

# **Greenpoint Environmental Benefits Project**

## **CAP Meeting 2 Summary**

### **January 23, 2012**

***Note: These notes provide a summary of the discussions at the second meeting of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) on January 23, 2012. They represent another round of discussions with the CAP seeking members' input on the Greenpoint Environmental Benefits Project process and, as such, reflect a continuing "work in progress."***

#### **Introduction**

- Meeting participants introduced themselves (see attached sign-in sheet for meeting participants).

#### **Review of Draft documents**

- CAP approved the draft Meeting Summary of CAP Meeting 1 held on Dec 1, 2011
- CAP approved the draft CAP Internal Protocols
- CAP approved the draft Collaboration Principles

#### **Community Meetings**

- Decision: CAP decided that a 3<sup>rd</sup> CAP meeting was needed to prepare for the Community Meeting and to use the February date proposed for Community Meeting 1
- Decision: Reduce Community Meetings from 2 to 1 for the first phase of the EBP process knowing that there will be additional meetings as the process continues.

#### **Introductory statement – State**

- Intent is to make this EBP process a model of community collaboration and engagement;
- This process will be different from earlier EBPs in the Greenpoint area in that it will bring in the community much earlier in the process.

#### **Presentation of models proposed by State and CAP, and discussion**

- The State presented two proposed models for the overall EBP process for review by the CAP, Model 1 depicted the EBP process as initially presented at CAP Meeting 1;
  - Model 1 differs from the prior EBP because it includes community input for selection of FAs and project categories;
  - Concerns were raised by members of CAP about this model at Meeting 1; some of which included:
    - Concern about upfront allocation of funds; and that re-allocation of funds later in the process would be too unwieldy;
    - It might not lead to the best projects;
    - Three separate project selection processes would place an added burden on the community
- Model 2 presented as new approach to the EBP process modified using input from CAP Meeting 1;
  - One FA;
  - No allocation of funds up front;
  - Use of flexible themes to help select FA selection and focus the project solicitation phase.

***Decision: CAP preferred the Alternative Model (#2) by a show of hands***

## **Discussion of General Fiscal Administrator (GFA) and Specific Fiscal Administrators (SFAs)**

- There will be community input on criteria for each;
- There will be different criteria for GFA and SFAs;
- GFA role is to run the solicitation, manage the evaluation of proposals, and to conduct due diligence;
- CAP expressed desire to have as much of the \$19.5M as possible go to projects, and for as little as possible to go to administrative costs;
- GFA compensation can be structured in different ways: as a percentage of total available funds or as a fixed fee;
- Need ability to replace the GFA if CAP is dissatisfied with their performance;
- Identifying project themes will help select GFA with the needed technical expertise;
- It was also suggested that the GFA role could be limited to the solicitation only; there was a concern about duplication of technical expertise that will necessarily be required for SFAs and the costs associated with two layers of administration. Discussion of whether SFAs will need both technical expertise and financial management capacity; if lacking the latter will need GFA to provide that capacity;
- GFA will be needed to provide general oversight and accountability;
- Suggestion was made that contract with GFA include phases, with renewal of the GFA's contract contingent upon successful completion of the prior phases;
- The State indicated that it will use an MOA to secure GFA services, an instrument with inherent flexibility;
- CAP recommended that there be an RFP for the GFA;
- CAP argued that the GFA's local presence was a minimum requirement; without it, the CAP believed a potential GFA should be viewed as ineligible
- In response to a question about ranking the GFA criteria, the CAP decided that the final criteria should not be ranked but should be considered "basic" or "core" criteria that every GFA would need to meet
- Community will be able to add or subtract from proposed GFA criteria at Community Meeting 1 by a show of hands;

## ***Decision: Agreement on criteria for General Fiscal Administrators, with qualifications (see below)***

### ***CAP's recommended list of basic criteria for General Fiscal Administrators:***

- Expertise in managing large request for proposals and technical review processes
- Local presence/experience (CAP ranked very high)
- Community outreach experience
- Financial management experience
- Cost effective administration (i.e., competitive fees for GFA services) [This criterion was added by the CAP]

CAP recommended eliminating these criteria:

- Demonstrated innovative or creative project experience
- Consistency between organizational mission and project categories
- Expertise in diverse project categories

## **Discussion of CAP's role and State's role in EBP process**

- CAP's role is to prepare straw proposal for presentation to the community at Community Meeting 1;

- CAP should use the straw proposal to stimulate conversation;
- State confirmed that CAP will continue throughout the EBP process;
- Legally, State is final decision-maker on EBP, including choice of GFA and projects to be funded; however, state wants a good process that will allow it to effectively integrate community recommendations.

#### **Discussion of Technical Review committee**

- Concept of technical review committee to grade proposals for technical and financial feasibility was introduced by State;
- Suggestion was made to secure services on pro bono basis, if possible.

#### **EBP Timeline**

- CAP discussed idea of conducting multiple rounds of solicitation;
- Value in allowing immature proposals to improve;
- Technical assistance would be needed to support proposal improvement.

#### **Discussion of eliminating project themes and alternative idea of developing a general vision/mission statement to inform two audiences:**

1. Participants in Community Meeting 1;
  2. Proposers responding to an RFP
- Some CAP members viewed using project themes as overcomplicating the process and/or not adding value;
  - It was noted that project themes would assist with selection of GFA and help to screen/filter the number of proposals that are submitted in response to the RFP;
  - Suggested that if one thinks of a planning process, a vision statement is like a mission statement and the themes are like objectives;
  - The vision statement should consist of general criteria and be consistent with and use terms from Consent Decree;
  - ESE to draft a vision statement and distribute to CAP;
  - Importance of translating key terms, giving examples.

#### **Discussion of Preliminary List of Project Types**

- List of preliminary project types should be used at Community Meeting 1 to generate community input on the list;
- These types should complement the mission and could be used that way in the RFP;
- Suggestion to add “/acquisition” to “creation of new park/open space”
- It was suggested that no proposals should be considered that sought funding for commitments made by the City during the 2005 Re-zoning process;
- Suggestion to re-name ‘green energy’ to ‘clean energy;’
- Suggestion that the example green roofs be moved from ‘Green Energy’ to ‘Stormwater Management’;

***Decision: Agreement to use “Preliminary List of Project Types”, as amended above***

***Decision: Do not ask community to rank themes or project types at Community Meeting 1.***

### **Discussion of opportunities for average resident/community member with project ideas to impact actual proposals submitted**

- Two opportunities were identified:
  1. Indirectly, helping to shape the RFP with input on project types;
  2. Direct impact on actual proposal development.
  
- Suggestion was made that Community Meeting 1 could begin with opportunities for residents to talk about what is good and bad in their environments to help get them engaged (values clarification);
- To develop actual proposals, residents could be matched with local non-profits at a future Community Meeting;
- Perhaps small grants could be given to help develop proposals;
- A Proposers' conference was suggested in which potential proposers could hear from local residents and make connections with them.

### **Discussion of Fact Sheet #1**

- CAP suggested it was important to clarify final decision-making role of the state;
- It was suggested that 'Riverkeeper' be recognized in the Fact Sheet as a lead litigant in settlement with Exxon Mobil.