the recommendation. We'll try to schedule that a week or two out. We'll have to look at the holidays to make sure that we're not butting up on anything like that. But I will work with everyone

to schedule that.

So today we have three main issues to address, which I will generally describe as transportation, management and staffing, and then budget. I intend to take the issues in that order.

I would like to get through the first two issues by lunch, and then we'll take a break and then come back and finish anything that's outstanding, which leads me to my next point is I'm generally going to try to give each party the opportunity to respond to a question asked by the Commission Members. But in order to keep the flow of the meeting, I might not permit extensive rebuttal so that we can keep the meeting going.

We'll make sure that all of the Commission

Members' questions are answered, though.

And before we start, I wanted to make sure that we have it on the record that the School District has supplemented the record this morning. There was just an unintentional exhibit left off of the denial letter. They have supplemented the record this morning with that. It is the May 26th, 2023 letter from DA Davidson.

And there's no objection from the school; is

that right? 2 MR. BIVINS: No, ma'am. 3 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. So unless there is anything else, I would 4 5 like to move into the appeal. 6 MR. BIVINS: No, ma'am. 7 All right. Charter School, you CHAIR GAY: 8 will now have ten minutes to explain your appeal 9 and position. And please remember to introduce 10 yourself and anyone that is subsequent coming up. 11 And I will have my phone, just for timing 12 purposes. I don't want you to think I'm being 13 rude. 14 MR. STERNBERG: Good morning, Honorable 15 Commission Members, Madam Chair. I represent the 16 Department of Education. Thank you for hosting 17 this appeal. 18 My name is Thomas Sternberg, along with 19 Jeffrey Wood of Tripp Scott. We represent the 20 Applicant appealing the denial, NAL-003, 21 Incorporated, who submitted the application as 22 Navigator Academy of Leadership High School 23 Davenport. 24 Some of the other people you might be hearing 25 from today include Jeremy Calkins, Bob Bivins,

Dr. Diane LaFrance and Ms. Valeria Blandino, all representatives of either Compass Charter Schools or the Applicant, NAL.

I would like to remind these Honorable

Commission Members of the legal standards of why

we're here today and obviously leave that factual

stuff to the people that you really want to hear

from, the Applicant themselves. We're here on

three issues, as Madam Chair correctly noted: The

transportation plan, the management and staffing,

and the budget.

And what's really important for this

Commission to understand is we are here appealing
the denial that the School Board must show that
they did have competent and substantial evidence
to deny the Charter School or that any denial that
they had of one of these three issues related to a
mandatory charter school requirement.

And for the reasons set forth in the brief that we've submitted, along with the legal and factual standards we'll put forth today, these standards were not met for, again, the transportation plan, the management and staffing, and the budget.

Two important points before, again, you hear

from the people that you really want to hear from. The School Board has made it abundantly clear, the School Board of Polk County, that it lauds itself on denying charter schools, even going so far as to include its actual denial statistics in its response brief of 50 percent of all charter schools submitted.

And all the anecdotal phrases, you know, not necessarily legal standards included in their response brief, but more so going on the fact that they are praising their own denial statistics and making sure that they move forward for a school that is actually already in operation, which we'll go through momentarily.

This school is not a new approach; although, this will be an extension of a -- an extended high school. There's already a K-8 that Compass Charter Schools and Navigator operates in Polk County.

The Applicant, the management company,
they're going to be housed on the same land. And
being that this group has already gone through
this process, they've already submitted a
successful application and have shown that they
know how to operate a budget, a transportation

plan, and a management and staffing plan, which will already be housed in the same location.

So, again, without taking too much more of your time, I would like to introduce Mr. Jeremy Calkins of Compass Charter Schools. And I thank the Commission Members for your time. We appreciate it.

MR. CALKINS: Good morning. I am reading so
I will try to be slow. My name is Jeremy
Calkins. I'm the managing principal for Compass
Charter Schools, the educational service provider
for Navigator Academy of Leadership.

I have been involved in the development of Charter Schools since 2007, including a period of time between 2010 and 2014 where I served as either the general contractor or owner's representative responsible for the development of nine charter schools within a four-year span.

I'm here today to talk to you about our budgets at the Navigator Academy of Leadership.

Before I get into some details, I would like to state for the record that we have outperformed our budgets year over year. Currently under the Navigator Academy of Leadership umbrella, we have a positive fund balance shared between our two

schools of more than \$8 million.

Quite frankly, I don't understand the arguments brought forth in the District's analysis of our Capacity Interview. If this was our first year of doing this type of venture, then I might be able to understand their concern. If we had a history of showing deficiency in this area, I might be able to understand their concern. But not only is there not a deficiency in this area, we excel.

When I introduced the integrated project delivery method, or IPD, to our board back in 2018, they had to trust me that this would be in the best interest of the school. Today that is no longer the case since we have empirical data that proves we're saving Navigator Davenport millions of dollars over the life of the loan because of that methodology. This is something that we've discussed time and again at previous board meetings with our Board of Directors.

Under our IPD, we have a partnership with our underwriting, our developer, architects, engineers, management, organization and board all for the benefit of the school.

CHAIR GAY: Please slow down a little bit.

MR. CALKINS: I'm sorry.

Under our IPD, we have a partnership with our underwriter, developer, architects, engineers, management, organization and board all for the benefit of the school. I would argue that no one else in the charter development world does what we're doing in a more cost effective and efficient way. This is the most financially advantageous methodology for the school in the industry.

The evidence of that statement is shown in the difference between the debt service between our two schools. Over the life of our two loans at Navigator Academy of Leadership, we will be saving more than \$50 million at Davenport as compared to Navigator Academy of Leadership in Valrico.

Davenport was developed using our IPD. In Valrico, we had to use an outside developer. I have the amortization comparisons available for those schools if this Committee would like to see them.

The same project development methodology that

I talked about during the Capacity Interview with

Polk will be the same methodologies that will be

used for the Navigator Academy of Leadership High

School, NAL-003. The significance isn't just in the savings but in the security.

2.3

The District notes on page 77 of their final report that several times I state project development fees will be used to clear any and all budgetary concerns. On page 78 of that same report, the District assumes that just because they don't see the \$350,000 in project advanced fees, that they do not exist. They do exist. And the reason they don't see them is because they're not the developer.

The District also tries to point out that they don't see where the debt services were deferred, as I may have inferred. Yes, that's true. Payments were not deferred because we open at capacity. No cure was needed.

The District went on to remove the CSP grant and capital outlay from our budget to try and demonstrate why our budget wouldn't work. But they never asked how exactly do you plan on curing these budget concerns with projected development fees. Instead of giving us the opportunity to provide answers to their concerns, assumptions were made that those cures and fees do not exist.

On page 76 of that same report, Ms. Candy

Amato says that if they have questions, they would email them to me. I never received any questions; therefore, it was my belief that since we've demonstrated we have done this very successfully before, a certain level of trust would be given that we would do it again.

During that same time of the interview, I mentioned payment deferrals. On page 77,

Ms. Amato talks about the postponement of payments. That was actually the word that eluded me that day, deferment, payment deferrals.

Immediately after our interview, I provided a letter, which I believe you guys just received today, from our underwriter that included answers to the budget cure concerns. Some of those included partial payment deferrals, contingency funds, interest only payments, et cetera, et cetera, the FACR of CSP and capital outlay, two sources of income we received before and anticipate receiving again.

That's why they're in our budget. If for some reason they do not come through, those monies are baked into our contingency plan via our integrated project delivery method. It can be drawn down upon if necessary.

Here's a practical example of how that might work. The credit source for our furniture at Navigator Academy of Leadership Middle School fell through in the 11th hour. It was not a problem, as we had a contingency plan in place. In fact, we still have \$1.8 million in contingency that we would could have drawn upon in the event of other unknown surprises, such as CSP grants.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

That particular endeavor was very risky. was our first delivery method with this team. had seven months to construct a school on undeveloped property. We had to bring in all public utilities, sewer, water, gas. We had to make off-site improvements. We had to work with three different municipalities: The City of Davenport, Haines City, Polk County. We had to build an off-site lift station. We had to bring in a 16-inch force main. We had to build a neighboring -- we had to build another off-site lift station for a neighboring single-family residence developer. And we accomplished all this feat on time and within budget.

Here's the bottom line. Not only have we demonstrated that we're capable of building and maintaining successful budgets, but we exceed our

own expectations. We underestimate revenues. We overestimate expenses. And we outperform our budgets year over year.

And I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

2.3

All right. Now the District has ten minutes to provide its response.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you, Madam Chair,

Members of the Commission, Representatives of the

Department of Education and Counsel.

My name is Wes Bridges. I'm General Counsel to the School Board of Polk County. With me today I have Candy Amato, who is our Senior Director of Charter Schools.

I think the appeal that is before you today is fairly straightforward. The denial letter that the District submitted, which is included in your materials, I think was very explicit, very specific, and cross-walked all of the evidence that is required by statute with regard to providing evidence based on good cause for denial.

We are here to discuss only the application that was submitted by Navigator, not any other application, not any other school, not any other

information that is not part of the record. Our concerns that were raised in this appeal were a main three: Transportation, staffing, and budget. And to paraphrase the Good Book, the greatest of these is budget.

I'll touch on transportation briefly. The school simply does not provide a transportation plan. There isn't a transportation provision in this application for transportation.

The demographics of Davenport suggest that that is a difficulty. The infrastructure in Davenport does not support transportation for their students. The sidewalk situation, the traffic situation with respect to bicycles, it is not conducive to safe pedestrian traffic for all the students who would be potentially attending this school. There simply is no transportation provision in this application. We believe that's clear.

On staffing -- and I trust you had an opportunity to review our denial letter and the specific issues that were raised there. You will note that the application called for 12 full-time teachers. The staffing plan submitted only ten. There's a provision for one-half of an ESE

teacher. There's a provision for one-half, .5, of an ESOL teacher.

Once again, the demographics of Davenport suggest that these are inadequate figures to address a student body of the size proposed by this school.

When it comes to electives and to coaching, the allocations are insufficient for the extracurriculars that are in the application.

There's a provision for one JV coach for boys and girls together, a single coach for all sports, boys and girls together, JV.

There's no provision for a varsity coach until year three. So if you're coming in as a -- this year if you were to come in as an 11th grader or a 12th grader, there would be no provision for a varsity coach.

Retirement: There's retirement provided for in the application, budgeted for ten teachers.

Once again, the application indicated that there would be -- that the staffing level would be 12.

And there is no provision in the application for retirement for anyone, for administrators and anyone else. So just in a nutshell, that's transportation and staffing.

Budget: The School's representative indicates that they have outperformed their projections for other schools. And that may be. Once again, we have no brief to talk about other schools today. We had no idea whether it's true or not.

We do know that for this application, the budget that they submitted did not balance. And that is a critical issue for our Charter Review Committee when they were evaluating charter applications.

This may be the fattest charter application that I've ever seen. It was a good 6-inches thick. But it's also, I think, one of the thinnest that I've ever seen when it comes to budget.

Since the School has talked anecdotally about other schools, I'll say that they do have another school in Polk County, and the application they submitted came back three times before it was approved. Mainly on budget.

And the District worked with them identifying things that needed to be improved, which they did, and ultimately had an application approved. We are very willing to do the same thing now. But in

this instance, there simply was not any give and take on that.

We had a Capacity Interview, and we provided it to you, copies of the very thorough questions that were asked by the Committee in the Capacity Interview, as well as the transcript of the answers that were provided. They do not reflect the situation that has been described to you by the School.

The School relied on capital outlay funds as part of their budget. At the Capacity Interview, they acknowledged that capital outlay funds will not be available for the first three years of the contract. Why that's in there -- why that was included by an experienced applicant, I have no idea, but it does not inspire confidence.

The budget includes line items for fundraising and donations, which I've never seen in a charter school application before and would submit to you that it is not appropriate for budget and not something that can be considered by the District in reviewing a charter school application budget.

Technology fees. The application included -- it's not a huge amount of money. It's \$150 per

student. The first year it was \$37,500. The second \$56,250. Then \$75,000. In year four, \$93,750. And then year five, \$97,500.

Not a whole lot of money. But it is an item that sends up a brilliant red flag in a district that had been involved in desegregation lawsuits for 40 years and still is required to consider things that we have agreed to and been ordered to do by the Federal Court for the Middle District of Florida.

You can't charge student fees and base your budget on receipt of those fees. That is a sort and select provision that absolutely -- well, it causes a dramatic knee-jerk reaction in Districts that have been known for desegregation actions.

I think in the past interview, the Applicant acknowledged that and said, no, we'll treat it as a donation. Once again, if it's a donation, you can't include it in your budget. It's not revenue that is appropriate for budget.

The School also included their CSP grant, which is not only a competitive grant and inappropriate for inclusion in the budget, but it's also a reimbursement grant, paid in arrears.

And in reference to -- and I apologize for

the omission. When we were printing our brief,
apparently Exhibit 10 got left at the bottom of
the box. We've supplemented it today to add it.

We referenced it in our brief and guoted it

in our brief so you can see the relevant portions.

But I wanted to make sure that you have the actual document. And counsel was very gracious to allow us to supplement our brief and add that today.

CHAIR GAY: Mr. Bridges, that's your ten minutes.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

All right. So I think that has us ready to move into the first issue, which is whether the Applicant's transportation plan meets the requirements of Section 1002.33(20)(c), Florida Statutes, and the standards set forth in the Evaluation Instrument adopted in Rule 6A-6.0786, Florida Administrative Code.

For the School, you have three minutes on the transportation issue.

MR. STERNBERG: Thank you, Madam Chair.

You know, as you correctly noted, this should be one of the shorter issues that we're talking about, the transportation.

I believe that the School Board of Polk

County confuses the traditional requirements of

traditional public schools versus what a Charter

School is required to provide. So to read what

the actual legal standard in the statute is and

what the School Board denied it for -- the School

Board denied it by saying that the application

failed to provide a transportation plan that will

serve all eligible students and will not be a

barrier to access for students residing within a

reasonable distance of a school.

2.3

As you also heard, the School Board just said that there was no transportation provided at all.

There was nothing mentioned. It was completely omitted from --

CHAIR GAY: Slow down just a little bit.

MR. STERNBERG: Of course.

That it was completely omitted from the brief. And this is also not true. You can -- not the brief. The application. My apologies. If you look at our Exhibit B, page 97, we discuss a transportation plan.

However, I would like to go a little more in-depth of what the transportation requirements of charter schools are. And as we saw in Section

1006.21, it talks about the duties of a District School Superintendent and a District School Board regarding transportation.

However, that was then clarified in a pretty recent case in St. Lucie County, so the Renaissance Charter School, Incorporated, and Renaissance Charter School at Tradition for St. Lucie County School Board. This is Case No. 14-3267. And this was also affirmed on appeal in the Fourth District Court of Appeal, 4D15-2905.

And the issue on that appeal was whether
Renaissance Charter Schools would be required by
the St. Lucie County School Board to offer regular
school busing to all eligible charter students
residing more than 2 miles from the charter
school.

The order entered by the Administrative Law

Judge, the Chief at the time, Darren Schwartz,

responded without any equivocation, the School

Board -- and I quote -- cannot require petitioners

to offer regular school busing to all charter

school students residing more than 2 miles from

the School at Tradition.

So on page 97 of our application when the school provides that students attending Navigator

Academy of Leadership Davenport, the K-8 that's currently there, they do walk, they ride their bikes, they have private bus services, they have parents that pick them up and drop them off. That is in and of itself a transportation plan.

So the fact there was wasn't an allocation for a bus or what you might traditionally see, it's just not required by law. And to require Charter Schools to meet the same requirements as traditional public schools fails as a matter of law.

And so when we look at what the standard is, whether they had competent and substantial evidence to deny the application based on a transportation plan, that just in and of itself does not meet that standard.

And if the Board has any questions, I'm happy to answer them as well.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you. We will give the School Board the opportunity to respond for three minutes, and then I will open it for questions.

MR. BRIDGES: Thanks, ma'am.

The School Board does not assert that transportation has to be provided to all students. And we were very careful to point that out in our

brief that was submitted to you.

We do maintain that this application does not include transportation for anyone, including exceptional student education students, ESE students. There is simply no provision for it.

The statute, while it does not require transportation to be made available to all students, there are circumstances where transportation is required, certainly for ESE students, and transportation cannot be a barrier.

And once again, in Davenport, the infrastructure, the sidewalks, the road systems, the unavailability of public transportation all work together to serve as a barrier if there's not some form of transportation available to students in need.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

All right, Commission Members. The floor is open for any questions that you may have of either party on the transportation issue.

Osvaldo.

MR. GARCIA: I have a question for the School, please.

CHAIR GAY: Go ahead.

MR. GARCIA: Even though this is not an

\_

extension of the current school that you have within the area, in my opinion, it cannot separate one from the other due to the fact that future performance is dependent upon prior history.

So how have you handled transportation in the current K-8 school and any difficulties you may have encountered regarding ESE students, for example?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, sir. Jeremy Calkins.

So we have a traffic operations plan, and we have dropoff and pickup, which I would argue we do have a plan because it's high enough for buses to go through. We just haven't had the need.

We have more than a 1,000 student waiting list, and not a single parent has come to us asking for transportation. So it's something we haven't had to address because the need simply doesn't exist.

CHAIR GAY: I'll do a follow-up for the School. So if a student with an IEP comes in, transportation is required as a related service, how would the School approach that?

MR. CALKINS: Yeah. We would take a look at the need. We would determine what we need to do,

and then we would be solution minded.

the School.

CHAIR GAY: Does the School Board want to respond? I wanted to make sure that I provide the opportunity.

MR. BRIDGES: The fact or the suggestion that no one has previously requested the service is not evidence that the demand does not exist. It is some evidence, if true, that the students currently at the school do not have that requirement. And that leads to other questions concerning the ESE population at that school.

And once again, I would just point out there are no funds budgeted. There's no provision for transporting students, including exceptional students. Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: Kia, did you have one?

DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I did. I'm sorry. For

Like Dr. Garcia said, it's hard to separate the K-8 from the proposed high school application because it will be a feeder for the most part.

How did your transportation plan differ in this application than the last application?

MR. CALKINS: It didn't. We took a look at our historical data and how things operated

because we're pulling from the same resource pool, so we know. They can study demographics, but we have empirical data that tells us, you know, who is showing up at our school.

So we just took a look -- like you said, you can't separate the two operations, so we realized that there's not a demand there.

And if I might add, too. The District's own head of transportation just said at our charter renewal that we have no transportation problem. So if their head of transportation is going to tell me that verbatim at our charter renewal visit, that we have no transportation problem, I don't understand why they insist on us trying to visit it.

As noted in my opening, we have an \$8 million fund balance. We have monies. And they pointed this out in the application and their final report as well, for transportation needs, if needed. that's what I said, if needed. If that need arises, then we will address it at that time.

> CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

Yes, Tiffanie.

MS. PAULINE: I have a follow-up.

CHAIR GAY: I'm sorry. Let me get give the

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

School Board a chance to respond, and then 2 Tiffanie's question will be a follow-up. 3 all might want to stay close to the mic. MS. AMATO: 4 Hi. My name is Candy Amato from 5 the District. 6 So to answer your question, in their previous 7 application and their current K-8 application, 8 their transportation plan did state that they 9 would try to contract with outside services to 10 provide transportation to their students. 11 So it was not omitted and it was not 12 addressed that it would solely rely on parents, 13 car riders, or walkers. They would attempt to contract outside. And that has not been 14 successful at this time. 15 16 MR. CALKINS: Can I respond to that? 17 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. Let me finish with Commission Members' 18 19 questions, and if there's still any remaining. 20 MS. PAULINE: Yes. So as it relates to 21 students with IEPs or that require 22 transportation, and going back to the plan, I heard some conversation about we have a 23 24 contingency, but I also heard that it was not

25

budgeted.

I understand that this appears to be -- it's not -- I wouldn't call it -- to me it's not an extension because an extension would be an amendment to the current contract. So to me it's being presented as a standalone school. So given that, you know, you have to look within the box.

So what I'm not seeing, unless I'm missing something from your conversation or from the application, is what exactly is the plan, if and when?

I see you're leaning a lot on, you know, what it could be based on the current school. But given that this is not another K-8, this is a high school, that brings about, you know, all different kinds of variables that aren't always anticipated, I'm still not clear on where the full plan is in case of there being a need or a request.

MR. STERNBERG: Absolutely. And just to also go back to what Ms. Amato was just saying, to answer your question directly, in that page 97 on Exhibit B of the application itself, it says, in the event Navigator Academy of Leadership High School can find a private bus vendor in accordance with Section 1002.33 --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can he slow down.

CHAIR GAY: Slow down.

2.2

2.3

MR. STERNBERG: -- transportation will not be a barrier to equal access for all students within a reasonable distance of the school.

Navigator Academy of Leadership High School will provide free bus transportation by contracting out the service to a vendor.

So, again, this is it. You know, in that event, that contingency is there.

So as you are right, this is a standalone application, even though it will be similar and we are kind of balancing back and forth a little between the two. The empirical data does show that it's not been needed.

But they're saying that if there is a need for it with the balance and the fund and the surplus that they have, there will not be an issue and they will make sure that they comply with the law when it is required to comply with.

