

**Greenpoint Community Environmental Fund
Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Meeting Summary
July 25, 2013**

Note: The following is a summary of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) meeting held on 7/25/2013. The notes represent an ongoing dialogue with the CAP related to the development and implementation of the Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects Program aka the Greenpoint Community Environmental Fund (GCEF).

Notes, Updates and Other Business: Laura Treciokas, North Brooklyn Development Corporation (NBDC) distributed the new GCEF fact sheet created to provide information for the Greenpoint community and other interested parties about the grant program. The fact sheet describes the purpose and administration of the GCEF, community participation in development and implementation, actions to be taken under the GCEF, types of grants, informational contacts, and important dates. Several key dates in GCEF roll-out were announced to the CAP including: 1) a September 25, 2013 community meeting to introduce the GCEF grantmaking process to the community and potential applicants and explain how to participate in it and to solicit community feedback about it; and 2) the release of the GCEF pre-proposal request for proposals (RFP) the week of October 14, 2013. Courtney Kwiatkowski, National Fish and Wildlife (NFWF) provided an update about the website development which is slated for completion in September/October.

CAP Meeting Goals: David O'Neill, NFWF, introduced the goals of the meeting: 1) preview and receive feedback about the content of the draft PowerPoint prepared by the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP); and 2) review proposed draft version of the RFP and application.

Preview of the Center for Watershed Protection Presentation. The CWP was engaged to research best practice examples representative of the preliminary list of project ideas developed by the Greenpoint community. This information was translated into a PowerPoint for use at community meetings and workshops. The draft PowerPoint presentation provides examples of project types including: waterfront revitalization, schoolyard retrofits, community gardens, urban tree canopy and forestry, green streets, trash and waste management, and restoring natural area remnants and vacant lots etc. The presentation described for each project type: specific environmental benefit, general cost, level of effort needed to design and deliver, and whether there was an opportunity for the community to be involved in the project.

Cap Discussion and Feedback: The CAP liked the concept of providing example of projects at the community meeting. However, a number of concerns were expressed about the current project examples in the PowerPoint. They recommended the addition of: 1) more information about cost, design, types of organizations that do projects, and the elements of construction and maintenance; 2) more Greenpoint and New York City examples; and 3) energy practices, innovative practices, living shorelines, park improvement projects and very large-scale projects. They also requested more before and after photos in the presentation to generate excitement in the community about the potential of practices and projects to improve Greenpoint. The CAP asked if CWP technical assistance might be available to provide advice to industrial and other businesses to help them develop environmental benefit projects at their operations? The CWP is not currently on a retainer to supply this type of assistance but it was something that could be explored as part of the technical assistance activities of the GCEF. The CAP asked if CWP was conducting on the ground surveys in Greenpoint to better understand the neighborhood? NFWF indicated the idea was suggested when the CWP was engaged, but it is not currently in their scope of work. Kate Zidar asked to be the point person should such a survey be conducted and also pointed out that there were already a number of project-related inventories for Greenpoint that should be used to provide ideas/precedents (the BOA Plan, Parks Green Inventory, urban agriculture inventory, and DEP's green infrastructure fund).

Grant-making Process: David O'Neill reviewed the major elements of the draft RFP and the applications. The major elements:
1) **Overall goals of the GCEF.** The goals are to: secure significant environmental improvements in Greenpoint, support projects that address the community's environmental priorities, and engage in a transparent and objective process in partnership with the Greenpoint community to ensure it has a direct, continuing role in guiding the GCEF's development and implementation.
2) **Grant categories, match and solicitation process.** Grants will be available in three categories: a) small grants ranging from \$5,000 to \$25,000 will be available for smaller-scale projects; b) large grants ranging from >\$25,000 to \$2,000,000 will be available for projects that have more significant scale and scope; and c) large legacy grants >\$2,000,000 will be available for projects that have an exceptionally high environmental benefit. Small grant applicants will be encouraged to provide a matching contribution of cash or in-

kind support; large grant applicants will be encouraged to provide a 1:1 match; and large legacy grant applicants will be encouraged to provide a 2:1 match. Applicants for small grants will submit a full proposal. Applicants for large and large legacy grants will have proposals processed in two stages, a pre-proposal and a full proposal.

3) Highlights of grant guidelines. For the purposes of the GCEF, Greenpoint is defined as the area of Brooklyn, NY encompassed by 11222 zip code and the entirety of McCarren Park. The primary benefit of projects must be an environmental benefit which would result in improvement, restoration, protection, or reduction of risk to public health or the environment. Projects must address environmental areas of concern in the community, including but not limited to: water quality, groundwater, open space, reduction of toxic pollution, and air quality. Eligible applicants include non-profit 501(c) organizations, state, tribal, and local governments, and academic and educational institutions. Individuals and for-profit business are not eligible to apply.

4) Examples of community environmental improvement priorities. The GCEF RFP has integrated six project "themes" derived from a community outreach process which engaged large numbers of Greenpoint residents. These community environmental improvement themes are: Green Streets and Other Community Greening, Waterfront Restoration and Infrastructure, Greening Community Buildings, Facilities and Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space, and Environmental Education and Stewardship.