So we're not contracting with a bus vendor, because it hasn't been required. So in the event that an IEP comes in, Navigator Academy of Leadership will obviously comply with all requirements of that IEP and of law and make sure that transportation is not a barrier to equal

access for that student in that event. 2 has not happened yet. But in the event, they have 3 those surplus and the contingencies to be able to 4 provide for a transportation provider through a 5 private vendor. 6 MS. PAULINE: Where is the surplus that 7 you're talking about in this budget? 8 MR. CALKINS: I can speak to that. 9 CHAIR GAY: And, I'm sorry, I was going to 10 remind everyone to state your names when you come 11 to the microphone. 12 MR. CALKINS: Jeremy Calkins. 13 It's in the project delivery method, like I 14 mentioned in my opening. So in our IPD, we had 15 \$1.8 million in contingency. 16 MS. PAULINE: And can you clarify for me 17 what IPD means, please. 18 MR. CALKINS: That's an integrated project delivery method. 19 20 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 21 MR. CALKINS: A typical construction project 22 is a design, bid, build. When I was getting my 23 master's at Drexel University at the College of 24 Engineering, our professors liked to put 25 "litigate" on the back of that.

We believe that this delivery method, the reason why we use it, saves the school money and it protects it. And that's the security.

So to answer your question, it's baked into the develop fees. So when asked about the develop fees and, you know, what are we using for contingency, I always went back. And they noted that in their response, in their report that it's baked into the development fees. So if we need to draw down on that, we can.

I guess a better way to look at that is the construction of the facility is based off a guaranteed maximum price. So that's where we get our debt service line item.

The best way to analogize it is to liken it to a home equity line of credit. We have monies available to draw down upon if we need to in the project development. So if that need arises, we can pivot, just like we did with the furniture.

CHAIR GAY: Do you have follow-up?

MS. PAULINE: Yes, as I'm still not clear.

So are you referring to project advance from development \$275,000 for the first two years? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am.

MS. PAULINE: Okay. Where is it in the budget then?

MR. CALKINS: So you don't see it in the budget there, but it would be revenues that the school would get back during construction.

So the school at construction, at the time of construction -- for example, so we had a \$14 million -- you know, Mr. Bridges says that we're not going to compare schools, but he compared our last application when we came up here and said that we had to talk to them three times. I build our budgets. Nobody talked to me about our budgets.

We had a \$14 million gross maximum price on the K-8. We brought it in at just under 12.2. That's where the 1.8 comes in. So that's where the monies come from.

So anywhere we need to add monies to our budget, that's how we do it. We have monies that we can add to our budget as a revenue line item. So that project advance fee, it could go to 350, it could go to 500. We have monies available. So that would be where the line item is.

And like with all budgets, it's conjecture.

It's your best guess. So if that money needs to

come -- if that needs to go to 1.2, we can do it. 2 If that needs to go to 1.8, we can do it. Whatever we need to do, we can do within the 3 4 budget parameters up to \$15 million. 5 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. 6 Let me ask the School Board to respond, and 7 then Ashley will have a question, if you would 8 like to. 9 MR. BRIDGES: Just very briefly. 10 believe that what's being discussed there is part 11 of this application, part of the budget that we 12 evaluated or considered, nor would it be 13 appropriate for us to. 14 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Ashley. 15 MS. BARBER: Ashley Barber. 16 My follow-up question is along those lines. 17 Is there anything within the application, any 18 document to support --19 MR. CALKINS: It is. MS. BARBER: -- that those funds --20 21 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 22 MS. BARBER: -- are available to you? 23 MR. CALKINS: I said many times throughout 24 the application process and at the Capacity 25 Interview, the project development fees.

happy to clarify. In fact, I had a follow-up conversation with 2 Ms. Amato. It lasted five minutes. I tried to 3 ask, you know, if they had questions on how we 4 5 operate. And she basically --6 MS. BARBER: But within the application? MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 7 8 MS. BARBER: Within the documentation that 9 our team has to review? 10 MR. CALKINS: Project development fees. 11 the allocation that she mentioned, the 275, that number can move. That needle can move so we can 12 13 advance. 14 MS. BARBER: Is there any evidence 15 supporting your --16 MR. CALKINS: Our letters with DA Davidson. 17 Let me grab that. CHAIR GAY: And if you could let Ms. Barber 18 19 finish her question before responding, that would 20 be helpful for the court reporter. 21 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 22 CHAIR GAY: And are you referring to the May 23rd? 23 24 MR. CALKINS: There's two of them. 25 There's April 19th and May 26th. ma'am.

CHAIR GAY: Oh, 26th. Thank you. 2 MR. CALKINS: It says, acquisition of the 3 existing facility, construction costs of the high school facility and predevelopment contingency, 4 5 FF&E, et cetera, et cetera. 6 And May 26th, it went on to say, include interest only periods, partial payment deferrals, 7 8 fund and capitalized interest, drawdown bonds, 9 extended amortizations. 10 CHAIR GAY: Do you have any follow-up? 11 MS. BARBER: Not necessarily to the budget 12 of transportation. I'll have follow-up to the 13 budget. 14 MS. PAULINE: I have a question. CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. 15 16 MS. PAULINE: Tiffanie Pauline. 17 So what you just explained is -- when you 18 referenced predevelopment activities, we're 19 talking about transportation that may not 20 necessarily be predevelopment. I assume that 21 predevelopment would be specific to 22 construction-related costs, so if there were 23 overruns or changes in scope. 24 But you're telling me that DA Davidson would

make these funds available to support --

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 2 MS. PAULINE: -- a shortfall due to 3 transportation projections? MR. CALKINS: Not only that, they put in 4 5 FF&E, et cetera. So what they're saying is 6 whatever the money, we have basically -- again, 7 the best way I can analogize it is it's like a 8 home line, equity line of credit with the school. 9 We have a certain amount that we can draw down 10 upon, so for whatever we need. And that's why 11 they put et cetera costs in there. MS. PAULINE: And are there -- I'm sorry. 12 13 CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. 14 MS. PAULINE: Are there terms to any of this? 15 16 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 17 MS. PAULINE: It's very broad. 18 curious as to how would like the governing board members of the school evaluate, you know, when to 19 20 draw down and when not to draw down based on the 21 impact on, you know, debt service and inventory 22 payback? 23 I'm not understanding. MR. CALKINS: 24 MS. PAULINE: I guess my basic question is 25 do you have at this point terms to --

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 2 So the terms are based on the guaranteed maximum price. And if we don't use it, like we 3 didn't use it the first time around, it goes back. 4 5 And that's how we realized such a significant 6 savings. 7 MS. PAULINE: So the financing is final? 8 You have all the --MR. CALKINS: It's not final because we 9 10 don't have an approved charter. So it's kind of 11 the cart before the horse. 12 MS. PAULINE: Okay. We have a letter of intent. 13 MR. CALKINS: 14 MS. PAULINE: Got it. 15 MS. BARBER: I'm sorry. 16 CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. MS. BARBER: You said you have a letter of 17 intent. Is that what you're calling this letter 18 19 right here? 20 MR. CALKINS: This is -- that's what I'm 21 calling this letter. 22 MS. BARBER: Okay. MR. CALKINS: It's their intent to give us 23 24 financing. They believe that they can give us 25 financing.

MS. BARBER: Okay. And you also mentioned a 2 maximum -- I forget what you referred to it as. MR. CALKINS: It's a quaranteed maximum 3 4 price on the cost of development. 5 MS. BARBER: And do you have a number for 6 that? 7 MR. CALKINS: We do. \$50 million. 8 MS. BARBER: Okay. And is there a reason --9 I don't -- it's not in the letter, correct? 10 MR. CALKINS: No, it's not in the letter. 11 MS. BARBER: There's no documentation that 12 that's the maximum anywhere in the information 13 that we have? 14 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. 15 MS. BARBER: Okay. 16 Do you have a question, Kia? CHAIR GAY: DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: 17 Yes. And it can go, I 18 guess, to both the School District and to the 19 School. 20 At what point do you -- I'm making an 21 assumption as to why you don't have anything 22 definitive. But at what point do you get 23 something definitive as far as financing goes? 24 MR. CALKINS: We get it after we get the 25 charter approved. They don't give us the

financing before we get the charter approved, so we can't get anything definitive until the charter is -- it's the cart before the horse. So once we get the charter approval, then they'll give us definitive terms.

CHAIR GAY: Did the School Board want to respond? I'm sorry, I know there was a lot of back and forth so you have quite a bit to respond to.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you, ma'am. Wes Bridges.

The May 26th letter from DA Davidson indicates that it does not serve as a commitment to underwrite. It does discuss DA Davidson's support of the application and their experience in financing such things.

But it says that there can be no guarantee that financing will be available to the School.

And this letter does not serve as a commitment to underwriting.

Once again, we're looking at the budget they submitted. And the budget that they submitted does not balance. All of this other extraneous conversation, it may very well be that some or all of it is true, but we did not have it before us in

this budget.

2.2

CHAIR GAY: Go ahead.

MR. STERNBERG: Thank you.

Just to bring this Commission back. You know, we're talking about the transportation plan that was submitted. And I understand we do have a budget section as well. The transportation plan that was submitted does comport with the requirements of Florida Statutes.

When we go back to the financing plan, I know we're bouncing back and forth on whether the School Board does want to include the K-8 or doesn't want to include the K-8. We have financing at the K-8.

You will never find a letter of intent that doesn't say "this is not a guarantee that this is financing." That is every letter of intent you're ever going to see submitted by any underwriter.

On top of that, the K-8 that has been submitted that has been in operation has not had a need for any ESE or IEP transportation in its course with a wait list of over 1,000 students. So we're talking about the transportation plan of the high school that will be located on the same property. So why would a budget or a

transportation plan based on historical and empirical data include anything in a transportation plan that doesn't show that there's a need?

What it did include is it included a letter of support from the City Manager of Davenport. It included support from DA Davidson that they can underwrite this. And we will hopefully move forward. Which DA Davidson already has provided financing for the current course.

So I think it's important for this group to understand and take it piecemeal in the sense that we are talking about a transportation plan based on what we know already, based on what has been provided, and that they can provide transportation if need be. However, that has not been shown to be needed at this course for an ESE or IEP and it does not currently exist. Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: And I wanted to clarify for the record that both statute and rule permit the Commission to solicit additional information. So us asking these questions is permissible and is supported by case law.

Do Commission Members have any other questions on transportation?

I do. MS. BARBER: I'm sorry. 2 CHAIR GAY: No. That's great. 3 MS. BARBER: So responding to what counsel has said before, he referenced the statute and 4 5 the application. So the statute that he 6 referenced talks about how transportation is not a barrier to equal access for all students. 7 8 And then the line in the application that was 9 referenced is on page 105, it's the second 10 paragraph there. And it starts by saying, in the 11 event that NAL-003 could find a private bus 12 vendor. And that's the line that you quoted. 13 So my question to the School is within 14 reading the application, it seems like finding a 15 private bus vendor is challenging in that area. 16 And so in the event that you cannot find a private 17 bus vendor, how are you going to ensure that 18 transportation is not a barrier, because I feel 19 like that part is maybe what's missing? 20 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. Can you repeat 21 that question one more time? 22 MS. BARBER: Yes. Absolutely. 23 So in your application, paragraph two on page 24 105, it states that in the event that NAL-003 25 could find a private bus vendor, and then you

carry on with how you will work with the private bus vendor.

MR. CALKINS: Sure.

MS. BARBER: So my question is if you cannot find a private bus vendor, how are you going to ensure that transportation is not a barrier to all students?

MR. CALKINS: Yes. We might use those contingency funds that I keep alluding to to even purchase buses. I don't know. At the time the need arises, we will address it.

You know, Mr. Bridges also said that our current facility doesn't provide for transportation. It does.

During the engineering process, we can take -- we have a queuing plan for a regular school bus to go underneath our canopies and through our parking lot, so we'll do the same thing. We'll make sure that our facility is prepared and it's ready to utilize buses if and when necessary.

MS. BARBER: Okay. So at this time, does the board have a transportation plan, something in writing to ensure that transportation is not a barrier to these students as --

We have a transportation MR. CALKINS: 2 operations plan. I'm not sure I'm understanding 3 what you're asking because there's not a need, so 4 to say --5 MS. BARBER: I'm referring to the students 6 in nine through 12. 7 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 8 So you might not be fully aware MS. BARBER: 9 of all the students that are coming in. 10 might not be fully aware of the enrollment 11 population. 12 MR. CALKINS: Correct. So I was curious if the board 13 MS. BARBER: 14 had a plan for what would be the transportation plan for nine through 12, if and when a student 15 16 needs transportation? 17 MR. CALKINS: Sure. Like I said, our design 18 is equipped and we will -- and this facility is 19 equipped and the site plan is equipped to 20 facilitate buses if needed. So if we find out 21 that we need buses, we will figure out a way, and 22 the busing will be able to access our property on 23 and off. And we have a queuing plan and the 24 ability to drop them off. 25 I have a follow-up to MS. PAULINE:

Ms. Barber's question.

So I think that is the crux of the issue we keep hearing, "we will find a way." I've been doing this work for a while and I've attended a lot of charter school conferences. I've attended a lot of meetings held by the DOE where there's lots of discussions about creating standard operating procedures, plans and policies.

I'm just curious as to -- and I'm trying not to rely on the K-8 because that's not what's before us. But just because you are -- I won't say veteran -- but at least an experienced charter school operator, I would have expected to see your policy or your standard operating procedure related to this because specifically as it relates to students with IEPs or students that require special provisions related to transportation, you have no way of knowing until they get in your school, right?

So you can have a wait list of 1,000, a wait list of 2,000. You can't look at that wait list to determine -- you can't ask those questions to determine, you know, who will end up in your school that requires this. So I think the crux of the issue is not being clear.

Of course, the budget plays into it because 2 it supports what the narrative says. But I'm not 3 clear on the what if it happens. I don't see the 4 provisions, particularly -- anywhere. Either in a 5 policy, in this application, in an attachment. 6 That's what's missing for me. 7 MR. CALKINS: Okay. 8 MS. PAULINE: Thank you. 9 CHAIR GAY: Any further questions from the 10 Commission? 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIR GAY: All right. Hearing no more 13 questions, do we have a motion on Issue 1 14 regarding transportation? 15 (No response.) 16 CHAIR GAY: And, again, I'll repeat how the 17 process will go. We will have a motion. And you 18 have the motion sheet before you that gives you 19 kind of some language that you can utilize with 20 options for whether or not there is competent 21 substantial evidence. So we'll have the motion and then a second. 22 23 And if it's properly seconded, then we will move 24 to discussion, where we can talk about the pros

and the cons, and then we'll take a final vote at

that point. So once the motion is pending, we will have discussion, but first I need a motion.

(No response.)

CHAIR GAY: And if it's helpful, we can do discussion before the motion if the Members think that would be more beneficial.

(No response.)

MS. PAULINE: I think we should have some discussion.

MR. GARCIA: I mean, once again, as I expressed previously, this is an application that, yes, it's a standalone application; however, their experience on a prior -- or on another school that will be the feeder, or one of the feeders of this school, has been successful leads me to make a motion that the School District then does not have competent substantial evidence to conclude that the applicant's transportation plan does not meet the requirements of the state standard, Statute 1002.33(20)(c), Florida Statutes, and the standards set forth in the Evaluation Instrument adopted in Rule 6A-6.0786, FAC Section 17.

CHAIR GAY: All right. So Osvaldo has made the motion.

Is it seconded? 2 MS. PAULINE: Just for clarity, his motion is that it is not, correct? 3 MR. GARCIA: Correct. 4 5 Is not. The motion is that CHAIR GAY: 6 there is not competent substantial evidence to 7 conclude that the applicant's transportation plan 8 does not meet the requirements. So if it is --9 well, is it seconded? 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIR GAY: All right. Then the motion 12 fails at this point. So let me open the floor for discussion if 13 14 we're not prepared to make a motion at this time. 15 And you can share your concerns. 16 MS. PAULINE: Sure. I'll start. 17 So it goes back to the last comment that I 18 made. If we look at it as a standalone application, it's missing some key factors that it 19 20 should have. 21 If we look at it, you know, as Osvaldo 22 indicated, you know, an experienced provider, it 23 should have been very easy for them to provide 24 some kind of standard operating procedure or plan

that was fully comprehensive and encompassing as

to the what ifs. So it's just simply not complete to me.

There are some components that do -- I mean, a lot of the language there aligns with the statutory language. It's that, you know, as Ashley pointed out, you know, the what if.

And that's what a plan does. A plan contemplates unforeseen things or establishes policy to ensure that, you know, it is not a barrier no matter the situation. And I guess that's the weakness I'm struggling with.

MS. BARBER: And to carry on to that, I think the fact that they have success in the K-8, it's evidence that they are able to have a population that doesn't require transportation.

But I think my concern goes back to the statute, which states that they need a plan to ensure that transportation is not a barrier. And I feel like that specific plan and the word "barrier," I feel like that part is what's missing for me in the application, as well as in the response and because that's what the statute specifically states.

The only plan that they have is if they can find a private bus vendor. And they stated within

the application that it's difficult to find a private bus vendor. And he, you know, came up and said, well, we could get buses.

And, you know, I've seen schools come up with plans that don't even include buses, but there's a plan in place. And I feel like just that's the issue for me.

MR. GARCIA: Are we not allowed to consider clarification on this application to make our decision?

CHAIR GAY: We absolutely can.

And, Jamie, if you want to step in about the clarification that we can seek as far as this meeting.

MS. BRAUN: Yes.

The Courts have ruled that the Charter School Statute 1002.33, the part dealing with the Appeal Commission, they state that based on School Board of Volusia County vs. East Coast Charter School case, they state that the statute unambiguously allows the Commission to consider information outside the record on appeal.

And they go on to state that you are allowed to gather other information, gather clarifying information and ask questions.

So while this is -- you know, it's an appeal, it is a little bit different than what a lot of the lawyers are used to when they do an appeal and you truly are limited to like what's in that record.

And this is kind of -- it's a review process, but it's also the time for you to ask questions and use your expertise. You know, if maybe somebody didn't ask a question at the district level that would have clarified things like transportation or the budget, this is the opportunity for the School to make that clear or the District to make it clear to you what they didn't get a chance to put forward initially.

So, yes, you can absolutely take into account clarifying information that you learn today.

MS. BARBER: And can I ask another procedural question?

CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. BARBER: So we could vote that there is competent substantial evidence that it does not meet the requirement. And then later on I believe we then vote to see if that's reason to deny the application; is that correct?

MS. BRAUN: Correct.

2.3

For each issue, it is set up where you do two votes, depending on how it goes. You have to vote is there competent substantial evidence or is there not to basically support a finding that the application -- that they did not meet the standard of the statute or the Evaluation Instrument.

Then if you vote that there is competent substantial evidence, we then take a second vote to determine whether that is good cause to deny the application. So there have been cases in the past where maybe an application did not meet the standard, but there was a determination that it was not good cause to deny because the applicant indicated that they would, you know, fix the issue, whatever it was.

MS. BARBER: And when we're looking at that, are we looking at -- so whether or not there's good cause to deny the application, are we looking at the application as a whole to see is this one piece enough to deny the entire application?

MS. BRAUN: Well, you are voting -- yes, you are voting whether or not each issue. So like for transportation, if there is competent substantial evidence to conclude that the

transportation plan does not meet the standard, 2 then you will take a second vote as to whether or not failure to provide reasonable a 3 4 transportation plan either is or is not good 5 cause to deny the application. You will do that 6 on each of the three issues. 7 MS. BARBER: Okay. Any other discussion from the 8 CHAIR GAY: 9 Members? 10 MR. GARCIA: I do. 11 CHAIR GAY: Yes, Osvaldo. 12 MR. GARCIA: Had this been an application of someone who all the sudden out of the blue 13 decided to open a charter school, probably my 14 decision to make the motion that I made would 15 16 have been different. 17 So for clarification purposes, how long has 18 the K-8 been open? MR. CALKINS: For four years. 19 20 Calkins. I'm sorry. 21 If I could talk about the transportation 22 The District never asked us to clarify a 23 plan, if needed. And if they would have, I would 24 have come back to the contingencies that we had 25 talked about.

Like you had mentioned, we are basing our 2 decisions based off, yes, I don't think you can separate the two, the K-8, the high school. 3 4 is going to be our main feeder program. 5 So the way that we built the high school is 6 the same way that we built the middle school. 7 got approved for the middle school with the same 8 The plan didn't change. 9 So the plan was okay the first time around. 10 I don't understand why the plan is not okay this 11 time around. 12 We mentioned in our application that if the need arises -- and I feel like I've addressed how 13 we would cover that -- if the need arises, we will 14 15 absolutely address it. But the way that our site 16 plan has been developed, we can bring buses on. And if that need arises, we will absolutely make 17 certain that it's addressed. 18 19 Thank you. CHAIR GAY: 20 Any other discussion, Members? 21 I have a question for the MS. PAULINE: 22 School. 23 CHAIR GAY: Okay. MS. PAULINE: I was trying to find it while 24

you were responding. I believe it happened in

the Capacity Interview or I read it in the transcript. I believe the District asked, it seemed like, because you were talking about reserves and contingencies related to the K-8, the consideration of purchasing a fleet of buses or some sort of owned contingency in the event that there is a need that arises, but I don't recall what the response was.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. And that's what we said we would look at. The District pointed out that we had a significant unrestricted fund balance by the way we manage and operate our budgets. And they actually suggested that we buy our own buses.

The reason why we don't do that is because we don't want buses just to sit there not being used.

If the need arises, we are prepared to create whatever plan is needed to accommodate.

MS. PAULINE: So as a follow-up, if I may.
CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. PAULINE: Given that that conversation took place, has there been any conversation about what that plan would look like? I mean, you're telling me we would do it, but --

MR. CALKINS: We would do the same thing.

Yes, ma'am. We would look for outside 2 contractors first, like we mentioned in our 3 application the first time around, if the need were to arise. 4 5 We have constructed and developed our site 6 plan in a way to where we can accommodate. So if 7 that need were to arise, yes, ma'am, we would 8 address it, and we feel confident that we would be 9 able to accommodate. 10 MS. PAULINE: So you said you would look for 11 outside contractors? 12 MR. CALKINS: We would first. 13 MS. PAULINE: Not necessarily purchase 14 buses? 15 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. Not necessarily. 16 We would put all options on the table. ma'am. And if it's more cost effective and 17 18 efficient to outsource, that's what we would do. 19 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 20 CHAIR GAY: Kia, did you have follow-up? 21 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Yes. I have a question 22 about transportation. What would determine the need for 23 24 transportation, because you mentioned that the 25 District, you know, mentioned that you could

purchase buses? How did that conversation come up 2 as far as --MR. CALKINS: I think that it would come up 3 from parents. It came up because the District 4 5 brought it up. We haven't had anybody ask us 6 about transportation. Correct me if I'm wrong, 7 but I don't think we've had one single parent 8 inquire about transportation in four years, not 9 one single comment. 10 The only people that have ever brought it up 11 is the District. So nobody in our geographic 12 region, in the community in which we serve has 13 asked us about transportation. Nobody. MS. PAULINE: Can I ask one more? 14 CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. 15 16 MS. PAULINE: I'm sorry. Calm yourself, 17 Tiffanie. I'm getting excited. 18 So in the planning phase, you know, you have 19 a group of people, including the governing board 20 and whoever you designate, having all of these 21 "if" statements? 22 MR. CALKINS: Sure. 23 If this happens, how do we? MS. PAULINE: 24 If this happens, how do we? 25 So I think to piggyback off what Kia is

saying, what would be the threshold? 2 threshold if we have X percentage of parents that 3 have requested transportation from X miles, then 4 we would consider X, Y, Z? 5 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 6 MS. PAULINE: Has that taken place? 7 MR. CALKINS: 100 percent. And we do have policies in place when you talk about systems of 8 9 operation, we ask parents to identify. And so 10 nobody is identified in our applications as 11 other. Nobody has come to us and asked. 12 Can I stop you? MS. PAULINE: 13 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 14 MS. PAULINE: So I'm talking about -- I 15 don't want to talk about the K-8. I'm saying, 16 okay, you have high school, that is very 17 different. Were there conversations around we 18 have a very different beast ahead of us, we're 19 going to have some drivers, some nondrivers, 20 we're going to have --21 MR. CALKINS: 100 percent. 22 -- high school kids that don't MS. PAULINE: 23 want to walk because their hair is going to get 24 frizzy like mine is right now. 25 Yes, ma'am. MR. CALKINS:

MS. PAULINE: So has there been the 2 conversations; and if so, has that been codified 3 anywhere? I think that's what we're asking. 4 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 100 percent. 5 do that with our engineers. We've accommodated 6 for student drivers, so our parking lot is 7 bigger. We have driveways to accommodate the 8 But I don't think we can separate one 9 from the other. 10 You know, we were -- this was not an issue in 11 our application the first time around. We didn't 12 modify anything. I didn't think this would be an 13 issue now until the Capacity Interview. 14 So we got approved for that K-8, and this

So we got approved for that K-8, and this wasn't a barrier for approval. So why would we change what we did the first time around? Why would we change that methodology now?

MS. PAULINE: Okay.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CALKINS: If that was a barrier to approval the first time around, then we would have made the necessary changes, but it wasn't.

MS. PAULINE: And just for clarification,

I'm sorry -- and I know the attorneys referenced
the precedent that was set by the case -- I just
want to make sure you understand that I don't

think that anyone here is saying that you have to provide transportation to all students. I don't think that's the intent here.

We're trying to figure out what happens if there is a need and understand what the call of action will be. So I just want to go on the record by saying that.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BARBER: And, also, if there's a plan -I hear you talking abut a physical plan for your
facility.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BARBER: I'm sorry, Ashley Barber again.

I hear you talking about a physical plan for the facility. I just -- because the statute specifically says a plan for transportation to ensure that it's not a barrier. I don't hear that your governing board has developed a plan to prevent it from being a barrier, or if you have, then --

MR. CALKINS: Yeah. I respectfully disagree. We have a site plan that has a traffic operations plan that allows for busing. And if the need were to arise, we have a financial plan as well that I keep mentioning in our integrated

project development. So I keep mentioning the two.

2.3

There's a plan for busing should the need arise. There's funds for busing should the need arise. If we receive applicants that say they need busing, then we will address it. And we have funds in place to develop that plan. It's there.

CHAIR GAY: Would the School Board like to respond to the follow-up questions?

MR. BRIDGES: I think Ms. Amato has some specifics that she would like to address. But before that, I would simply like to mention that in a school of 1,000 students that's been open for four years, I find it remarkable that there have been zero requests for transportation for ESE students or others.

And we heard -- we've heard once again that there are funds available if the need arises. Not in the budget, they're not. Thank you.

MS. AMATO: Hi. Candy Amato.

So kind of to piggyback on your question that you had asked about their plan. So in the Capacity Interview, which you touched on, one of the questions that was asked is you indicated that you continually research and contact

transportation companies. Did you pursue acquisition of transportation 2 services prior to submitting a high school 3 4 application; if not, why? 5 The response by Mr. Calkins was, no, we did 6 not originally -- we did originally, and it was 7 the same situation. Couldn't identify a good 8 provider. We have not recently, so we have not gone back since this new application. 9 10 So there is currently no plan. They have not researched any outside providers. 11 12 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I just want to 13 piggy-back. This is Kia. 14 Is that in reference to transportation in general or for students with an IEP? 15 16 MS. AMATO: That was transportation in 17 general for any student who would potentially be 18 eligible or would need transportation. DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: And I just have a --19 20 this is really a roundabout question dealing with 21 this, but do you hold an applicant meeting for 22 potential applicants? MS. AMATO: We do not, but we do provide 2.3

them with a PowerPoint, along with contact

information, should an Applicant have questions

24

1	about a specific area.
2	DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: And then one
3	MS. AMATO: And then our office, obviously,
4	is available.
5	DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Okay. One more
6	question. I know it's in the brief that the
7	School submitted previous applications for the
8	high school?
9	MS. AMATO: Correct.
LO	DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: And one was denied and
L1	one was withdrawn?
L2	MS. AMATO: The first one was denied. The
L3	second one was withdrawn.
L 4	DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Was one of the reasons
L5	for denial transportation?
L 6	MS. AMATO: I would have to go back and
L7	look. I don't recall. If you'll give me a
L 8	minute, I'll do research on that.
L 9	DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Okay.
20	CHAIR GAY: Any other questions from the
21	Members?
22	MR. GARCIA: One question.
23	CHAIR GAY: Yes.
24	MR. GARCIA: In the four years that the K-8
25	has been in operation, have you received any

complaints from any parent that they were not 2 able to have a child there because of 3 transportation. MS. AMATO: We've received numerous 4 5 complaints about their pickup and dropoff line in 6 the mornings and afternoons, yes. 7 MR. GARCIA: But that's different than --8 MS. AMATO: In regards to Yes. 9 transportation, buses specifically, I would have 10 to go back and look at my notes. It's not 11 something that I -- I didn't bring it with me, 12 but I can go back and look. 13 CHAIR GAY: Would the School like to respond 14 to that two or three questions? 15 Yes, just briefly talking MR. STERNBERG: 16 about anecdotes. I really take issue with the 17 fact of what Mr. Bridges said by saying he's 18 shocked, you know, with 1,000 students. 19 Again, we're making only inferences. 20 has been nothing substantial or competent --21 there's been no competent or substantial evidence 22 that the District has provided to deny this 23 transportation plan. 24 And then for Ms. Amato to come up and say 25 that they received complaints about the times of

pickup and dropoff, that's not the transportation plan. The transportation plan isn't that we have to call a bus service provider every day to see if they have a bus available for us. That's not a transportation plan.

What is a transportation plan is can you contract with -- if the need arises, can you contract with bus services providers? Can you buy your own? Can you work with parents? Can they walk? Can they ride?

All of this was provided in there. It's provided in the statute. And, again, the precedent provides that you cannot require charter schools to offer busing more than 2 miles away.

So not only have they complied with what the transportation plan requirements under statute and precedent are, but, again, we're talking about something that we have historical empirical data on that there has not been a need to contract with individual bus service providers because that's not not only required by law, but also not required under the current historical empirical data of the K-8, which will be the main feeder program going into it.

CHAIR GAY: Okay. Do we have any further

discussion, Members? 2 (No response.) I would like to move this along. 3 CHAIR GAY: So if we have a motion, I will entertain it. 4 5 MS. PAULINE: I'll make a motion. 6 CHAIR GAY: All right. 7 MS. PAULINE: I move that the Commission find that there is competent substantial evidence 8 9 to conclude that the applicant's transportation 10 plan does not meet the requirements of the 11 statute and the standards set forth in the 12 Evaluation Instrument adopted in the rule, Section 17. 13 CHAIR GAY: All right. The motion is that 14 15 there is competent substantial evidence to 16 conclude. Is that seconded? 17 18 (No response.) 19 CHAIR GAY: All right. That motion failed. 20 MS. BARBER: If we want to discuss, I just 21 have a comment. 22 CHAIR GAY: Discussion, I think, would be 23 appreciated at this point. MS. BARBER: Okay. So in looking back at 24 25 the application, I feel like, although there

wasn't necessarily -- it was the line -- for me 2 it was the line that said in the event that they could find a private bus vendor and that there 3 4 was trouble finding a private bus vendor. 5 talked about the possibility of purchasing buses. 6 And then looking back at the narrative within 7 the application, they do provide information about 8 like if they wouldn't be able to do that, then 9 these are the requirements that they would have 10 for different students. 11 So in looking back at that, I feel like 12 putting the pieces together, there is enough of a 13 plan to kind of show that they put some thought 14 into it and that they were trying to prevent it 15 from being a barrier. 16 CHAIR GAY: Would you like to comment? 17 MR. GARCIA: Question for counsel. Can we 18 go back to my motion, my original motion? 19 I think you can make the motion CHAIR GAY: 20 again. 21 Yeah. I think you have to do it MS. BRAUN: again because that motion has failed and is no 22 23 But you can make it again. longer open. 24 MR. GARCIA: Okay.

MS. PAULINE:

Can I ask for clarification

from counsel? 2 CHAIR GAY: Yes. 3 MS. PAULINE: So even if we were to pass as is through C -- I think Ms. Barber was asking 4 5 this question before -- it could still not reach 6 the threshold based on the vote on C to deny for 7 that reason, correct? 8 MS. BRAUN: Correct. 9 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 10 CHAIR GAY: Okay. We do not have a pending 11 motion. Can I have a motion specific to Issue 1, 12 the transportation plan? MR. GARCIA: Okay. So I move that the 13 14 Commission find that there is not competent substantial evidence to conclude that the 15 16 applicant's transportation plan does not meet the requirements based on State Standard 1002 --17 18 statute, I'm sorry -- Florida Statutes, and the standards set forth in the Evaluation Instrument 19 20 adopted in Rule 6A-6.0786, FAC, Section 17. 21 CHAIR GAY: Okay. I have a motion. 22 Is it seconded? 23 MS. BARBER: Second. 24 CHAIR GAY: I have a motion and a second. 25 Any further discussion, Members?

```
(No response.)
               CHAIR GAY: I think we have enough on the
 2
          record that we don't have to do additional
 3
          discussion.
 4
 5
               All right. Karen, will you please call roll
 6
          for this vote.
 7
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Osvaldo Garcia.
 8
               MR. GARCIA: Yes.
 9
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Ashley Barber.
10
               MS. BARBER: Yes.
11
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Tiffanie Pauline.
12
               MS. PAULINE: Yes.
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Kia Sweeney. Kia Scott.
13
14
          I'm so sorry.
               DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Yes.
15
16
               CHAIR GAY: All right. The motion passes.
               I am going to ask for a quick five-minute
17
18
          break.
19
               MR. STERNBERG: Do we need to go to C,
20
          though?
21
               CHAIR GAY: Oh, I'm so sorry. We do not
22
          have to go -- let me make sure.
23
               MS. BRAUN:
                          Right.
24
               CHAIR GAY: We don't have to go to C since
25
          it passed.
```

MR. STERNBERG: I just wanted to make sure. 2 CHAIR GAY: If it was the other language, then we would. 3 I just wanted to clarify. 4 MR. STERNBERG: 5 CHAIR GAY: Thank you for that 6 clarification. If everyone is amenable, I would like a quick 7 8 five-minute break. There are restrooms on this 9 floor that I will have to locate. 10 MS. PINEDA: It's one door over. 11 CHAIR GAY: One door over. So we will be back at -- let's call it 10:30, so seven minutes. 12 13 Thank you. 14 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.) CHAIR GAY: We are back on the record. 15 16 will give Ms. Amato the opportunity to provide a 17 response to the question that Kia had earlier 18 regarding the prior applications. Just for the 19 record, the vote has already happened, but I did 20 want to let her answer that question. 21 MS. AMATO: Hi, it's Candy. 22 So to answer your question, their previous 23 application, the 2019 application of Navigator 24 High School, they did meet the standard; however, 25 here is the language that allowed for that. The

applicant explains Navigator Academy of Leadership will issue an RFP for bus services provided by a third-party vendor. The RFP will call for the vendor to provide school buses with a maximum capacity and maximum mileage that meet all federal and state requirements for the school bus transportation.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

And we are now prepared to move into the second issue, which is management and staffing.

The issue is whether the applicant's plan for management and staffing is viable, adequate, and meets the requirements of Section 1002.33(7)(a)9 and (7)(a)14, Florida Statutes, and the standards set for in the Evaluation Instrument.

I will first ask the School to present on management and staffing for three minutes.

DR. LaFRANCE: Good morning. My name is Dr. Diane LaFrance, and I'm VP of Academics and Operations.

I'm here today to clarify that Navigator

Academy of Leadership has developed a viable and

adequate staffing plan that meets the needs of the

school. The plan identifies the number of

teachers and other staff members that will be

needed and the qualifications for each position.

I want to first begin with talking about managing our time to maximize the impact of the .5 teacher allocation. I want to remind you that this is time served, not half a body.

We may involve scheduling small group sessions, providing targeted interventions during specific periods. And we also have to remember that ESE students often require additional support services.

In addition to instruction, ESE students may also require speech and language pathology, occupational therapy, or physical therapy. So it does not come down to our .5 teacher allocation.

Also, the number of minutes of service an IEP student receives varies depending on the student's needs. We hope to effectively provide ESE services that extend beyond teacher allocation and require a holistic approach that involves collaboration, individual support, and data-driven instruction.

Also, I would like to clarify something

Ms. Amato had stated. She stated that we

originally put in for 12 full-time teachers. This

was in a previous application and not the

application that we are talking about today.

Today, in our application, we have put in for ten

teachers.

And it was explained at the interview that we are hoping to find teachers that may be joint certified so that they can provide teaching for more than one subject. This is something that we have seen happen based on our empirical data at our schools today.

Another thing that was brought up was the fact of JV and varsity coaches. I would like to clarify something that Ms. Amato had stated. She stated that when an 11th grade teacher (sic) enrolls in the school in the second year of operation, that they will not be able to play varsity. That is correct. Year one and year two, okay, we will only have ninth and tenth graders in year one, which is where we provided a JV coach. Year two, we will move on from there.

What has empirically been done at our schools and what I can tell you my firsthand experience is, my daughter plays varsity soccer, and her teacher is a varsity coach who receives a stipend. When she played JV, her teacher, her math teacher was her JV coach.

We have provided that in here, that while we will go ahead and do one JV coach, we will have teachers that will be teaching for our sports.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you. That's your three minutes.

All right. And for the School Board, when you're ready.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you, ma'am. As mentioned earlier, we based our appeal on the application that we have received, not on any extraneous information that may be presented today.

I guess if you take that analysis far enough, an applicant could come in and promise you the moon and stars today and you can accept that or not. But we based our appeal on the information that we had in the application that was submitted.

With regard to staffing, we'll once again reiterate that on a school with 650 students projected, we simply don't believe that a .5 allocation for ESE or for ESOL is sufficient.

The application did not budget expenses for substitute teachers. In the Capacity Interview, the applicant affirmed that there was an allocation of \$19,275 for .5 of the school nurse,

contracted speech services, and a mental health counselor. That amount is not sufficient to cover those.

The proposed budget also does not reflect allocations for the positions that were listed with respect to maintenance, curriculum specialist, or IT specialist.

This is a school with a projected enrollment of 650 students. Our position is simply that the staffing model that has been presented is not sufficient for that amount.

Candy, do you have anything?

MS. AMATO: No.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

All right. We're ready to move into questions, Members. I should say questions specific to management and staffing, though, I understand there might be some overlap.

MS. PAULINE: To the School, can you go into some additional clarification on whether you are or are not sharing resources related to staffing between the proposed school and the existing school?

DR. LaFRANCE: Yes. Like we stated at our interview, we are sharing some services.

One of the things I do want to clarify that 2 was just spoken of, it said that based on 650 students, we would have a .05 ESE teacher 3 4 allocation. We are projecting .5 for year one of 5 250 students. By the time we get to 650, we have 6 three ESE teachers that are stated there. 7 MS. PAULINE: Can you go a little deeper? You responded, yes, you're sharing resources. 8 9 But I guess my follow-up would be what resources 10 are you sharing? 11 DR. LaFRANCE: Okay. So, for example, when we contract out our speech and pathology, some 12 13 contracted services that we would have, we can 14 use for that. Also, we could be potentially 15 using an ESE teacher because we have paras at one of our schools, so we can provide -- being on the 16 17 same campus, there are some things like that that 18 we can. The director, assistant 19 MS. PAULINE: principal, I see .5. Are those being shared as 20 21 well? 22 DR. LaFRANCE: Right. So basically when we 23 talk about our Director of Schools, that position 24 will be overseeing both schools as the director.

MS. PAULINE: And the AP?

25

DR. LaFRANCE: And the AP for year one will 2 be considered a co-principal and will be shared 3 that first year. However, our other school will 4 be gaining an assistant principal at the time, so 5 we will not be losing a .5 there. We actually 6 will be gaining it. 7 Just a follow-up question. MS. BARBER: many students are currently enrolled at the K-8? 8 9 DR. LaFRANCE: So at the K-8 right now, we 10 have 1,000 students. We have a principal, an AP 11 and a Dean. How many students would be in 12 MS. PAULINE: 13 the eighth grade possibly transferring? 14 DR. LaFRANCE: So we hope to have -- in our 15 ninth grade, we are hoping to have 125 students. 16 So our first year opening, we're opening with ninth and tenth grade, 125 in each. Right now we 17 18 have about 116 students in our eighth grade. 19 CHAIR GAY: And I wanted to give the School 20 Board an opportunity, if there was any response 21 to those questions. They were for the School, 22 but if the School Board has a response to any of 23 those questions, you have the opportunity. 24 MR. BRIDGES: I agree there have been 25 references to shared services in the application.

I would go back -- and I think I misspoke when I mentioned the school is 650. It is in fact going to be a school of 650, but they are correct, it opened smaller.

2.2

2.3

If you look at the language of the District's denial letter on page three, paragraph one quotes the application. Since the first year we'll have smaller enrollment, the ESE teacher will also oversee gifted IEP students.

And once again, the District's position, contrary to this statement, the School's allocating .5 ESE teacher in the first year of operation to serve approximately 30 students of 12 percent.

In addition to providing direct services, the teacher is also responsible for preparing and facilitating all IEP and 504 meetings, monitoring and recommending stipulated goals and expectations, ensuring all legal requirements are fulfilled, et cetera.

This allocation is insufficient to maintain and anticipate the needs of exceptional students.

And, likewise, with the ESOL reference in paragraph three below of .5 allocation to serve approximately 30 English Language Learner

Based on student needs, the existing 2 Navigator Academy of Leadership K-8 school 3 increased their personnel to serve ESOL students 4 in the first few years of operation. 5 Considering the history of projected student 6 population and actions taken by Navigator's K-8 7 school, .5 ESOL in the application is 8 inappropriate. 9 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. 10 Any other questions, Members? 11 MS. PAULINE: Yeah, I have one question. 12 In the School District's eval., there was 13 conversation -- and I think it was brought up 14 briefly -- about the lack of substitutes. 15 Can the School respond, because I'm not clear 16 on how it would handle given the teacher vacancy 17 issues nationally and just normal, you know, 18 day-to-day vacancies, how the school plans to accommodate for substitutes when necessary? 19 20 DR. LaFRANCE: Yeah. Just like we're doing, 21 we do have that allocated in 5,100 in the budget 22 for substitute teachers. 23 MS. PAULINE: 5,100 on line 120, is what I 24 think I remember reading? 25 DR. LaFRANCE: Yes.