5) How to apply. Proposals must be submitted electronically through NFWF's online application system, Easygrants.

6) Grant screening, review and award process. During the pre-proposal round the GCEF General Administrator (GA) will screen all proposals submitted to ensure they meet minimum standards, i.e., they are complete, meet the GCEF Guidelines, and are feasible in terms of methods, budget, and timeline. Full proposals for large grants and large legacy grants will be reviewed by an Independent Review Committee (IRC) comprised of neutral, subject-matter experts with no relationship to any of the proposals being evaluated for funding under the GCEF. Final decisions on the projects to be funded will be made by the State.

7) Assistance available to applicants: Workshops, webinars and one-to-one assistance will be available to applicants throughout the grant-making process.

8) Content of applications: Applicants will be asked to describe in the application: project purpose, objectives, need, environmental benefit, work plan, nature of community engagement, partners, communications and qualifications, funding requested, match, and project time period.

CAP Discussion and Feedback: There was some discussion about the need for a match, particularly on small projects. The GA explained that a match has a lot of value since it is an indication of the level of commitment and sustainability of the proposed project or program. A match will not be required, but highly encouraged and a higher ranking will be assigned to those projects that provide match. The CAP asked for clarification of a proposed grant guideline that allowed a project to be located outside Greenpoint, but still considered for funding if it had a primary environmental benefit to Greenpoint? NFWF suggested it could be a proposal that addresses a source of air pollution outside of Greenpoint but that affects Greenpoint residents. Discussion about this issue resulted in strong CAP consensus that this particular grant guideline be removed from the RFP. There was some thought that such a guideline might be appropriate in the second round of grant making and so could be revisited then. One CAP member asked whether a 1 to 3 year project timeline worked against large projects, the response was that there was a need to balance desire for large projects with getting money out the door and into projects. A CAP member asked for clarification on whether the construction of new buildings would be considered an eligible project and the conversation turned to whether it would be helpful to produce a list of ineligible projects? The GA explained at this time it is impossible to say whether a specific proposal would be eligible or ineligible because that decision is based upon review process and screening factors described in the RFP. But the RFP will describe ineligible project types to receive funding from the GCEF. The GA agreed to create a checklist for prospective applications with ineligibility criteria. However, the GA pointed out that a proposal for construction of a new building would have to meet a very high bar to be considered eligible for funding. The building would have to provide multiple environmental benefits, funds could be provided for specific environmental enhancements associated with the building such as solar panels etc., the applicant would have to have site control, and provide a high match. There was also CAP discussion about whether environmental results should be weighted more heavily in the evaluation criteria as compared to the work plan or budget evaluation factors? NFWF agreed to reconsider the percentage distributions for criteria in the next draft of the RFP and to report on their thinking about the appropriate percentages and how they would be measured.

Conclusion: There was general CAP agreement that the CWP presentation should be improved as described to make it a stronger tool for the September community meeting. There was general CAP support for the proposed draft RFP.

Issues to be addressed in subsequent CAP meetings include: 1) the RFP and application – how will the GA review the documents with the CAP? 2) how will the grantmaking process deal with projects from the City e.g. projects in 2005 rezoning; and providing seed money for other City projects? 3) how to insure that projects do not have significant roadblocks to implementation i.e., superfund

remediation, administrative feasibility and other planned activities occurring at location? and 4) NFWF's thoughts on the percentage distributions for the evaluation criteria.

The next in person CAP meeting date is September 11, 2013, 6pm to 8pm. A CAP meeting in August will be needed to address outstanding issues from this meeting. This will be scheduled via a doodle poll.

Participants in 7/25/2013 meeting

Christine Holowacz	Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee (NMC)
Kate Zidar	Newtown Creek Alliance (NCA)
Kurt Cavanaugh	Open Space Alliance for North Brooklyn (OSA)
Laura Hofmann	Barge Park Pals
Leah Archibald	EWVIDCO
Michael Heimbinder	Newtown Creek Alliance
Manuel Zuniga	47 Java Garden Collective
Phillip Musegaas	Riverkeeper
Ryan Kuonen	Brooklyn Community Board 1
Lisa Bloodgood	City Council member Stephen Levin's office
Emily Mijatovic	NY State Assembly member Joe Lentol's office
Jack Cunningham	NY State Senate member Dan Squadron's office
Michelle Moore	NY State Department of Environmental Conservation
Peter Washburn	NY State Office of the Attorney General (OAG)
Joe Haas	NYSOAG
David O'Neill	General Administrator (GA)/National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)
Lynn Dwyer	GA/NFWF
Courtney Kwiatowski	GA/NFWF
Tim DiCintio	GA/NFWF
Rich Mazur	GA/North Brooklyn Development Corporation (NBDC)
Laura Treciokas	GA/NBDC
Laura Truettner	State Outreach Consultant, Enviro-Sciences Engineering/ARC Engineering & Construction, P.C.
Filip Stabrowski	GA/NBDC