MS. PAULINE: I don't see a line 120 under 2 the 5,100. Am I missing it? DR. LaFRANCE: So it's actually 51,100. 3 MS. PAULINE: So it's lumped into the salary 4 5 number? 6 DR. LaFRANCE: Uh-huh. 7 MS. PAULINE: Is there an assumption made in 8 terms of the rate you're budgeting, how many per 9 month or per year? 10 DR. LaFRANCE: Well, we just used basically 11 the empirical data of what we have at our school 12 right now at our K-8. MS. PAULINE: What is that empirical data? 13 MR. STERNBERG: We're looking it up. Yes, 14 ma'am. 15 16 MS. PAULINE: Okay. We can come back to 17 that. 18 CHAIR GAY: Okay. You can come back to it 19 or are you prepared to respond? 20 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. Jeremy Calkins 21 again. 22 I did want to say our Senior Director of Finance, who handles the day-to-day on this, 23 couldn't make it today because she -- her mother 24 25 is having a major medical procedure.

MS. PAULINE: Oh, I'm so sorry. 2 MR. CALKINS: She would be the one best equipped. But I do know our budgets. I review 3 our budgets with her. And the 51,100 would be 4 5 the line item. And we're trying to find the 6 percentage for you. 7 CHAIR GAY: Okay. While you all are looking for that, I'll ask if there's any other questions 8 9 for --10 I'm sorry, School Board, would you like to 11 respond? 12 I'm sorry, can you repeat what MS. AMATO: the question was? I was looking something up. 13 I believe the question is with 14 CHAIR GAY: respect to the provision of substitute teachers 15 16 based on your denial letter. 17 MS. AMATO: No, ma'am. Okay. Any other questions of 18 CHAIR GAY: 19 the Members while the Applicant is looking up 20 their information? 21 MR. GARCIA: I do. 22 CHAIR GAY: Yes. MR. GARCIA: Regarding the comment that the 23 School District made regarding junior varsity 24 25 coaches. Based on the School's prior experience

or current experience, has there been any 2 collaboration with the School District, as is allowable by the statute, that students and 3 4 charter schools participate in sports with the 5 District? 6 MS. BLANDINO: Hi. Good morning. Valeria 7 Blandino. I'm currently the principal of the K-8 8 center. 9 No, we haven't had any collaboration with the 10 District. The only thing that we have done is 11 that we currently have a girl's volleyball team. 12 And they just had their first game with one of the 13 districts of public schools as well. 14 So they did compete against them. They did 15 play. But there hasn't been any additional 16 collaboration or any additional offers to be able 17 to collaborate with them. 18 MR. GARCIA: But I hope you also understand that it is allowed. Charter school students can 19 20 participate in sports within the district with no 21 limitations pretty much. 22 MS. BLANDINO: Thank you. 23 CHAIR GAY: Would the School Board like to 24 respond? 25 MS. AMATO: Candy Amato.

So we do have charter schools that do not 2 offer sports that do participate at their zoned Obviously they have to fill out the 3 controlled open enrollment and work with our 4 5 athletic director. But we do have charter schools 6 in our district that do have their children 7 participate at their zoned school. 8 MR. GARCIA: Okay. 9 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. 10 Any other questions, Members? 11 (No response.) CHAIR GAY: Are you all still working on 12 gathering the information? 13 MR. CALKINS: She is. 14 15 CHAIR GAY: Okay. I just wanted to make 16 sure. MR. CALKINS: It's a calculation we're 17 18 looking for. 19 CHAIR GAY: Understood. 20 Any other questions while we're waiting? 21 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I have a question about ESOL for the District. And I don't know how to 22 23 ask it because I've never worked in a high school, so just bear with me. 24 25 Younger children who come in needing

services, I would I assume would need a lot more depending on, you know, their language when they came to school. But at the high school level, if they've been in school for the most part, you know, over the years, what differs as far as what an ESOL teacher would provide? Would it be more services, accommodations?

And the only reason I'm asking is because I'm trying to justify a .5. I'm trying to see how that plays in.

MS. AMATO: Candy Amato.

So, again, it would be both. The area of the district in which the school is looking to open is a very high Hispanic population. There's a lot of mobility in that area.

Obviously, with a charter school, they do have that enrollment process and application period. But, again, it is an area of high need for dual language services. Those students would need both.

CHAIR GAY: And for the school to respond as well.

DR. LaFRANCE: I think I know what you're asking there. What we have found in our K-8 is our -- what we see with our ESOL students as they

go up in grades, they are testing out of ESOL.

It's usually about two years of services, and
then they test out of those services. So we have
a lot less of students receiving ESOL services at
our middle school, which is 6-8, as compared to
our K-5.

CHAIR GAY: Go ahead.

MR. GARCIA: One follow-up question with the same thought in mind. As students move up into the high school, their level of direct services, in my experience, tends to be less.

How have you experienced that in elementary going into middle school and what is projected for high school?

MS. BLANDINO: Good morning. Valeria Blandino again.

So currently we have 38 percent of our school population is ESO1 at the entire school.

Obviously in the middle school component, it is significantly less. So we're looking at approximately, I would say, a good perhaps maybe 15 percent that will be.

And they do require less services that are needed. As far as we also have additional support staff that does provide the services when needed.

MS. PAULINE: Can I ask the District a 2 question? 3 CHAIR GAY: Of course. MS. PAULINE: Can you talk to me a little 4 5 bit about, I guess, the demographic landscape in 6 terms of newly arrived immigrants in the area 7 that's being proposed? I guess for the School or 8 the District. I don't know. 9 CHAIR GAY: I think it's posed to the 10 District. 11 Okay. I was looking at MS. AMATO: 12 something. MS. PAULINE: I'm trying to gauge how many 13 kids would matriculate from a K-8 and how many 14 would come in for the first time of the potential 15 16 for new entries at the high school level with 17 ESOL requirements, because I'm assuming, based on Kia's conversation and Osvaldo's conversation, 18 the need of services would be different for a kid 19 20 matriculating from an existing system from a kid 21 coming into the country for the first time in a 22 high school, whether it be the first year of the high school or the fourth year of the high 23 24 school?

Yes.

So obviously services will

25

be needed regardless, you know, whatever level 2 they come in at. So that area -- and, Kia, I know you're on the other side of that line. 3 4 that area is obviously growing by leaps and 5 bounds to where we can't even -- you know, we're 6 struggling to keep up with the housing and the 7 infrastructure as it is. 8 MS. PAULINE: Right. 9 MS. AMATO: So I will -- let me reach out to 10 the Facilities Department so they can give me 11 some more context. 12 MS. PAULINE: I just needed anecdotal 13 information. I just needed to -- like in Miami, 14 of course, we see an influx, you know, at 15 different parts of the year. 16 MS. AMATO: Correct. MS. PAULINE: I'm not familiar with Polk 17 18 County or that part of the state. 19 MS. AMATO: Yes. 20 MS. PAULINE: But just curious as to whether 21 you're seeing the same kind of trend. 22 MS. AMATO: Yeah. And more so in that area 23 would be higher need of incoming immigrants who 24 are learning the language for the first time. 25 Obviously if they're receiving services at a

younger age, obviously we know that acquisition of the language looks a little different from kinder 2 and first than it does in high school. 3 I would like to provide an 4 CHAIR GAY: 5 opportunity for the School to respond to that 6 question, if you would like. 7 MS. BLANDINO: Valeria Blandino. So we have seen an influx, but not 8 significantly to say that -- it is more in the 9 10 lower grade levels that we have seen it versus the 11 middle school, which would be the services that 12 there would be obviously a need for as far as the 13 high school goes. It's not as big as it is in Miami. 14 I'm from Miami, Florida, so I know exactly the influx that 15 16 we have in Miami. It's very different. 17 very different population here. I have a follow-up question for 18 MS. BARBER: the school. 19 20 CHAIR GAY: Go head. 21 MS. BARBER: I think you just mentioned when 22 you were up previously that your ESOL population of the K-8 is 33 percent? 23 MS. BLANDINO: No, 38 percent in the entire 24

So the K-8, yes.

25

school.

MS. BARBER: So 38 percent? 2 MS. BLANDINO: Yes. MS. BARBER: And then looking at your chart 3 that you have on page 11 of your application, it 4 5 says that the ELL population is 16 percent. 6 I was just curious where that number arose 7 from because I'm assuming that your ELL numbers 8 for your new school came as an average? 9 MS. BLANDINO: I believe when we did the 10 averages, it was based on the previous numbers. 11 DR. LaFRANCE: Diane LaFrance. 12 That was brought up at our interview 13 question, and you can see the answer there. 14 was an error in transcribing there. So you can see that in the -- if you have the interview 15 16 questions there. 17 MS. PAULINE: So a follow-up. What is the 18 accurate picture now? DR. LaFRANCE: The 38 percent, which is what 19 20 we have right now. 21 MR. GARCIA: For the entire school? 22 DR. LaFRANCE: Uh-huh. 23 Is there -- I'm sorry, if I can MS. BARBER: 24 follow up. 25 CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. BARBER: Is there a breakdown for, let's 2 say, sixth through eight or the eighth grade of 3 the students that you're expecting to matriculate there? 4 5 DR. LaFRANCE: We can look and see if we can 6 get that for you. 7 Osvaldo, did you have a CHAIR GAY: follow-up? 8 9 MR. GARCIA: No. I was just curious about 10 ESOL students in the eighth grade, which would be 11 the ones transferring. In addition to just the overall 12 MS. BARBER: 13 percentage, I'm interested to know the ESOL levels of those students. If you could provide a 14 breakdown of that. 15 16 DR. LaFRANCE: Okay. 17 Sorry. I have another question MS. BARBER: 18 for anybody who has the documents in front of I'm looking in the notes from the District 19 20 of the interview that they had with the School, 21 and I was looking to reference what the School 22 just mentioned about the comment that it was a 23 transcribing error from the 38 percent to the 24 16 percent. 25 Does anybody see where that is so I can look at it?

MS. AMATO: This is Candy.

So to answer your question, ma'am, if you look on the Evaluation Instrument on page seven, it's under "Target Population and Student Body."

It starts on page seven and then moves into page eight. So there were repeated typographical errors.

MS. BARBER: Are you referencing the --

MS. AMATO: It states on page ten of the charter application, NAL-003 will abide by the enrollment of all policies and parameters. We cannot anticipate what our exact student population will look like; however, we anticipate the student population may mirror that of NAL-002, which is their K-8.

On page 11 of the charter application reflects Navigator Academy of Leadership K-8 has 16 percent of its students on free and reduced lunch. Sorry. And then it moves into -- and then page nine.

MR. GARCIA: There's a little table on page nine.

MS. BARBER: Right. I see where it refers to the free and reduced lunch. I was looking for

```
if it refers to the ELL and ESOL numbers.
               MS. AMATO:
 2
                           I did see that.
                                            Hang on.
 3
               MR. GARCIA: Page nine.
 4
               MS. AMATO:
                           Yeah. Go to page nine.
 5
               CHAIR GAY: Page ten is where it says --
 6
          that was just a scrivener's error.
 7
               MS. BARBER: Yes.
               CHAIR GAY: I think that's referencing --
 8
 9
               MS. BARBER: That's referencing the free and
10
          reduced lunch.
11
                           Oh, okay.
               CHAIR GAY:
12
               MS. AMATO:
                           I'm still looking.
13
               MS. BARBER: If it's not there, that's fine.
14
          I was just looking.
15
               MR. GARCIA: Did you see the chart on page
16
          nine?
                            I did, yes. But I didn't
17
               MS. BARBER:
18
          see -- the School had mentioned the discrepancy
19
          between the 16 percent ELL and what they had just
20
          mentioned as the 38 percent, so I was looking for
21
          reference to that discrepancy.
               MS. BLANDINO: Valeria Blandino.
22
23
               So I have the number. We do have LY, which
24
          up here in Polk County is not at the levels the
25
          way it is down there, Levels 1, 2, 3. It's LY or
```

LF. 2 So currently we have 22 students in LY, which are the ones that receive funds in eighth grade. 3 And three of them are LF, which is exited the 4 5 program already. 6 MS. BARBER: So that's 25 students in total? 7 MS. BLANDINO: Yes, 25 students in total. 8 MS. BARBER: I'm sorry. One follow-up 9 question. 10 MS. BLANDINO: Yes. 11 MS. BARBER: That's for eighth grade? 12 MS. BLANDINO: Eighth grade. 13 MS. BARBER: And your overall population for 14 eighth? 15 MS. BLANDINO: It is 116. 16 MS. BARBER: Is it 116 or 160? MS. BLANDINO: 116. 17 18 MS. BARBER: Okay. Thank you. I do have a question for the 19 CHAIR GAY: 20 School. One of the -- I believe it was 21 articulated in the denial letter that the K-8 had 22 to make some adjustments to its ESOL teachers 23 during the first year. 24 Can you just describe what that was like? 25 MR. CALKINS: If it's in the first year --

Jeremy Calkins here, I'm sorry. 2 Our principal for the first year and our VP of Academics and Operations are no longer with the 3 company, so this group, I don't think, would be 4 5 able to answer that specifically. 6 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry. 7 Maybe I'm wrong. DR. LaFRANCE: No, you're not wrong. 8 9 Diane LaFrance again. 10 I can say that, just like every year, we make 11 changes based on the students we have. So I will 12 say within the last two years, we've added like a 13 para-position to our ESE services just within the 14 last two years. 15 CHAIR GAY: Would the School Board like to 16 respond? DR. LaFRANCE: Actually, two additional was 17 18 added within the last two years in 19 para-positions. 20 I was mostly asking just in the CHAIR GAY: 21 denial letter it referenced that. 22 Okay. I was going to say the MS. AMATO: 23 numbers she's quoting are from their current K-8. 24 CHAIR GAY: Right. 25 However, they did indicate they MS. AMATO:

would be sharing services during that first year. 2 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. Any other questions, Members? 3 4 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I have one more 5 question. 6 I think I heard someone in the School 7 mention -- or from the School mentioned that the .5 is for part-time teachers. So what would the 8 9 other .5 be? What would that responsibility be 10 for that teacher? 11 MR. STERNBERG: I can address that. Thomas 12 Sternberg. 13 The .5, again, is talking about see-time 14 allocation, and it's a really a budgetary 15 projection of, you know, if a teacher is making 16 \$40,000, .5 is allocated \$20,000 to that. 17 So the .5 isn't necessarily the amount of 18 time they're going to be spending. It's just that shared position as it relates to the ESE or ESOL 19 20 or the para-professions that we're asking for. 21 So it's not that they're -- that one teacher 22 might do both and do the legal work, the 23 compliance that go with an IEP. But that's just 24 the budgetary .5. So it's not like they're 25 splitting their time. Well, they are, but it's

only allocated \$20,000 for that budget-wise. 2 CHAIR GAY: Any other questions, Members? 3 (No response.) CHAIR GAY: All right. If we're ready to 4 5 move into a motion. 6 MS. BARBER: I'll make a motion. 7 Go ahead, Ashley. CHAIR GAY: 8 MS. BARBER: I move that the Commission find 9 that there is not competent substantial evidence 10 to conclude that the Applicant's plan for 11 management and staffing does not meet the 12 requirement of SS 1002.33(7)(a)9 and 13 1002.33(7)(a)14, Florida Statutes, and the 14 standards set forth in the Evaluation Instrument 15 adopted in Rule 6A-6.786, FAC, Section 11. 16 MS. PAULINE: I second that. 17 CHAIR GAY: All right. I have a motion and 18 a second. I would like to open for discussion to articulate our factual basis. 19 20 MS. BARBER: So we need discussion so that 21 we can record? 22 Right. CHAIR GAY: 23 So just to explain, one of the cases within 24 the past several years is that we have to articulate our factual basis. 25 So this is our

opportunity to do that, to get it on the record, 2 and also use in formulating that final written 3 recommendation. So if you could articulate that factual basis 4 5 during this discussion period. 6 MS. BARBER: So I would say that the staffing plan seems adequate to cover all the 7 8 needs of the students. And the School appears to 9 be aware of the possibility for a potential 10 increase in staffing, especially that .5 ESOL 11 they seem prepared to add if needed. And the 12 coaching positions that the District was concerned about seems to be well covered in the 13 14 applicant's response. 15 CHAIR GAY: Anyone else? 16 MS. BARBER: Do we need to address all of 17 the District's concerns? I don't know if my 18 comments just addressed everything. So do we need to address all of the District's concerns in 19 20 our comments? 21 I think it would be helpful for the record if we at least touched on them. 22 23 I was just going to go back and MS. BARBER: I don't know if I can cover them all. 24 25

I think there was ESOL, ESE,

MS. BRAUN:

coaching, substitute teachers.

CHAIR GAY: Maintenance curriculum specialist and IT specialist.

MS. BARBER: I think overall I feel like the applicant would be prepared to cover the positions or provide for those positions as needed. They seem confident and aware of the needs of the school.

CHAIR GAY: Osvaldo, do you have anything to add?

MR. GARCIA: I would say that the two .5 positions that they make reference to in their application are justified by the percent of students that they currently have going into, which would be the majority of the students for year one, 116 out of 250 starting with, so I think it's justifiable.

MS. PAULINE: I would add that I think what's been presented specific to ESE, the ESOL, the clarification provided about the substitute teachers, I think those are all reasonable. I do, however, have some concern about budgetary allocations to support, but there seems to be acknowledgment of an appropriate staffing level.

CHAIR GAY: All right. If no further

discussion, I'll ask Karen to call the roll for 2 the vote. 3 MS. HINES-HENRY: Ashley Barber. MS. BARBER: Yes. 4 5 MS. HINES-HENRY: Tiffanie Pauline. 6 MS. PAULINE: Yes. 7 MS. HINES-HENRY: Osvaldo Garcia. 8 MR. GARCIA: Yes. 9 MS. HINES-HENRY: Kia Scott. 10 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Yes. 11 CHAIR GAY: All right. Thank you. motion carries. 12 And we will then move into the third and 13 14 final issue. I just want to note it is 11:11. would like to start this issue and then do a lunch 15 16 break. 17 So the third issue is whether the applicant's 18 budget meets the requirements of Sections 19 1002.33(6)(a)4 and (6)(b)2, Florida Statutes, as 20 well as the standards set forth in the Evaluation 21 Instrument adopted in rule. So the School will have three minutes to 22 present on the issue of the budget. 23 24 MR. STERNBERG: Thank you, Madam Chair. 25 I won't take the entire three minutes.

I would like to bring this Commission back again to what we're here before on the budget.

We're here as an experienced operator with a current K-8 with a long and lengthy wait list that operates at a surplus and is now moving into the next phase of the process. And I would like to talk about the reasons for denial of why they think it wasn't -- why the School Board of Polk County does not believe that the budget balances.

Of course the budget won't balance if you take out and cherrypick whatever you don't want to include in a budget. So the budget as currently written and presented does balance.

Yes, it includes fundraising, fundraising with historical empirical data, a small amount, we're talking \$30,000, has been shown to make a technology fee, which is a non -- you know, it's not part of an application. It's not something that they could ever deny somebody on. It's part of a budget they that can include.

CSP grants, they are competitive, absolutely. And if they don't get it, we have talked about the budget shortfalls with DA Davidson and what we can do. But we're anticipating to receive the CSP grant.

Grants are allowed to be put in a budget.

2 There's no requirement under Florida

3 Administrative Code that says that they cannot be.

4 And the non-recognized revenue is just that. If

5 the CSP grant is recognized, then there is a

6 balanced budget. If there isn't, then there are

7 other shortfalls and contingencies that this

experienced operator in multiple counties knows

9 how to allocate and knows how to do it.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And a budget is just that. It's a proposed It's a projected budgeted. And I hope this Honorable Commission understands that this group, with their experience, with the ability to understand and operate, will do just that and ensure that this budget, as currently written, which does balance, will continue to serve the students as they move forward, whether it's management staffing, whether it's the grant funding, whether it's the work with financiers, they have met all the standards, and the District did not have competent substantial evidence. they're relying on nonmandatory requirements of charter schools in denying this section of the application. Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

And the School Board, you have three minutes when you're ready.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you, ma'am.

As I mentioned earlier, of the three, the greatest of these is budget. And budget is where we spent most of our time in analyzing and critiquing this application. And it simply was an unusual budget.

As I mentioned earlier, the items that counsel has mentioned are not things that we see in charter school budgets. This is unique in our experience.

So 250,000 in CSP grant revenue for the first two years of operation, competitive grant first off. Then we move to the capital outlay funding, which they've included, which they are not eligible for. The budget did not balance without this.

If they're able to come in today and tell you that based on their fund balance with other schools and revenues in other bank accounts that they can pay their bills, I'm not sure why we have an application process asking them to submit a budget. Our problem is that we are analyzing the budget that is put before us.

In all of the years that we have received charter school applications -- and by the way, I know counsel talked earlier about us somehow holding out the number of denials that we've had as exemplary. No.

The point there is we have reviewed a bunch of charter applications through the years. We've denied several and we have approved several. We are not newbies when it comes to reviewing charter school applications and charter school budgets. This one stands out to it because it includes these things that we've referenced in our denial letter.

The CSP grant funds, we've not seen that included in an application before. We have plenty of applicants who have been like situated, but that is not an item that we would consider appropriate for inclusion in a budget.

The capital outlay, once again, they included it. They're not entitled to it. They acknowledged that.

The technology fee, as I mentioned earlier, that's a double concern to us. It's not a whole lot of money, but it does raise the specter of situations in years past where we were accused of

sort and select at the district. That is something that immediately raises the red flag for our Charter Review Committee in reviewing their budget.

They have acknowledged that it is not appropriate. They have now said they will still include it but as a donation. And I'm not sure how you can budget based on donations. We referenced their other miscellaneous sources.

CHAIR GAY: I'm sorry, that is your three minutes.

MR. BRIDGES: I think we touched on all the issues. Thank you.

CHAIR GAY: All right. Now we're ready to move into questions from the Members on the budget.

MS. PAULINE: I'll start with a very preliminary question. So in the standard -- the model application template, it says under Section 20, Question B -- D, I'm sorry -- D as in dog -- provide a detailed narrative description of the line item revenue and expenditure assumptions on which the operating and startup budgets are based. The budget narrative should provide sufficient information to fully understand how

budgetary figures were determined.

So that's usually where I first start when I analyze a budget. So I went to page 114, 13 or 14 in your budget, and I saw like very brief descriptions, primarily couched off of estimations from recommendations from the charter support unit template, I'm assuming.

But am I missing that somewhere in the application? Was there an attachment that actually went line by line so that the reader or the evaluator could determine the actual assumptions on methodology made or even the revenue worksheet to help understand how the FEFEP was derived and any of those line items? Did I miss it somewhere?

MR. CALKINS: Jeremy Calkins.

I think I understand the question. I may need clarification. But we have internal processes that we use based off empirical data that we build our budgets based off percentage points.

And I would like to say that in year one of our first budget, we exceeded those projections by 665 percent. In year two, we exceeded it by 471 percent. In three year, we exceeded it by 450

percent. In year four, 596 percent. On average, we've exceeded our budget projection revenues or expenses by more than 500 percent. So what we do is we took our empirical data with the charter support unit to derive at our numbers.

And to address Mr. Bridges' comments about he hasn't seen a budget. They made reference to how good we are at budgets in the application. And we have a significant fund balance. So I think we've demonstrated that we know how to build and maintain budgets.

Also, when he said he hasn't seen these other things, we do them. That's why they're in there. So fundraising this last year, we allocated, we had a budget line item for \$70,000. The actual revenue that we brought in was \$160,000. So these are things that we're actually doing.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

Was your question answered?

MS. PAULINE: No. Let me use an example. So like in the conversation we had on the staffing, I believe it was the management and staffing, we talked about substitutes being buried into -- I won't say buried -- embedded into that line 5,100, that salaries line.

A narrative would show me how much of that total number would be X number of teachers, X number of administrators, X number of substitutes. That's the whole purpose of the narrative, so that evaluator or the reader can determine -- and I think it's in the evaluation tool -- how realistic the assumptions that are made are.

And I'm just failing to -- I have no way to validate or verify your narrative portion of some of the items in your application and juxtapose that to the support that would be needed in the financial section, like the maintenance. We talked about a bunch of examples like that, the ESOL, the ESE.

It's hard to see or to glean if there is valid accountancy for that plan or programs that you say you're going to provide because I don't have much here.

And it's okay to use a percentage based on empirical data. That's fine. But then you need -- I would expect you then to explain for this line item based on X, Y and Z, we assume that of the total revenue or of the total expenses this would equate to X percent because of. I mean, that's not what I'm seeing, unless it's here and

I'm missing it. 2 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. It's embedded in our worksheets. And that information wasn't 3 4 asked for us to provide. 5 So the function and object codes that we use 6 in our projected estimates and how we prepare our 7 budget, those are embedded by function code, very 8 detailed inside the worksheets that we used to 9 develop these budget projections. 10 MS. PAULINE: Okay. So the question that 11 I'm asking, was there a detailed narrative 12 provided for both the five-year budget and the 13 startup budget that would provide sufficient information for the evaluator? 14 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. We provided a 15 16 five-year statement to cash flows with every 17 single function and object --18 MS. PAULINE: No. Narrative, a budget 19 The question is, is it here or is it narrative. 20 not here? Am I missing it or it's not in here? 21 MR. CALKINS: I guess your question towards 22 a specific narrative is, no, ma'am, we didn't 23 provide a narrative. It was never asked. 24 MR. STERNBERG: Just briefly. You know, 25 it's kind of to go to what we have Capacity

Interviews for. And a budget narrative can be explained in the budget in and of itself, the line items, object codes, applying certain amounts to that.

And then when you go through an interview, a Capacity Interview, you know, you also have the seven days for technical nonsubstantive changes.

All of these things are --

Thomas Sternberg, by the way. My apologies.

All of these things are composed of what would be a narrative. So if I can ask a clarifying question.

Are you talking about like a written-out response for each object code? How can I better answer the question?

MS. PAULINE: So just using the description that is provided in the model application template, provide a detailed narrative description on the line item revenue and expenditure assumptions.

In most of the applications I've seen,
whether it's in this process or in our district's
process, there is a separate two, three,
four-pager that goes line by line.

And I've even seen it with the CSU model

where revenue is  $X_{\bullet}$  Y and Z. This is comprised 2 of, this makes up the staffing section where it 3 talks about the salaries. This is, you know, X number of full-time teachers, X number of 4 5 administrators, X number of whatever at whatever 6 rate so that someone could then back into the number, because the evaluation tool is asking the 7 reader to evaluate whether or not this is valid or 8 9 realistic or reasonable. And I believe that was 10 the reason for that Number D, so that we could 11 take just general numbers back into them to make 12 that determination. 13 MR. STERNBERG: So now I understand a little 14 better. 15 MS. PAULINE: Okay. MR. STERNBERG: So would that be maybe 16 17 better suited under the financial management and 18 oversight section, discussing the --19 MS. PAULINE: No. It's a part of the budget 20 section, Section 20. 21 MR. STERNBERG: I understand the narrative 22 that we're talking about is something written But wouldn't that be better suited under 23 24 the financial management and oversight section,

how they're expending the funds?

MS. PAULINE: No. Financial management is 2 talking in general about how you're managing your finances over the course of operation. 3 MR. STERNBERG: Yes. 4 5 MS. PAULINE: This is talking to how you 6 built your budget now for the five-year term and 7 the startup. They're two separate things. 8 MR. STERNBERG: Okay. So as for the 9 written, let me look back and see if I can get 10 some clarification there. 11 MS. PAULINE: Okay. I just want to make 12 sure I'm not missing it. That's all. 13 MR. STERNBERG: No. Absolutely. 14 Understood. I just wanted to make sure I was 15 clarifying what we were actually looking for. 16 appreciate it, though. Thank you. 17 MS. PAULINE: Sure. And I have more 18 questions. 19 MS. BARBER: Yes, I have questions. 20 CHAIR GAY: We'll go ahead and move to other 21 questions while you all are looking for it, 22 unless you need a few minutes. 23 Mr. Sternberg, do you need a few minutes or 24 can we continue the questions while you all look 25 into that?

MR. STERNBERG: I think you can continue. 2 Absolutely. 3 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Wonderful. 4 Go ahead, Ashley. 5 MS. BARBER: Okay. So I had a question for 6 the School. I know that the District had asked 7 it as well, but looking at the project advance 8 from development, you had \$75,000 in preplanning 9 and \$275,000 in the first year of operation and 10 then also just referencing the letter from DA 11 Davidson and the funds that might be received 12 there. 13 Is a repayment plan included in the budget for those items? 14 15 MR. CALKINS: Jeremy Calkins. I realize I'm not doing a great 16 No, ma'am. job explaining this, so I'm going to try to do it 17 18 It's already there. So that's just the better. 19 line item that we allocated. We could put -- so 20 let me give you an example. 21 When we talk about the DA Davidson letter of 22 contingency, there's \$3 million in contingency. That's what we think we have available. 23 24 already allocated to debt service. So we're

basing our amortization schedule based off of a \$3

million contingency.

That's why all of these other line items that we're talking about, we're really not worried about because we know that we have a \$3 million contingency that's already baked in through project development fees. And that's a line item 9,200. So it's a \$15 million guaranteed maximum price integrated project delivery.

And so we don't expect to use them. That's why they're contingency. We expect to use everything, including fundraising, including CSP that we think we're going to get. But in the event we don't get these, we have a \$3 million contingency. And that's what the DA Davidson letter provides.

MS. BARBER: So just to clarify, so 9,200 debt services references repayment?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BARBER: And that also encompasses rent?

MR. CALKINS: That encompasses everything.

That encompasses our contingency. It encompasses everything. And that's why I was going back to my original opening statement. I don't believe anybody does what we do. You know, we maximize the benefit to the school.

MS. BARBER: And then, I'm sorry, I'm just 2 trying to wrap my head around these different 3 pieces. 4 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 5 MS. BARBER: But the project advance from 6 development, the \$7,500 -- sorry -- \$75,000 and 7 \$275,000, those funds are from that \$3 million 8 contingency? 9 MR. CALKINS: That's correct. And we 10 actually have a letter from DA Davidson where we 11 do have \$350,000 we've allocated for preplanning. 12 And above and beyond that, that wasn't in the 13 application. 14 MS. BARBER: I'm sorry, you have a letter from DA Davidson? 15 16 MR. CALKINS: It's not a letter, but a breakdown in our sources and uses through 17 18 development. And that's going back to my opening 19 20 statements, too. That's why the District wouldn't 21 see it, because they're a part of the development 22 fees. 23 MS. BARBER: Do you have anything that you 24 can share with the Commission here showing that 25 DA Davidson has either --

MR. CALKINS: Sure. 2 MS. BARBER: -- provided funds for this school or is quaranteeing a set number of funds 3 for this school? 4 MR. CALKINS: Well, they won't guarantee, as 5 6 mentioned before, in the letter of intent. But I can give you -- I can find an email and show it 7 8 to you from Senior Vice President Maggie Mirsky. 9 MS. BARBER: Is that something that seems 10 appropriate? 11 MS. BRAUN: I mean, you can take into account additional information learned from the 12 parties today. So if that would help the 13 Commission in making their decision, yes. 14 15 MS. BARBER: Yes. 16 MS. PAULINE: Can I follow up here? 17 CHAIR GAY: Yes. 18 MS. PAULINE: Okay. So the debt service line item, the 9,200 on the five-year capital 19 20 budget. 21 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 22 MS. PAULINE: And I assume Column 250 is 23 your planning year? 24 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 25 Okay. So that says 225 in the MS. PAULINE:

first year, right, 225,000? 2 MR. CALKINS: That's correct. Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. PAULINE: Okay. And then the project advance from development income is 275? 4 5 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 6 MS. PAULINE: And then on the startup 7 budget, the startup budget there was 8 seventy-something-thousand. 9 MS. BARBER: 75,000. 10 MS. PAULINE: 75,000 there. So that coupled 11 with -- I don't clearly understand. And I may 12 need to kind of unpack these questions. Let's back up. So talk to me first about the 13 14 facility's financing arrangement. MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 15 16 MS. PAULINE: Because in parts of the 17 application, it was referenced as rent, and there 18 were conflicting amounts of rent. But then it was spoken to, and you have the letters from DA 19 20 Davidson that propose that it's debt service. 21 I'm just confused. 22 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. MS. PAULINE: 23 I mean, I don't know how else 24 to put it. I'm just confused as to what is 25 happening here.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. So we have a 2 \$15 million allocation for the high school. That's what we're working on for --3 To build a new building? 4 MS. PAULINE: 5 MR. CALKINS: To build a new facility. 6 MS. PAULINE: When you say --7 MR. CALKINS: And just to put that --8 MS. PAULINE: Hold on one second. 9 MR. CALKINS: I'm sorry. 10 When you say "we," do you mean MS. PAULINE: 11 Compass or do you mean the school? 12 MR. CALKINS: The school. The school owns 13 And I'm glad you asked that question. Let 14 me clarify this. 15 Compass doesn't own the schools. The school 16 owns the schools. Our schools own their schools. 17 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 18 MR. CALKINS: We serve as a developer at a 19 fee. All open book. Everything is open book. 20 It's the developer at a fee with a guaranteed 21 maximum price. So we take a set amount of 22 \$15 million. That's what we've done here. 23 To draw a comparison, we don't have nearly 24 the impact that we had when we did the K-8. 25 we're sharing a campus, so that's why I think we

have to compare the two.

All of the infrastructure that we didn't have is already there. We brought that project in with a \$14 million GMP at \$12.177 million. So the construction costs were \$8.8 million.

Now, we are going to have a little bit of site cost because we're going to have to put rain tanks on, which will bring the site development costs back up. But we have a very significant contingency baked into our development plan.

So we do not believe based off, you know, all the bids and estimates that we've been getting in -- and this was asked of me at the time of the application. We are very comfortable that we have a very conservative estimate here. So that's why we just used those numbers. That's all we need to draw upon is the 275 and the 75 to make our balance -- our budget balance.

MS. PAULINE: Okay. So I kind of understand that, but I'm going to have to come back to that.

MR. CALKINS: Sure.

MS. PAULINE: So in the planning year, you have allocated monies that I assume is your contingency. Normally we would see a contingency or a reserve or like the district has a minimum

percentage that it holds for reserve. 2 understanding you don't have to do that. Yes, ma'am. 3 MR. CALKINS: 4 MS. PAULINE: But this is some arbitrary 5 I'm not exactly sure what it's based on. 6 Well, I guess that's the question. 7 You have in your year one another 275, but in the out years, I see no revenue related to 8 9 contingency, nor do I see any expenditures to set 10 aside a contingency unless that's the debt 11 service. And if so, what is the assumption made 12 for that if that is the contingency? 13 MR. CALKINS: It is the debt service. 14 And the assumption is \$15 million. 15 the cost of construction, the assumption that's 16 made is \$12 million. 17 So this whole budget projection is based off 18 the assumption that we're actually, when we get 19 done, going to give \$3 million back to the school, 20 and that debt service will actually go down. 21 I'm sorry, can I just --MS. BARBER: 22 MR. CALKINS: And that's how we've --23 MS. PAULINE: I'm so confused. MS. BARBER: 24 So the \$15 million is through 25 DA Davidson?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 2 MS. BARBER: That's not -- none of that \$15 3 million is actually acquired already? It's all 4 something that DA Davidson is going to work with 5 you? 6 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. That's in the 7 plan. 8 MS. BARBER: The facility development --9 MR. CALKINS: Plan. Yes, ma'am. 10 MS. BARBER: -- \$12 million, is that what 11 you said? 12 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. The whole budget 13 allocation for development is \$15 million, including a \$3 million development contingency 14 15 fee. 16 MS. BARBER: Okay. 17 MR. CALKINS: So whatever that means. 18 that's why when they put in their letter at the 19 time of the application existing facility, 20 construction cost, fund predevelopment, 21 contingency, FF&E, et cetera, et cetera, it's all 22 baked into that line item, so whatever we need to 23 draw down upon. 24 I think the concern that I have MS. BARBER: 25 is that there's no numbers included in the letter from DA Davidson. And I understand everything
you've said about that.

MR. CALKINS: Sure.

MS. BARBER: There's no numbers. We're basing this off of what you're telling us. And what you're telling us is that past experience has been with DA Davidson and your other current charter school?

MR. CALKINS: Sure.

MS. BARBER: So before we kind of like dig into that a lot more, I guess my question for the District would be looking at the other charter school that's in operation that has gone through DA Davidson, listening to what the applicant is up here stating now, do you have any comments to make on their current operations and the -- and I don't want to say truthfulness -- but also truthfulness to what they're presenting here? Is there anything that we as the Commission should know about how things have progressed with DA Davidson on the current charter school?

I just want to give the Board an opportunity -- or sorry -- give the School Board an opportunity to discuss that, or District, sorry.

CHAIR GAY: That's fine.

2.3

MS. AMATO: Candy Amato.

So their current K-8 is in the positive, so they do have a fund balance. I believe it's quoted several times. It's a significant fund balance. So they are operating on the right side of the numbers, which makes us happy as a District.

During the Capacity Interview, Mr. Calkins, and the rest of the team that was present, did address the debt services with DA Davidson, which is why we did ask for the May letter because during the Capacity Interview, we did not have that May letter. During the Capacity Interview, that was when it was addressed and brought up about the CSP, about capital outlay.

Mr. Calkins did indicate that he realized their error when they did include those fees on their budget, and they did correct it in one of their workarounds and was working with DA Davidson to -- I forget the word they used -- but basically put off their debt services for three years.

So then we did ask for an updated letter to reflect that those debt services would be waived for the first three years because that would

impact the budget. 2 The letter we received does not specifically It does say they would help come up with 3 some creative financing, but nowhere does it state 4 5 that DA Davidson would postpone those debt 6 services for the first three years. 7 Sorry, just a follow-up for you MS. BARBER: before you sit down. Do you have any concerns 8 9 that they would not receive the funds from DA 10 Davidson? 11 MS. AMATO: I don't know who DA Davidson is 12 so I cannot answer that question. I don't know 13 the relationship. I don't know their history with them. I don't know. 14 15 MS. BARBER: Okay. Thanks. 16 CHAIR GAY: All right. For the School. 17 MR. STERNBERG: I just wanted to address a 18 few things. Thomas Sternberg. 19 Possibly DA Davidson is one, if not the 20 largest, underwriters for charter schools in the 21 state of Florida. I think that's pretty well 22 known. Briefly I found the narrative. If we look 23 24 back from page 113 of it, that's where they go

through in-depth. They talk about the

attachments. They have line items that go through there. They talk about each individual one.

MS. PAULINE: So just for clarification. I went through it and it's not line by line. It's just a select few of the line items that are described.

MR. STERNBERG: And then everything else with the narrative. They talk about not only Attachment Z, but we go through and write a detailed narrative description of line item.

They go through revenue. They go through the FTE. They go through contingencies of \$350,000. They go through the line items, rentals, insurance and bond premiums, textbooks, supplies, classroom furniture.

And, you know, just to also bring this back. The reason why I think we really are here today on NAL-003 is because this structure is really unique in the state of Florida.

You know, with these individual offerers now helping us do it, they're allowed to structure these types of financing that puts the money back into the pockets -- and we talked about detailed contingencies.

This is a fairly new approach that's being

done, and we're seeing immense success with the K-8 on this model right now. We've seen immense success that DA Davidson has already loaned and secured financing through the K-8. We now have DA Davidson.

And, of course, you can't have a letter of intent if you don't even have an approved charter. I don't know any bank that would say, hey, we're going to give you \$15 million but you don't need to do anything to get that. So, you know, we're kind of putting the cart before the horse, as Mr. Calkins has said. But everything points to not only operating when we're talking about budget, it's operating it successfully.

As Ms. Amato correctly stated, we have a significant positive fund balance. And moving into a high school, financing secured, contingencies allowed.

And the fact that it is fairly new, we understand that there are going to be generally questions on how those contingencies work, how the financing comes back. And we're happy to work through and provide any supplemental information, such as the emails that provide the specific numbers.

But, you know, again, when we talk about the 2 cart before the horse type issue, they're not 3 going to put a we're guaranteeing \$15 million, but 4 when a charter is approved, based on what we've 5 already seen. And what we've already seen is that 6 DA Davidson has worked with this group, has 7 provided financing. 8 And now there's a budget in a lower school 9 that will be a feeder program that is operating 10 with a significant positive balance. And so 11 clearly the operators not only know how to run a budget but know how to run one extremely 12 13 successful. 14 I'll allow Mr. Calkins to step in. 15 MR. CALKINS: Jeremy Calkins. 16 I do have the email from DA Davidson, if you would like to see it, with the amounts. 17 18 I was going to ask about --CHAIR GAY: MR. STERNBERG: Could we read it? 19 20 MR. CALKINS: Yeah. Can I read it? 21 MR. STERNBERG: Instead of submitting it 22 into the record? One moment, please. 23 CHAIR GAY: 24 MS. BRAUN: Let me think. 25 Let me -- while you're thinking, CHAIR GAY:

Jamie, let me ask counsel for both parties -- and I'm sorry I'm putting you on the spot -- but to make a short argument regarding admitting a new document mid hearing.

MR. STERNBERG: Thomas Sternberg.

Whether we want to admit a new document and supplement the record, we already did supplement the record right before we started here with Polk County. So I think that would be evidence enough if we would be able to continue to do it, if they would agree to do it.

If they -- if counsel would object to us submitting a new document, I think as we've been providing clarification, reading it into the record would probably be sufficient, so we're not actually supplementing the record, but just clarifying the document of the May 23rd letter that already is in the record. We're just clarifying what that contingency would be.

And I think reading it in might, you know, kind of bridge that gap to solve admitting anything new after that point.

CHAIR GAY: So I would ask, I'm assuming you're not going to consent to admitting it?

MR. BRIDGES: Yes, ma'am.

I think there's a little difference between 1 2 the document that we were discussing this morning, which is a document that came from DA Davidson and 3 4 was supplied by the appellant to the School Board. 5 It was their document. We had included it with 6 our submission, had quoted extensively from it for 7 the language that we needed, that we wanted to be considered. It was just inadvertently left out. 8 9 So it was their document. They had seen it. 10 Certainly before we consider whether to admit 11 additional evidence at the hearing, I would like 12 to see the evidence and find out for what purpose 13 it is offered and what it contains. 14 CHAIR GAY: All right. I will permit a --15 well, let's do a -- because it's 11:43 -- and if 16 everyone could stay in the room -- a five-minute break for counsel to confer on this document so 17 18 that he has seen what you might be proposing. MR. STERNBERG: 19 Sure. 20 CHAIR GAY: And we will resume at --21 MS. PAULINE: Can I ask something before we 22 break? 23 CHAIR GAY: Yes. 24 MS. PAULINE: May I ask that Attachment Z 25 that was referred to, because our electronic

copies don't have attachments and I have no idea 2 which file that is, but if someone -- I don't know from the District side or the School side --3 could tell me the title of that document is. 4 CHAIR GAY: Where we can find Attachment Z. 5 6 MS. PAULINE: I see the Revenue Estimate 7 Worksheet, but I don't see Z, the Evidence of 8 External Funding. I don't see that. 9 CHAIR GAY: So you all could be looking for 10 that in the five minutes as well so that we know 11 how to locate it. We will resume in five minutes. 12 13 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.) 14 CHAIR GAY: Did you have a chance to confer 15 regarding this document? 16 MR. BRIDGES: Yes, ma'am. Counsel has 17 provided a screenshot from an email. It's not 18 dated so I don't know what the specifics of it 19 But it purports to show a total borrow 20 amount and a breakdown by uses. 21 This is not information that we've been privy 22 to before. It does not seem to constitute an 23 offer from them. But for purposes of conversation 24 about what the uses and the amount that's being

discussed would be, I have no objection.

CHAIR GAY: Okay. Thank you. 2 Counsel, do you --MR. BRIDGES: And there is also no --3 4 because it's not an offer, there's no discussion 5 of terms. 6 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Thank you. 7 Did you have further argument, Mr. Sternberg? MR. STERNBERG: 8 No. 9 CHAIR GAY: Counsel, can you remind me of 10 the Commission's -- or I guess it might be the 11 Chair's authority regarding additional 12 information, the statutory reference? 13 MS. BRAUN: Right. So the Charter School Statute 1002.33 states 14 15 that the Commission may receive copies of the 16 appeal documents forwarded to the State Board, 17 review those documents and gather other applicable 18 information regarding the appeal. It also states 19 that the Commission may request information to 20 clarify the documentation presented to it. 21 And as we've already discussed, there have 22 been appeals on this issue in the Fifth DCA in the 23 School Board of Volusia County vs. Florida East 24 Coast Charter School case that stated that the

Commission unambiguously is able to take into

account additional information outside of what was presented to the School Board, may ask clarifying information. It specifically in that case declined to limit what that additional information really means.

So, you know, in this case, if the clarifying email or the information contained within it will help the Commission, then I think that it is within your purview to consider. And as the Chair, I think you would have the ability to rule on those issues there, a legal issue rather than an issue for the Commission to vote on.

CHAIR GAY: Okay. So what I'm going to do since -- I don't want to do this wrong -- since I haven't actually seen this document, is request that you forward it, and cc Mr. Bridges, to Jamie so that we can get a copy of it.

And we will take a break for lunch where I will consider it. And I'll come back after lunch with a decision on that. I think that's where we are now.

I know we had a few pending questions that were coming up. So, Members, if you'll just write your questions down so you remember them.

We are going to break for lunch until 1:00.

```
We will resume then.
 2
               MS. AMATO: I just wanted to respond to the
          earlier --
 3
 4
               CHAIR GAY: Oh, I'm sorry.
 5
               MS. AMATO: I did find it.
 6
               CHAIR GAY: Thank you. It is the April 19th
 7
          DA Davidson letter that was submitted as
 8
          Attachment Z, as in zebra.
               MS. PAULINE: That's not a budget narrative.
 9
10
          Okay.
11
               MR. STERNBERG: The title is "Evidence of
12
          External Funding." Example: Foundations,
13
          donors, grants.
               MS. PAULINE: But my question was around the
14
15
          budget narrative.
16
               MR. STERNBERG: I was saying that's what the
17
          attachment name is because you were asking what
18
          it was.
19
               MS. PAULINE: No. But you said on the
20
          record when I asked about the budget narrative
21
          that I could find it in Attachment Z. That's not
22
          a budget narrative. The Review Estimate
          Worksheets would be a portion of it, but it's
23
24
          not --
25
               MR. STERNBERG: That page 110 through 114,
```

you'll also see actual narrative as well. 2 MS. PAULINE: Understood. 3 CHAIR GAY: All right. So we will resume at 1:00. 4 5 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.) 6 CHAIR GAY: We are back on the record. 7 Before we go back into questions on Issue 3 8 for budget, I'm going to address the issue that we 9 left pending about admitting the email offered by 10 the applicant. 11 I reviewed the document over the break. 12 based on the statutory authority and case law that 13 permits the Commission to acquire additional 14 information during this meeting and the fact that 15 this document came up in response to a Member's 16 clarifying questions, I'm going to grant the 17 request to supplement the record with this email. 18 Now, whether the email answers the questions 19 of the Members and to what weight they give it is 20 up to them, but it will be at least supplementing 21 the record. 22 I went ahead and printed copies. I made ten, 23 so we should have plenty, just so we're all 24 operating on the same document. 25 So I'll give the Members a few minutes to

review the email, and then we will jump back into questions on the budget.

Members, when you're ready to start questioning again, just let me know, but I don't want to rush you.

(Whereupon, the record was paused.)

MS. BARBER: So with this information that we just got, I would just like to hear from the School in regards to this information. I mean, I'm trying to follow the email chain and the attachments here, but if you could just kind of give us an overview of what this is and what it is exactly that you want to point out to us here, just to make sure I'm looking at the right thing.

MR. CALKINS: Jeremy Calkins.

Yes, ma'am. I was just following up with DA
Davidson on the total sources and uses. So that
number that I gave you, that you asked for
evidence for, the \$15 million, that's where I got
it from. So I was working, again, off of
guaranteed maximum price for construction. Really
that's what it is. It's not development anymore.

And that's another point that I wanted to make where I don't believe, as Mr. Garcia has pointed out, we can separate the two. The middle

1	school owns the property, so all of the expenses
2	facility related, the middle school is going to
3	absorb. So the high school's at another advantage
4	there.
5	MS. BARBER: And then on this page where it
6	has the chart of the schools, the Navigator
7	Academy that's listed here, that's your original
8	school or is that the new school?
9	MR. GARCIA: New school.
10	MS. BARBER: So the K-8 or the 9-12?
11	MR. CALKINS: That's us.
12	MS. BARBER: As the K-8 or the 9-12?
13	MR. CALKINS: K-8.
14	MS. PAULINE: So could I follow up?
15	CHAIR GAY: Yes.
16	MS. PAULINE: Okay. When you we were going
17	back and forth when you were explaining the
18	\$15 million, the guaranteed maximum of price.
19	MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am, the guaranteed
20	maximum price.
21	MS. PAULINE: Okay. So based on on page
22	three, there's a little breakdown, a chart.
23	MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. PAULINE: So the sentence above the
25	chart says that issuance of 18.75 for a

\$15 million project cost. 2 So I guess I interpreted what you said was that the \$15 million is not really the cost of 3 construction, it's just the cost that's the 4 5 quaranteed price and that there would be some 6 delta that would allow you to then dip into that 7 delta for a contingency. But then when I look at 8 the uses, it seems like everything gets accounted 9 for. 10 Am I reading that wrong? 11 MR. CALKINS: That's on the bond. So the 12 \$15 million is the project funds that are 13 available, so the development, the project funds, 14 so the development project fees as a whole. 15 So you take the \$15 million. 16 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 17 MR. CALKINS: We're anticipating a \$12 million construction cost. And that's where 18 19 I keep coming up with the \$3 million in 20 contingencies. 21 MS. PAULINE: Is that \$12 million in this 22 somewhere? It's in the \$15 million. 23 MR. CALKINS: And is it itemized? 24 MS. PAULINE: 25 That's project funds MR. CALKINS:

available, so that would be our developer's 2 projections as well on construction costs. 3 MS. PAULINE: Okay. MR. CALKINS: And, again, I would like to 4 5 point out that the total cost of development was 6 12.1 the first time around. We took an orange 7 grove and brought in all of the utilities the 8 first time around, and now we're just 9 constructing the building. 10 MR. GARCIA: So what you're saying is that 11 the projected costs for the new building should 12 be less? 13 MR. CALKINS: Yes, sir. Yeah, we're being 14 very conservative. The actual construction cost 15 of the facility was \$8.8 million. 16 MR. GARCIA: Okay. 17 MS. PAULINE: May I follow up? 18 CHAIR GAY: Of course. 19 MS. PAULINE: So going back to the original 20 question around facility financing. So the 21 District and in the application, quite a lot of 22 conversation around the word "rent." So I'm still not clear. 23 24 Okay. You said earlier that the school will 25 own the property, but then on, I think, at least

three separate occasions there was a reference to a rent or a lease. And this specifically says 2 3 rent rates beyond year five will be calculated on base rent and an accelerated clause using CPI. 4 5 I'm confused. Is the school leasing or is 6 the school --7 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. The school owns the -- I'm sorry. 8 9 MS. PAULINE: I'm trying to figure out why 10 the confusion. Why does it say one thing and 11 then it says another, because they both -- they 12 mean two different -- they each mean something 13 different. 14 MR. CALKINS: Because that's how it's 15 identified in the -- in our function and objects 16 codes. It's rent, lease or debt service. And so 17 when they reference it, that's how they reference 18 it. So the line in the 7,900, we first put it as 19 20 rent. But the school owns the facility. 21 current school owns the facility. And this letter 22 of intent is for the school, the same board to own 23 the facility. 24 MS. PAULINE: The governing board is the 25 same for the existing school?

```
MR. CALKINS:
                             Yes, ma'am.
 2
               MS. PAULINE:
                             And the proposed school,
 3
          right?
 4
               MR. CALKINS:
                             Yes, ma'am.
 5
               MS. PAULINE:
                             And what you have in the
 6
          budget then is the correct debt service?
 7
               MR. CALKINS:
                             At the $15 million.
 8
               MS. PAULINE:
                             At the $15 million?
 9
               MR. CALKINS: Of which we don't believe
10
          we're going to utilize all of it, as was the case
11
          in the development of the middle school.
12
               MS. PAULINE: And you said the school, the
13
          current governing board owns the land.
          through this transaction, it will also own the
14
15
          facility?
16
               MR. CALKINS:
                             They own it all.
17
               MS. PAULINE:
                             Okay.
18
                             They own it all. Yes, ma'am.
               MR. CALKINS:
19
                            Sorry. I just want to -- you
               MS. BARBER:
20
          have a sample lease with the landlord and a
21
                   So the landlord in that sample that you
22
          provided, I was just pulling it up to look at it,
          but if you could just tell me who's the landlord
23
24
          in that.
25
                             Can you help me?
               MR. CALKINS:
```

MR. BIVINS: Robert Bivins. I'm General Counsel for the School.

Just to clarify, the current K-8 owns the entire property, but they're going to be leasing to the new school for the building. That's the current plan.

MR. STERNBERG: Thomas Sternberg.

So under traditional bond financing, you know, the K-8 is NAL-002, Incorporated. This that we're applying under, NAL-003, Incorporated, sharing the same governing board members, this is going to mean additional indebtedness.

So what that means is they're going to take the money out on behalf of the NAL-002. And then what they do is then they lease it to the NAL-003, meaning the same governing board is still going to own it under a different name that's the current operating K-8.

And so the lease is just, you know -- I don't want to say perfunctory, but it's the fact that it's owned by the governing board. You have to paper trail it for bondholders as well. But the same governing board under the other name will hold it as well. So they're still owning it under the NAL-002, taking out additional bonds and then

leasing it to the NAL-003. 2 MR. BIVINS: Davidson had wanted and asked 3 us for a sample lease because of that 4 arrangement, so I prepared that and submitted 5 that to them. 6 MS. BARBER: So within that lease agreement, 7 there is a proposed monthly rent? 8 MR. BIVINS: Yes. 9 MS. BARBER: So 003 is paying that amount to 10 002? 11 MR. BIVINS: What I'm not sure about that is 12 whether that's going to be a flow-through to --13 MR. STERNBERG: It's a pass-through. 14 MR. BIVINS: That's a pass-through to the --15 (Multiple speakers.) 16 THE COURT REPORTER: I don't even know who's 17 talking. 18 CHAIR GAY: One minute. If you can step up 19 to the microphone so the court reporter can 20 detail all of the conversations going on. 21 MR. BIVINS: Yeah. My understanding is that 22 the arrangement with Davidson is that it will be 23 a pass-through because there will be a mortgage 24 on that property. So that's the -- and since 25 they're going to be owning it, they're going to

have to, through the pass-through, receive those 2 funds and remit it to the debt service, so it's 3 overlap as a pass-through. So the rent is the debt service 4 MS. BARBER: 5 gets paid to 002, which then gets paid to --6 MR. BIVINS: Yeah. You've had more 7 discussions with Davidson. 8 MR. CALKINS: I wish Ms. Mirsky was here. 9 But the way that I understand it is the way that 10 they structure it right now, NAL-002 owns the 11 entire property and the facility. There will be 12 another bond agreement that will be with 00 --13 NAL-003 that they will be responsible for. 14 So I think the only thing that would need to 15 happen is there would be a land use agreement 16 which NAL-002 would probably lease for \$1 to 17 NAL-003, but NAL-003 would be responsible for its 18 own debt. 19 MS. PAULINE: And just to clarify again, so 20 each -- the two versus the three, they're not 21 standalone legal entities? 22 MR. CALKINS: They are. They are. Jeffrey Wood, also 23 MR. WOOD: 24 counsel for the School. 25 MS. PAULINE: My head hurts.

Doubling as Santa Claus this time 2 of year. 3 MS. PAULINE: It's becoming. So the structure is complicated, 4 MR. WOOD: 5 and I understand that there's some questions 6 about it. And I can understand why the District 7 would have questions, because they have never 8 seen this model before. This is a school sector 9 model. You're not used to it, I'm sure. 10 What you usually see is a developer and/or a 11 management company that owns the property and 12 leases it back to the school. This is not that. This is where the school is of the sole benefit of 13 14 the finance arrangement. 15 But because it's already under a finance 16 arrangement, you have to have collateral with So the investors of the original bond don't 17 share in the collateral with the new financing for 18 the building. There will be additional investors 19 20 with money brought in for the second building, and 21 that's who will get the security interest in the 22 building. Does that make sense? 23 MS. PAULINE: Yes. I mean, logically it 24

25

makes sense.

And you're right, I'm not used to this kind
of arrangement. But then there were -- I guess
where it gets kind of sticky for me is the
dependency for potential shortfalls also on a part

5 of this money.

And without even having a budget narrative or even clearly identifying -- like there's a lot of income mentioned on here, but no corresponding expenditures, at least as far as I can tell, without a budget narrative. I'm just very confused as to what the funds are really being spent on.

It seems like primarily construction, but
then there's a bit to dip into as long as there's
no overrides. But then in that delta, that
\$3 million delta, every time it is demonstrated
that there could potentially be a shortfall
because something was not properly demonstrated in
the narrative and we point to it, at what point do
we run past that point without knowing everything
that's been allocated or earmarked for this
\$3 million shortfall, or \$3 million delta? I
apologize.

MR. WOOD: So it's going to be additional debt which is not related to the first one that

was used to build the original school and the middle school. So that will have a different set of collateral that finances that particular debt.

The overlap is it's the same board. It's the same debt. And it will probably even be a guarantee of the middle school of this financing as part of that package. So it's all under one umbrella.

I understand it's a hard concept because it is kind of unique in the finance industry. If Richard Marin was here, he could explain it to me and then I could explain it to you. But it is kind of unique in the school sector.

And I completely get why Polk may not see it. And maybe the narrative didn't go as far as maybe they needed it to. But that's why we have these appeal hearings, so we can come here and clarify it for you guys so you guys feel comfortable with it.

I'm sorry, did you --

MS. BARBER: I'm sorry. Before we continue on down that path, can I just -- the lease that I was asking about, can I just get clarification on that?

CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. BARBER: So the lease that was included 2 in here, it's a land and building lease 3 agreement. And it goes through, and it's an entire draft lease with the rents included. 4 5 Are you saying that that lease is not going 6 to be applicable to the structure that you have 7 set --8 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. It 100 percent is. 9 In fact, we do have a budget narrative. 10 starts on page 112 and it goes almost through 11 page 120. 12 And part of that narrative says the school's budget is based on 100 percent of the projected 13

And part of that narrative says the school's budget is based on 100 percent of the projected student enrollment. In the event that threshold enrollment are not met at the 100 percent capacity, the expenses can be adjusted accordingly based on he number of actual students.

This allows our budget to be flexible and gives the Board the ability to make any adjustments necessary to ensure a balanced budget. Additionally, the ESP fees are variable and can be adjusted to --

CHAIR GAY: Can you slow down a little bit.

MR. CALKINS: I'm sorry.

Additionally, the ESP fees are variable and

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

can be adjusted to provide for --MS. BARBER: Okay. I'm just -- so looking 2 3 at the lease agreement that I have as a separate attachment. 4 5 MR. CALKINS: Correct. 6 MS. BARBER: It is going to be applicable. 7 What about that rent piece that's included in 8 that? 9 MR. CALKINS: It's included. It's included 10 on the student enrollment. Those student 11 enrollment projections, that five-year plan is --12 MS. BARBER: So 003 is paying --MR. CALKINS: 003, standalone. 13 MS. BARBER: -- 002 to --14 15 MR. CALKINS: No. That's 003 is paying for 16 itself. 17 MS. BARBER: That's what the lease agreement 18 says. The lease agreement is --19 MR. CALKINS: And that might have been --20 CHAIR GAY: Wait. Let Ms. Barber finish her 21 questions. 22 MS. BARBER: The lease agreement, the 23 landlord is listed as Navigator Academy of 24 Leadership, and the Operator of Public Charter 25 Schools is the tenant? Am I reading that

```
correctly?
               I'm sorry. TBD is the landowner?
 2
          I was not reading that correctly. TBD is the
 3
          landlord?
 4
 5
               MR. CALKINS: Yeah. We don't have a lease
 6
          agreement yet. That's a sample lease agreement.
 7
               MS. BARBER: So who is the lease
 8
          agreement --
 9
               MR. CALKINS: So the lease agreement --
10
               MS. BARBER: -- going to be with?
11
               MR. CALKINS: -- will be with NAL-003.
12
          was a sample lease agreement.
13
               MS. BARBER: You mean -- I'm sorry -- 002?
14
               MR. GARCIA:
                            002.
15
               MR. CALKINS: Correct. Yes, ma'am.
16
          don't have a lease agreement with --
               MS. BARBER: So 002 will be the landlord,
17
          003 will be the tenant, and therefore 003 will be
18
19
          paying rent to 002?
20
               MR. CALKINS: 003 will be responsible --
21
          standalone responsibility for their portion of
22
          the bond payments.
                            Is it just me or --
23
               MS. BARBER:
24
               MS. PAULINE: No.
25
               MS. BARBER:
                            I'm sorry, I just really --
```

One moment, so we can keep the 2 record clear. 3 Go ahead, Osvaldo. So the connection between the 4 MR. GARCIA: 5 two, 002 and 003, is the actual property? 6 MR. STERNBERG: (Nodding head affirmatively.) 7 MR. GARCIA: And, say, if the school 8 9 district had a property that they would lease to 10 me, I'm responsible for paying my debt; however, 11 they would lease it to me for \$1 a year. 12 Right. MS. BARBER: 13 So my question to the School was is the rent 14 that's listed in here applicable, and they said 15 It says, tenant shall pay to landlord as yes. 16 base monthly rent as set forth below. says, for the first year it's going to be \$35,700 17 18 monthly rent. So tenant and landlord being 003 and 002. Tenant will pay landlord \$35,700 month. 19 20 MR. STERNBERG: Exactly. So it's 21 essentially a paper trail of what we were just 22 talking about here of 003, which will be a new 23 entity that does not operate a charter yet. 24 we operate a charter, you know, we have to show

not only the bondholders but the District

25

themselves that we have a lease agreement that we are -- you know, because we have enrollment.

You paid off your FTE. We're paying that FTE to pay the bond debt and the additional indebtedness that comes from the bonds themselves. So if the bonds are issued through 002, then --

MS. BARBER: That's my question. Your bonds, all of this DA Davidson, all of that is through 002?

MR. STERNBERG: I don't think so.

MR. CALKINS: No, it's 003.

MR. STERNBERG: It's going to separate. I'm saying because they own the land. So you can own the land, the actual ground itself and build on top of it and get bond financing just for the building in and of itself. But because the building is obviously on the land that 002 owns, they're getting bond financing for the building, and they're going to lease -- it's a ground lease.

So if they design build or ground lease, however you want to describe the type of lease it is, but then you still have to then pay back to where -- as 002 owns it. So 003 owns the building through a debt that they will acquire, and then

```
002 is leasing the ground under it.
 2
               MS. PAULINE:
                            What was the amount in the
          lease?
 3
               MS. BARBER: $35,700 a month.
 4
 5
               MS. PAULINE: So times 12 is $428,000 a
 6
          year?
 7
               MS. BARBER: Right. Which is the District's
          paper or -- I forget where that was -- their
 8
 9
          response had the breakdown of it where it's not
10
          aligned. They have a chart in there.
11
               MS. PAULINE: I'm even more confused.
12
               MS. BARBER: The $15 million is going to 003
          from DA Davidson?
13
14
               MR. CALKINS: That's correct.
15
               MS. BARBER: To build a building on land
16
          that is owned by 002?
17
               MR. CALKINS: Correct.
              MS. BARBER: 003 is paying 002 for rent?
18
              MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. They're paying
19
20
          their own rent. They would have to pay them for
21
          the land. It's two separate things. There's
22
          land and there's a building.
23
               MS. BARBER: I think I'm confused by your
24
          agreement. It says --
25
               MR. CALKINS: I think it's the sample lease
```

```
agreement, which isn't a real agreement.
 2
               MS. BARBER: Right. But that's what I'm
          asking for clarification on. So what would be
 3
          the real agreement, is what I'm asking for?
 4
 5
               MR. CALKINS: It would be structured
 6
          similarly to how NAL-002 is with our board.
 7
          they're going to own the building. They're going
 8
          to own the facility. So it will have a
 9
          standalone lease agreement with the board.
10
               MS. BARBER: With 002?
11
               MR. CALKINS: With 003. It's its own
12
          entity.
13
               MS. BARBER: Okay.
14
               MR. CALKINS: So 003 is --
15
               MS. BARBER: Oh, as an owner?
16
               MR. CALKINS: They're going to own the
17
          building.
18
               MS. BARBER:
                            Okay.
19
               MR. CALKINS: That's the only thing they own
20
          is the building.
21
               MS. BARBER: And then the monthly rent would
22
          be 35,700?
23
               MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.
24
                            To 003, the building owner; is
               MS. BARBER:
25
          that correct?
```

MR. CALKINS: Correct. 2 MS. BARBER: And that's where it will pass 3 through? That's the mortgage amount, 4 MR. CALKINS: 5 correct. Yes, ma'am. 6 MS. BARBER: I was not hearing you well. 7 Thank you. 8 MR. CALKINS: I'm sorry. 9 CHAIR GAY: And before we move on to next 10 questions, I wanted to permit the School Board to 11 any response to the series that we've been going 12 through, as I recognize you have not gotten the 13 opportunity. 14 MR. BRIDGES: Thank you, ma'am. 15 I just think that we're so far afield from 16 the application that we received and evaluated that I'm not sure I can do a crosswalk. At this 17 18 point, I'm trying to figure out are we here having 19 a conversation today with the School or with the 20 developer? 21 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Thank you. 22 Members, any other --23 I do want to add one thing. MS. AMATO: 24 Yes. Go ahead. CHAIR GAY: 25 So not to muddy the water MS. AMATO:

Detween two and three, but in the Capacity

Interview, so in the Evaluation Instrument on
page 70, one of the questions that was asked at
the January 11th, 2023 Board meeting of 002
states under old business, the 002 middle school
will lease part of the 003 building. Please
indicate where this revenue source is located in
the budget. And it's not identified.

So you can read -- I don't want to verbatim that entire script, but basically the budget, the revenue for 002 renting part of 003 is not identified in the budget. And they're looking to put 125 students and charge a per-pupil basis.

So not to muddy the water on who's paying what, but now we have 002 paying rent to 003 with revenue that's not reflected in their budget.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

MR. STERNBERG: Just to respond briefly. It's not muddying the water. If anything, it creates a more positive revenue back to 003.

Again, we have additional space. We're building a new facility. There's already a current -- at the 002. I'm going to just use the numbers. It's a little easier.

The 002, which is already operating there,

we're building a building. And as we already know, we have, you know, a certificate of occupancy. We're building up to that 650 number in year five.

A sublease with a current tenant that's already on there isn't muddying the waters. And if they are going to charge a per-pupil rate for 120 students of additional space, I don't really see how that's muddying the water.

It's kind of red herring here. It's just going to be additional space that the eighth graders or seventh graders can use. And it's going to actually add to the revenue and strengthening the bottom line of 003.

CHAIR GAY: Members, additional questions?

MS. PAULINE: Yes. Just clarifying on your construction. Is the building being built in phases or what's the timeline on the facility?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. Thank you for that question. Jeremy Calkins.

It will be constructed in phases. We'll do a first floor and then a second floor. It's similar to how we did it the first time around. We built about two-thirds of the building out the first time, and then we had a phase two. We did that in

seven months. We had to do the land development as well.

So the goal here would be to build out the first floor, which would -- I believe the building capacity is around 2,000, so it will more than suffice for projected enrollments for year one.

MS. PAULINE: A follow-up. In Question E, which discusses a contingency approach and plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated.

And it says that this may include budgets for 75 and 50 percent of projected revenues.

But then the response was pretty much that, you know, you would, I guess, meet the situation wherever it is, but no really great details.

So if this was like a true lease facility or lease arrangement, like, okay, you have a little more control but once you start construction it's kind of hard to stop construction. And if for some reason your enrollment doesn't materialize or your budget projections are off, I'm still stuck on this contingency and whether or not you have enough -- I mean, if you had -- I don't understand where the budget development fees are coming from. I don't understand how they're derived. I also

don't see any additional contingency or reserve, justifiable reserve set forth.

So that coupled with just understanding this new financial arrangement -- I think it's great that the school itself will own the facility. You know, kudos to the governing board for even entertaining that.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. PAULINE: But there's still a lot of questions here for me. And I don't have a specific question because I'm just -- I'm at a place where I'm confused still.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. I'll try to address that because I realize it is new. And that's what I said in my opening is that I don't believe anybody is doing what we're doing.

Typically what you see is you have the landlord and the developer who makes that margin. We give that margin back to the school, plain and simple. That's the best way I know how to describe it. Everything is open book.

So all of those big millions of dollars that they take and they put in their pocket as a developer, we don't do that. We give it right back to the school. That's why I can stand in

front of you so confidently that our budget is --2 MS. PAULINE: Who is "we" when you said "we"? 3 MR. CALKINS: We're the developer. 4 5 the developing company. 6 MS. PAULINE: Compass? 7 No, ma'am. I have a separate MR. CALKINS: 8 company as Radius that develops the schools. 9 That's the one we did the first time around. 10 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 11 MR. CALKINS: We're a developer for a fee. 12 MS. PAULINE: Okay. MR. CALKINS: And we do not own the schools. 13 14 The school owns the schools. And the way that we do that is we control the costs. 15 16 Let me give you an example, if I could 17 further explain this. So we built 001 -- we labeled our schools 001, 002 and now 003. We 18 19 built 001. We did all of the predevelopment 20 research for that particular site in Valrico. 21 served as construction manager because I found the 22 site. 23 We took it through all the entitlements, 24 everything. And we had to go with another 25 developer because nobody was willing to take the

risk with us being a new developer with this new concept.

The construction costs were the same basically, around \$11 million for Valrico. It was an old SweetBay Academy. We were around \$12 million for Davenport.

Our lease rates for the life of the loan -- and Valrico is not going to own it -- are \$56 million -- that's a fact -- over the life of the lease. We own it.

That's the reason why we do this. We give the cost savings right back to the school.

There's no middleman taking any money off the top.

The school owns it. They're responsible for the debt service.

And we believe that this is the best delivery method in the industry. We're very confident in it. And we've proven it. I think our historical data proves that.

MS. PAULINE: In consideration for that statement, meaning that the cost savings are passed back to the school, is there a document that reflects that, because the sample lease does not reflect that? Is there any documentation that reflects exactly what you're saying?

MR. CALKINS: Yeah. I believe the lease 2 agreement itself would. The school board's the owner, so that would be the documentation. They 3 own it. It would be in the bond agreement. 4 5 sorry. 6 MS. PAULINE: And does it --7 MR. CALKINS: And I'm not a bonds expert. 8 I'm not a bonds expert so I'm starting to, you 9 know, get in over my skis when it comes to bonds. 10 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 11 MR. CALKINS: We work with our underwriter 12 from DADCO, who has done over 350 charter 13 schools. They love the model that we're doing. MS. PAULINE: Is DADCO the same thing as DA 14 Davidson? 15 16 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 17 CHAIR GAY: Kia, did you have a question? DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Yes. And this is for 18 both the School and the School District. 19 20 It mentioned in the Evaluation Instrument 21 about the rental of space in the high school --22 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: -- from the middle 23 24 school. 25 But where is that? I didn't see that in here at all in the application. You said it came from some minutes, board minutes. Is that what the intent was in the application?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. I don't think so.

And I would have to look back at those minutes.

I don't have them in front of me. But we discuss all kinds of budget cures.

So Mr. Sternberg's point, too, I think that just bodes well in our favor when we talk about, you know, budgetary concerns and how this process benefits the school.

In the event of -- we already know that we have a very healthy K-8 middle school. If we had to take 875 students as our baseline and transfer 125 over to the high school because we're not meeting our enrollment projections, then the middle school could afford to augment that rent and that lease payment.

So I think every way you look at it when you talk about owning the site, the fact that we'll have a few facility, we've covered ourselves. We have the contingency. We've covered ourselves in multiple different ways.

CHAIR GAY: I'm going to give the School

Board an opportunity to respond to the last two

questions.

MR. BRIDGES: Thank you.

Actually, that just gives rise to a couple of questions. I'm starting to get the picture that the developer and the education services provider, the separate corporate entities are the same entity.

And my question is who is going to sign off on this bond? I don't see the school copied on any of these documents, so I'm just trying to get a handle on who are we having this conversation with?

MR. STERNBERG: I'll be glad to answer that. It is the school. It's NAL-003, Incorporated. We have a management company, education service provider that's a separate entity. They're not the same as the developer. There's certain people that are similar, but two separate companies. The bonds are in the name of NAL-003. That's the answer to that question. It's the school who owns NAL-003.

The reason why you don't have multiple board members copied on it is because it would be a violation of Sunshine. But outside of that, you work with the group that's pushing it through and

the board approves it at public board meetings. 2 CHAIR GAY: Thank you. Additional questions, Members? 3 MS. PAULINE: Just a procedural question for 4 5 the District. Your policy, does your policy 6 afford a charter school, an existing charter 7 school that is not high performing the 8 opportunity to amend their charter? So like 9 could they have requested to amend this K-8 to a 10 K-12?11 Yes. Candy Amato. MS. AMATO: 12 Yes, we could have had a meeting, sat down 13 and had a conversation, asked for a plan, have a 14 rough draft to look at, what is it going to look 15 like, what's going to be the rollout, what's going 16 on their timeline. We absolutely would have sat 17 down with the Superintendent, General Counsel, and whoever from Navigator-002 and 003, along with our 18 board and could have had a conversation. 19 20 CHAIR GAY: Osvaldo, did you have a 21 question? 22 MR. GARCIA: Yes. 23 Oh, I'm sorry. You can respond CHAIR GAY: 24 to that. 25 MR. CALKINS: May I respond to that?

CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MR. CALKINS: That's not true. I asked for meetings. I get pushed off. I get on Zoom calls for the purpose of trying to figure out what's going to be best for our school and our community.

And the last time our Vice President of
Academics and Operations was on the call. Our
Senior Director of Finance was on the call. And
Ms. Amato said she's not the one that makes those
decisions. The call lasted less than five
minutes.

So I said, I'm sorry, I'm taken aback by that. I thought that this was the advocate for charter schools. She said verbatim to me, they're not an advocate, that they work for the District. So that's simply disingenuous. I'm sorry.

CHAIR GAY: Osvaldo, you had a question?

MR. GARCIA: Yes. Just in regards to

projections, you have 115 current eighth graders

projecting to go into the new high school. Out

of the 1,000 students or less that you said you

have on your waiting list, how many of those, if

you know numbers, are eighth graders on the

waiting list?

MR. CALKINS: No, sir. I'm sorry, we don't 2 have those numbers. We would have to run them. 3 MR. STERNBERG: We're going to look at that 4 right now. 5 Do we have additional questions CHAIR GAY: 6 from the Members in the meantime? 7 MS. PAULINE: Just anything in the budget? 8 CHAIR GAY: Anything in the budget. 9 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I'm trying to seek 10 clarification with the capital outlay piece. 11 They applied in '21, '22, this last application, 12 003? MS. AMATO: In '19. I'm sorry. 13 The '21 was 14 withdrawn. 15 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Okay. But I was trying 16 to figure the capital outlay piece with the two 17 year, when would the second school become 18 eligible now that the sister school is eligible to receive funds? 19 20 MS. BRAUN: So I think what you're asking is 21 that generally in order to receive capital outlay 22 funds, a charter school has to meet a number of 23 requirements? 24 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Yes. 25 MS. BRAUN: One of those is generally you

have to be in operation for two or more years. 2 But there are some other ways, I believe, to meet 3 that requirement. And one of them is what you 4 were asking about earlier, was is if you are 5 considered an expanded feeder chain of a charter 6 school in the same school district that's currently receiving charter school capital outlay 7 funds. 8 9 But that is not something, as far as I know, 10 that we can determine today. It's based on an 11 application that the new school would have to apply for and determine based on the annual 12 13 survey, you know, whether or not they meet those 14 requirements. I know they are spelled out in our 15 rule, administrative rule on charter school 16 capital outlay. 17 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: And just to clarify. 18 asked the question because I know at the time you stated that the current school did not receive 19 20 capital outlay. But as of '23/24, you do now? 21 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 22 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: Okay. 23 MR. CALKINS: And I do have an answer to

25 If you take what we have on our wait list for

your question, Mr. Garcia. Jeremy Calkins again.

24

eighth graders and our current eighth graders, we 2 have 279 students in total. 3 MR. GARCIA: So that's more than your 4 projected? 5 MR. CALKINS: And we're projected 250. 6 we already have 29 more students in one single 7 grade and we have a whole nother grade as well. 8 MR. GARCIA: Okay. Thank you. 9 MS. PAULINE: I have a question. 10 CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. 11 MS. PAULINE: On page 113, there's a 12 reference to --MS. BARBER: I'm sorry. Which document? 13 MS. PAULINE: The application. I apologize. 14 The potential to -- there's a MOU with DA 15 16 Davidson to fund cash flow shortages in the amount of \$350,000. 17 Is this in addition to the facility financing 18 that's also available to the school and is there 19 20 an actual MOU available or is it the same letter 21 of intent we've been looking at? 22 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. It's the same 23 letter of intent that you see. And those total 24 sources and uses, when I asked them to break it 25 down, I think you saw it there in that email.

MS. BARBER: Is it listed as the working 2 capital in the email? MR. CALKINS: Yes. I believe that's how 3 they have it listed there. That would be in 4 5 addition to what we see through development. MS. PAULINE: So a follow-up. So the debt 6 7 service that we're projecting again is based on 8 debt service for what amount? 9 MR. CALKINS: The \$15 million. 10 MS. PAULINE: Fifteen total? 11 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. Plus the 350. 12 That whole total sources, it's in there, that 1,875, that \$18,750,000 number. So it would be 13 14 the \$15 million plus the \$350,000. 15 MS. PAULINE: And the cost of the building 16 was 12.1? 17 MR. CALKINS: The cost of the building was 18 8.8. 19 MS. PAULINE: 8.8. MR. CALKINS: The cost of the entire 20 21 development was 12.177 roughly on a guaranteed maximum price of 14 million the first time 22 23 around. 24 MS. PAULINE: And since I didn't see a 25 budget narrative, I'm assuming that that includes

FF&E? 2 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. PAULINE: Do you know how much of that is FF&E? 4 5 MR. CALKINS: I believe, if memory serves me 6 correct, around 350,000. 7 MS. PAULINE: A onetime cost? 8 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. At the time of 9 startup. 10 MS. PAULINE: Is there anything else --11 again, since I don't have a budget narrative, is 12 there anything else that should be considered or that we should know that's baked into that 13 14 number? MR. CALKINS: I would just like to keep 15 16 going back that we feel like we have a 17 substantial contingency in place. If you take a look at the historical construction costs -- and 18 the reason why I try to differentiate between 19 20 construction and development, this isn't true 21 development because the preplanning already took 22 place for a building and where we're going to put 23 it on this particular site so I just --24 MS. PAULINE: By "preplanning," you mean the 25 infrastructure?

MR. CALKINS: The infrastructure. Yes,
ma'am.

MS. PAULINE: And the site readiness?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. And that's

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. And that's standard operating procedure. When you take a site plan and you work with your engineers, you have a master plan and future plans in mind when you develop. And so we developed this site in hopes that we would be successful and that we could expand.

And so a lot of those costs were already absorbed the first time in the development of the original site. So all of those costs associated with that, we're not going to have to absorb. So we anticipate that because these numbers were based off of their calculations -- and they wanted to be comfortable.

And if I could add, too, this was during
COVID when costs were going through the roof.
They're coming back a little bit. So we had costs
all over the board.

We feel very comfortable when you consider that we built a similar facility for 8.8 million that \$15 million is going to more than cover what we're trying to do here.

MS. PAULINE: Okay. I think I have maybe one or two more questions.

So I assume, based on your response to

Ms. Scott, that you are assuming the capital

outlay is appropriately included because of the

potential to tap into the funds as a feeder. What

I don't see, again, because I don't have the

budget narrative, is the associated expenditures.

As you know, capital has limited allowable uses. But on the expenditure side, I'm not sure if things are captured, so I don't know if the capital outlay that's being noted as an income is a wash because we have equivalent expenditures or not, or are there more capital-related expenditures that are not covered by the capital outlay income? I don't know if that can be answered.

MR. CALKINS: Yeah. No, ma'am. When you're talking about capital, again that goes to the site. So I believe that the middle school could absorb some of those costs as well since, again, they own the site. So any type of improvement to the site, the middle school owns it.

MS. PAULINE: Okay. And the final question is I still don't have clarification on the actual

debt service because there's a debt service in 2 the budget and there are two different debt services in the narrative. And then there seems 3 to be a combined debt service in the lease. 4 5 Can you clarify for the record what we should 6 be considering as the appropriate debt service in the budget? 7 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry. 8 conferring with counsel. Can you repeat the 9 10 question? 11 So I just needed clarity on MS. PAULINE: 12 the actual debt services expenditures because in 13 the budget, you have debt service starting at 225 14 going out five years all the way up to 780. 15 I believe in the narrative piece of the

I believe in the narrative piece of the budget, there was what was referred to as rent as a different amount. Then in the lease, when we did the calculation, the monthly calculation, that seemed to include more than just the facility.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm just not clear on what the school 003, I think is the school at question, will be responsible for in terms of debt service.

MR. CALKINS: Yeah. To help me understand,
I think you said that you had a question about
what was in the narrative.

Are you talking about the budget narrative? 2 MS. PAULINE: No. MR. CALKINS: What narrative? 3 MS. PAULINE: Yes, it was in the budget 4 5 narrative, a piece of the budget narrative. 6 MR. CALKINS: In the budget narrative in the 7 application? 8 MS. PAULINE: I think in the facility 9 section there was some reference, and I think in 10 the narrative piece of the budget section. 11 MS. BARBER: You're talking about the 12 discrepancies between the debt services? 13 MS. PAULINE: Yeah. 14 MS. BARBER: I mean, on page 65 of what the 15 District submitted, they put a chart together 16 that kind of outlines the discrepancies. 17 know if that would be helpful. 18 MS. PAULINE: That would be helpful. 19 Page 65 of what? MR. STERNBERG: 20 MS. BARBER: Page 65 of the evaluation. 21 MS. PAULINE: Yeah, there it is. Thank you. So there are four different sources of what 22 appears to be debt service. I'm just not clear on 23 24 that. 25 MR. CALKINS: Can you point me to where you

are? 2 MS. PAULINE: Page 103 has a list of sources starting with 270. There's a reference on page 3 4 114, 225,000. In the budget, of course, you have 5 different numbers. Only the first number matches 6 114. And then there's a calculation made in the 7 sample draft that yields different numbers. 8 MR. CALKINS: Correct. The sample draft was 9 the latest numbers that we received from DA 10 Davidson. 11 MS. PAULINE: Okay. But that varies from --12 does that vary from what's in the -- well, it 13 does vary. MR. CALKINS: It does. 14 There's a 15 discrepancy there. Yes, ma'am. I see that. 16 I believe that's because, you know, the interest 17 rates, they change, so that's going to fluctuate. 18 MS. PAULINE: Just so I'm clear, so you're 19 saying what's in the budget right now for year 20 one is \$225,000 for that first year of debt 21 service. 22 But what would be in the lease, what is in 23 the lease, the sample lease will equate to 24 \$428,000. That's a huge difference. 25 MR. CALKINS: No, ma'am. What we have in

the budget is what would be there under 9,200, 2 the debt service, the 225,000. 3 MS. PAULINE: Okay. So what's in the budget is the most accurate number? 4 5 MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am, what's in the 6 budget. And that budget was updated. 7 And the way that we look at our projections, 8 if you -- and, again, I apologize, our Senior 9 Director of Finance, who does most of the heavy 10 lifting on this with my assistance, isn't here. 11 She's the architect behind this budget. But it 12 was updated in April of '23, so those were the 13 last numbers that we got from DA Davidson. 14 was April -- I'm sorry -- April 12th of this year. 15 MS. PAULINE: So you said you got these 16 numbers from DA Davidson. Do we have that 17 document? 18 MR. CALKINS: I do. I would have to find 19 I can find another email. I would have to 20 find it. 21 MS. PAULINE: That's okay. 22 CHAIR GAY: And I wanted to permit the 23 School Board the opportunity to respond to the 24 questions about the debt service discrepancy. 25 MS. AMATO: All right. Candy Amato.

with you now.

So your question with regards to the debt services, we struggled. I'll be honest with you. We asked for clarifying. We asked for the second letter from DA Davidson, you know, to clarify from DA Davidson to address the debt service component.

We did not get exactly what we were -- that was indicated in the Capacity Interview. So we don't have the exact information. It's a guessing game at this point to clear through all of the who said this, where are we, what does it look like, the different names, the different entities, the 002, the 003. So, no, we don't have specifically what you're looking for to even have a tangible response because it's all over the place.

I did want to go back, circle back to when you asked about their enrollment numbers or their current wait list for their lottery for their current eighth graders. In their application on page 98, they do not identify giving an enrollment preference to their current eighth grade students sitting at their campus.

They do identify students with siblings, governing board members, you know, the typical preferences that are permitted. But nowhere does

it state that the current middle school students
will receive a preference or an automatic
enrollment.

When you look at Attachment S, which is their application, there is also no indication on there to indicate that they are a current Navigator student.

MS. PAULINE: Can I ask a procedural question from the District, just so I understand your process.

CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. PAULINE: So an application is submitted. Then there's a Capacity Interview after the initial evaluation. After the Capacity Interview, there appears to be -- is there another work session or is that a meetings or some indication that the School did not appear at some meeting?

MS. AMATO: So how we operate is the application is submitted. We provide the applicant an opportunity to speak ten minutes in front of our Board to share their ten minutes of fame. It's their opportunity to share all the glows and why our District needs their school.

At that time, the Board Members are at

liberty to ask questions. We give a ten-minute time limit, but we know that always exceeds because our Board Members have lots of questions and inquiring information.

So it's up to the Board to ask the questions and for the applicant to participate. We do not make that mandatory. Navigator did participate in that presentation.

At that point, the application is shared with -- well, prior to that, the application is shared with the Charter Review Team. The Review Team has one initial meeting where we start that initial process. We gather comments, concerns, positives from the Review Team. Capacity Interview questions are developed.

The Capacity Interview takes place. It is recorded. And we do provide the transcripts to anybody who asks for them. The recording is provided to the Review Team if they are unable to attend. It is also provided to the Board Members.

And then at that point, there is a follow-up Charter Review meeting where the Review Team makes the recommendation after discussing everything that was shared during the meeting, during the Capacity Interview, and any additional follow-up

research that's been done. 2 MS. PAULINE: And that last follow-up 3 meeting is --MS. AMATO: So that's with the Charter 4 5 Review Team. 6 At that point, we then go to the Board for a 7 work session where all of the evidence is shared 8 with the Board Members, as well as the 9 recommendation from the Charter Review Team. 10 MS. PAULINE: Between that last -- after the 11 Capacity Interview and then --MS. AMATO: With the Charter Review Team. 12 MS. PAULINE: -- the Charter Review Team, 13 between there and the work session with the 14 15 Board, does the applicant have the opportunity to 16 provide additional information? 17 MS. AMATO: If it's needed during the 18 Charter Review Team. For example, we asked for 19 the letter, the May letter from -- during the 20 Capacity Interview. 21 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 22 MS. AMATO: If there's additional 23 information that we are unsure or can help codify 24 the information, we do ask for it, which is why 25 we -- Navigator did provide us with the May 26th

letter from DA Davidson, because it was something 2 that came up during the Capacity Interview that 3 could have actually helped and benefited their 4 budget. 5 So we do ask for that information. 6 that information is shared with the Review Team, because it becomes new information. 7 8 Following the work session, then there is a 9 Board meeting where the Superintendent makes his 10 recommendation to the Board. And then the Board 11 chooses to uphold or not. 12 MS. PAULINE: Okay. 13 MS. AMATO: So at those meetings would be 14 when it would be. And the Board meeting, 15 obviously it's open to public forum. You have 16 three minutes to speak. 17 MS. PAULINE: So at the point that the 18 recommendation is given to the Board from the 19 Superintendent, is the applicant provided notice 20 of what that recommendation of the Superintendent 21 is going to be? 22 They are provided --MS. AMATO: Yes. Yes. 23 before the work session presentation, they are 24 provided a copy via email of the Evaluation

Instrument. Obviously there was no -- so they

have access to what their Charter Review Team's recommendation is, but that's not binding at that point.

And then prior to the Board meeting, again they receive another notification that includes the Superintendent's -- what the Superintendent's recommendation is going to be, as well as the date, the time of the meeting. And they are also live streamed.

MS. PAULINE: So just to be clear, the applicant did not the attend the public Board meeting to which this was on the agenda?

MS. AMATO: Correct, to our knowledge. They may have been in the audience, but no one signed up to speak.

MS. PAULINE: May I ask the School if anyone was in attendance and signed up to speak?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, ma'am. Jeremy Calkins. I'm glad I get the opportunity to address this.

Yes, it's true we didn't show up to the final Board meeting. It became clear we really weren't welcome. When I tried to reach out to Ms. Amato at her office, she told me again that there was nothing that she could provide. I tried to work collaboratively with them.

We already knew what the verdict was going to render, so we just felt to go ahead and let it take its course and we would prefer to appeal to you, an audience that didn't have what we felt like a bias towards charter schools.

So I tried to reach out to her several times

So I tried to reach out to her several times to talk about the needs of our community, to talk about the good things that we were doing.

In fact, we just had our charter renewal, and we had a peer reviewer say that it was the best charter renewal she's ever seen in her 30 years of doing it in over 50 schools.

I would love to talk to this District about that, but they are very closed off to us, quite frankly. And so we realized that we weren't going to get the votes and we decided that we would take this route.

MS. PAULINE: So just to be clear, there was no action taken on behalf of the School to sign up to speak directly to the Board prior to them making a final decision?

MR. CALKINS: That's correct. Yes, ma'am.

Because we knew that the recommendation was going to be a denial.

CHAIR GAY: Osvaldo, did you have a

question? 2 MR. GARCIA: Yes. To the School. 3 So how many opportunities were you actually 4 given to defend your charter application? 5 MR. CALKINS: Zero. You know, when she 6 talks about the letter, there's not an email, 7 there's not a phone call. There's nothing coming 8 There was nothing. back to me. 9 So when they asked that they needed to 10 understand, you know, how this mechanism works, 11 they didn't ask any questions. She can't produce 12 one email that she sent back to me about the 13 development fees. 14 You know, I wanted to talk to them. 15 proud of what we're doing, you know. 16 we're doing the best job in terms of this industry 17 because we're cutting out the developer. 18 And I'm proud of the fact that we are 19 developing our own schools. That's how we're 20 saving the schools this type of money. That's why 21 our fund balances are so robust. I'm very proud 22 of what we're doing. CHAIR GAY: Did the School Board want to 2.3

respond to Mr. Garcia's question?

Candy Amato.

MS. AMATO:

24

So the School has the opportunity at the 2 Capacity Interview, as well as our Board Members 3 are public figures. Their emails and their phone 4 numbers are public record. There was plenty 5 opportunity that they could have taken their own 6 initiative to reach out to the Board Members to 7 have those conversations, those one-on-one 8 conversations. He could have very easily bypassed 9 my office if he felt he was getting blocked. 10 Mr. Calkins has my personal cell phone 11 So there has been ample conversations number. 12 with Mr. Calkins, not only just through my office 13 but on my personal cell phone. So I take great 14 offense that he finds that I am unreachable and 15 unapproachable. 16 We have a wonderful working relationship with 17 our charter schools, including theirs, when we 18 went for their five-year review. And knowing that 19 we were coming here for an appeal, I still took 20 the time to speak to Mr. Calkins. 21 CHAIR GAY: Okay. Thank you. 22 Any other questions, Members? DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: 2.3 I do. I'm sorry. the School Board. 24

You mentioned that at the time of the

application workshop, the Capacity Interview, 2 that, you know, you didn't have that letter and it 3 may have helped. Once you received it, was that information 4 considered in the decision? 5 6 MR. BRIDGES: Yes, ma'am. The letter just 7 simply did not include the information that it 8 was represented it would contain. 9 CHAIR GAY: Any other questions, Members? 10 I'm sorry. Did the School need to respond? 11 MR. CALKINS: No. 12 CHAIR GAY: Any other questions, Members? 13 (No response.) 14 CHAIR GAY: All right. If that's the case, 15 then I think we're ready for a motion. 16 MS. PAULINE: Okay. I'm going to make a 17 Do you want discussion first or do you want the motion first? 18 CHAIR GAY: I had planned to seek the motion 19 20 first, but if the Members would like to discuss 21 first, that's fine. 22 MS. BRAUN: I think it might be helpful for a discussion. 23 24 CHAIR GAY: Let's open it for a discussion 25 so that we can be more productive that way.

in the evaluation of this section for me where I am having a little bit of heartburn is on a realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school and a sound plan to adjust the budget should revenues not materialize as planned.

MS. PAULINE:

So the two most valid points

And I want to also say for the record there's been a lot of conversation about resting on the financial viability or positioning of the K-8.

But that was not really relayed in the proposal as kind of a condition.

It seemed to me like it was presented -- I go back to the original conversation -- as a standalone charter school. And that was the way it was evaluated appropriately.

There's been a lot of conversation today that some of them do validate maybe the stance taken by the School, but it's not really demonstrated or justified through the process. There seemed to have been a few easy fixes, should this have been thought through.

The budget narrative, for example, is what an evaluator would really hone in on to truly

understand, again, the projected sources and revenues. Other than the FEFEP, it's hard for me as one Member of this Commission to really point to the fact that -- or to feel comfortable that the plan is sound, which is why I kind of leaned into whether or not there was consideration that this should have been a K-12 instead of a high school proposal. I'm just really struggling.

Every time there's a response, there seems to be more questions for me because I don't have that documentation to support what seems to be maybe logical, sound responses, but in a vacuum leave still a lot of concern.

CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

MS. BARBER: I know some of the things that you said that you were looking for in the budget narrative. I think you discussed like the ESE, ELL, the substitutes.

Is there something like in addition to those?

MS. PAULINE: Yeah. To follow up, so even
to use as a basic example, I mean, looking at the
salaries, that's a basic line item, a very easy
line item to explain for understanding what makes
up salaries, the rate of the employees, the
number of employees. We heard ten, I think,

teachers. What else is made up there? What is the range? How do we ensure TSIA, all of the rules around TSIA. There seems to be a lot to guess or estimate.

MS. BARBER: So you're not necessarily questioning any of the numbers that they put specifically, you're just saying I'm just taking your word for it? I'm just trying to understand.

MS. PAULINE: It's actually both because I have to question numbers unless I can go back and tie the assumptions made to what the numbers report, in some cases, not all cases.

And then there's a conversation between the School and the District about, you know, an interpretation was made, this was backed out because.

But that to me is a whole reason why you have a budget narrative, so that there is no interpretation to be made. There is sound judgment that can be based on -- I won't say facts because it's all projections. But if I tell you I'm going to pay all of my teachers \$100,000, then you'll see why my salary line is so high. Absent that information, it's very hard to evaluate how realistic or accurate the numbers are.

And the key one for me, I'm kind of
understanding the debt service, kind of, but,
again, not understanding everything else and some
of the shortfalls and having information that I
can point to around this whole facility's
arrangement. It just causes some concern whether

or not the project advance for development is enough to capture any shortfalls that may exist.

And then there are the other questions that came up as a part of the plan, like the transportation issue, the maintenance, the ESO.

There's just -- and in a charter school, I think we all know, we've all been in this business for a while, you never know what you're going to get.

And you can plan as much as possible, but all it takes is for one thing to go wrong.

That's why a contingency reserve is so important, but also understanding, you know, what would hit that line would be helpful. And just using a contingency based on the project costs and the delta of \$3 million and not understanding if there are any other costs not anticipated that might get that \$3 million, I don't know what -- I can't say right now if that's enough when it speaks to financial viability. There's just a lot

of concern. CHAIR GAY: Additional discussion? 2 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: I agree with you. 3 4 a little confusing. But then I have to say if 5 this was the same way it was done prior, what 6 makes it different this time, so I don't know. 7 MR. GARCIA: I think this new projected 8 school has more advantages than the initial 9 school. The initial school already has the 10 property and the space for them to develop. A 11 lot of expenses that the K-8 incurred, the high 12 school does not have to incur. I struggle with the procedures that the 13 14 District has in regards to allowing the school to 15 ask the questions that we've asked and to be given 16 clarification on the things that we've been given 17 some clarifications. I struggle with that. 18 that's something that, you know, affects my decision. 19 20 MS. PAULINE: Can I just follow up to your 21 point? 22 CHAIR GAY: Yes. MS. PAULINE: I'm still not -- it seems like 23 24 these questions were not borne at the Board

meeting, right, so these questions kind of came

about? 2 MR. GARCIA: Yes. MS. PAULINE: A need for clarification came 3 about at --4 5 MR. GARCIA: Well, the Board typically does 6 not engage in those questions. The Board is 7 making a decision based on the recommendation that their team put together. 8 9 So 90 percent of the time, the Board has 10 little information or questions on the process on 11 how they were scrutinized. They have a committee 12 that does that. 13 I think we've done that job, I believe, in a 14 higher degree that their own committee did in just 15 one day. 16 I mean, personally looking at MS. BARBER: 17 everything that the School District submitted to 18 us, I feel like they did a really thorough job. 19 Our job here is different from their job. 20 You know, according to my experience, when 21 you're sitting in the school district, you're not 22 taking any substantive -- I always say that word 23 wrong -- substantive changes and accepting 24 additional information. Whereas, here, we can

accept additional information and give them

additional opportunity.

Am I correct in that way of looking at it?

CHAIR GAY: Yes.

MS. BARBER: And I feel like the School
District did a phenomenal job of documenting and recording and providing the information, asking the questions, recording the responses, the notes, the charts, putting the information together.

You know, I think the District did give them an opportunity to make responses. I think our role here is just different and encompasses a little bit more, giving us those opportunities to dig a little deeper and accept more from the School.

You know, I think this is just a challenging budget to look at and to take in everything that we've been given today to make a determination.

For me what's sitting kind of hard is just putting the pieces together and seeing what seems to be concrete and what seems to be speculative and trying to differentiate between those so that my decision is based on what's going to take place and not just what the School hopes for, if that makes sense.

MS. PAULINE: That makes perfect sense. If I could just add one more thing and then I'm finished.

So I agree with you wholeheartedly. And I think the position I find myself in, I want to go on the record, again, applauding the School for the type of financial deal that I think -- the facility financing deal that I think I understand, because at the end of the day, it seems like the School itself will be the asset holder, right. So I get that.

I think to kind of piggyback on what

Ms. Barber is saying, a lot of it is speculative.

A lot of explanation that was provided here today could have, in my opinion, been -- since this is the third time -- provided prior to, or there could have been a better demonstration today.

And I know the finance person could not be here, who's the architect behind the deal, but the questions still remain, you know, because of his or her absence.

And then one would think in the absence of the person that could explain it, you have some kind of documentation to really demonstrate or to bring it home. And that's where I'm stuck.

I want to believe you. I really do. sounds like a great program. But there's still a 2 3 lot of unanswered questions. And I'm glad this is a Committee decision and not a sole decision. 4 5 That budget narrative would have been very 6 helpful for me. And it is a requirement of the 7 application. And what was provided was very, very 8 high level, and not detailed, and in some 9 places -- some areas not complete. 10 So that's where I'm -- you're right, it's a 11 different body and a different review. But even 12 in that context, I don't have what I need 13 personally to really answer some of the questions 14 as to leases. 15 CHAIR GAY: Osvaldo, did you have anything 16 else? 17 I'll just go back to my MR. GARCIA: No. 18 initial statement this morning. If this was an 19 applicant who's never opened a charter school, I 20 would have certain doubts. But they have a 21 proven record with a school that is financially 22 solid based on what has been provided to us. 23 CHAIR GAY: Thank you.

Kia, did you have anything to add?

I asked a question

DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT:

24

earlier on as far as like the budget. You know, there is no new applicant meeting or new application meeting, but I just have to wonder since this is the third time that this has gone through or, you know, approached, were these the same type of issues from the first app to the withdrawn app to now? Had they been mentioned? Are they the same? And if so, I would think at the third submission, that it wouldn't be so much of a haul to try to understand the budget.

MS. BARBER: I mean, I feel like we've had to dig deep to get answers. The first line in this email, with the numbers included in it, helped me see about how DA Davidson is on the same page as what we're being told here. Again, the prior relationship from the current school with DA Davidson seems in support.

And then I understand that there's some questions about different sections in the budget, about revenue that's listed that probably should be removed from the budget, at least for the time being.

And at the same time, I keep coming back to if they're getting this bond and if they have these extra funds, which it seems like what DA

Davidson is basically saying. I don't think they 2 would have given a letter like this if they didn't already have a good relationship or because they 3 4 have a relationship. If it was poor, they 5 wouldn't give a letter like this, plus this email 6 with the numbers. 7 The School seems to know what they're talking 8 They can address different parts of the 9 budget even though their main budget person isn't 10 here. 11 I don't think there's knowledge gaps of what 12 needs to be done necessarily. And it looks as 13 though there's going to be finances to support 14 anything that might be missing in the budget. 15 I don't know what your thoughts are. 16 CHAIR GAY: All right. Are we prepared to 17 make a motion? 18 MS. BARBER: I mean, I guess I will. 19 CHAIR GAY: Go ahead. 20 MS. BARBER: Let me find where it is here. 21 I move that the Commission find that there is not 22 competent substantial evidence to conclude that 23 the applicant's budget does not meet the 24 requirements of SS 1002.33(6)(a)5 and

1002.33(6)(b)2, Florida Statutes, and the

```
standards set forth in the Evaluation Instrument
          adopted in Rule 6A-6.0786, FAC, Section 20.
 2
               CHAIR GAY: Do I have a second?
 3
               MR. GARCIA: Second.
 4
 5
               CHAIR GAY: All right. I have a motion and
 6
          a second.
 7
               Karen, will you please call roll for the
 8
          vote.
 9
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Ashley Barber.
10
               MS. BARBER: Yes.
11
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Osvaldo Garcia.
12
               MR. GARCIA: Yes.
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Tiffanie Pauline.
13
               MS. PAULINE: No.
14
               MS. HINES-HENRY: Kia Scott.
15
16
               DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: No.
17
               CHAIR GAY: And I will be voting yes.
18
          the motion passes.
19
               And we now need to move to the final motion
20
          based on all that we have heard and decided today.
21
               So can I get that final motion from somebody,
22
          please.
               MR. GARCIA: I move that the Commission
23
          recommend that the State Board grant the appeal.
24
25
               CHAIR GAY: Do I have a second?
```

MS. BARBER: Second. 2 CHAIR GAY: I have a motion and a second. 3 Karen, please call the roll one final time. MS. HINES-HENRY: Osvaldo Garcia. 4 5 MR. GARCIA: Yes. 6 MS. HINES-HENRY: Ashley Barber. 7 MS. BARBER: Yes. 8 MS. HINES-HENRY: Tiffanie Pauline. 9 MS. PAULINE: No. 10 MS. HINES-HENRY: Kia Scott. 11 DR. SWEENEY-SCOTT: No. 12 CHAIR GAY: And I will be voting yes. 13 So the Charter School Appeal Commission's 14 recommendation will go to State Board at its next 15 scheduled meeting, which I believe is 16 January 17th, 2024 in Tallahassee. I don't think 17 we have a time and place established yet, so the 18 Department will be in contact with the parties about that exact time. 19 20 Thank you all again, Members. Thank you so 21 much. And the parties, thank you. I know that 22 was a long haul and tedious, but I appreciate 23 everyone's efforts in doing this. We will be working with staff to draft that 24 25 written recommendation to the Board, and we'll

```
have a follow-up telephone conference, as I
 2
          mentioned earlier, in order for this body to vote
 3
          on that.
               So is there anything else I forgot, Jamie?
 4
 5
               MS. BRAUN: I think that's it.
               CHAIR GAY: Anything else, Members?
 6
 7
               (No response.)
               MR. CALKINS: Thank you very much.
 8
 9
               CHAIR GAY: Thank you. It's adjourned.
10
               (Whereupon, proceedings were concluded at
11
          2:29 p.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )
3	
4	I, MICHELLE SUBIA, Registered Professional
5	Reporter, certify that the foregoing proceedings were
6	taken before me at the time and place therein
7	designated; that my shorthand notes were thereafter
8	translated under my supervision; and the foregoing
9	pages, numbered 1 through 203, are a true and correct
10	record of the aforesaid proceedings.
11	I further certify that I am not a relative,
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
13	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
14	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am
15	I financially interested in the action.
16	DATED this 18th day of December, 2023.
17	
18	
19	Michelle Sulie
20	MICHELLE SUBIA, CCR, RPR
21	NOTARY PUBLIC COMMISSION #HH252438
22	EXPIRES JUNE 7, 2026
23	
24	
25	