

Meeting Summary
Greenpoint EBP Program CAP Meeting #4
April 18, 2012
6:00 to 8:00 pm

Note: These notes provide a summary of the open discussions at the fourth meeting of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) on April 18, 2012. During the meeting, a CAP Subcommittee was formed to discuss the Request for Applications for the General Administrator (GA). In accordance with State procurement rules, the discussions of the CAP Subcommittee are not included in this summary since general distribution could create a conflict of interest for potential GA applicants. The summary continues to represent an ongoing dialogue with the CAP related to the development and implementation of the Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects Program and, as such, reflects a continuing “work in progress.”

Discussion of Community Meeting 1

- The feedback from the CAP on Community Meeting 1 was very positive- CAP members noted the large turnout of over 170 people from the community and the upbeat positive tone throughout the meeting.
- It was noted that the large turnout was due in part to the CAP’s work, with CAP members posting meeting notices on websites and making announcements at other community meetings.
- CAP members noted that the volume of ideas and process of writing them on flip charts slowed the meeting down; members suggested the following as possible remedies-
 - Use multiple scribes;
 - Place a time limit on reports from tables; and
 - Have each group write their ideas on flip-chart sheets and then read them aloud.
- CAP members also suggested the following improvements-
 - Note the number of references to the same project idea to capture community priorities;
 - Link the ideas with the names of the proposers;
 - Use a mock exercise to demonstrate how groups at tables should conduct the conversations;
 - Advertise meeting segments to allow parents to attend specific parts of the meeting; and
 - Provide childcare to help parents with children participate in the meeting.
- CAP members suggested that the GA discussion should have occurred before the project charrette due to its importance to the community; many people had left the meeting before the GA discussion occurred.

Review and approval of CAP Meeting 3 Summary

CAP Meeting Summary 3 was approved.

ESE’s Greenpoint EBP Report

- The State noted that we are breaking new ground on state-community collaboration during an Environmental Benefit Projects (EBPs) program; therefore, it will be important to document what works well for future EBPs.

- The CAP reviewed and discussed a preliminary list of recommendations for the report (summarized in Hand-Out #1).
- One CAP member suggested that it was important for CAP members to have experience in community planning and environmental work and that similar criteria for CAP members should be included in the recommendations.
- ESE requested that the CAP send additional comments or suggestions for the report to ESE via e-mail.
- The CAP reviewed a revised schedule for the report that included:
 - A CAP meeting on May 16th to discuss the RFA (Request for Applications);
 - Draft report now due May 30th to CAP to allow ESE time to capture CAP experience at the May 16th meeting;
 - Two-week CAP review of draft report to conclude on June 13th ;
 - ESE to incorporate CAP comments and send draft report to the State on June 20th ; and
 - State to provide comments to ESE and ESE to provide final report on July 10, 2012.

General Administrator RFA/Selection and Contracting

- CAP reviewed General Administrator (GA) responsibilities (Hand-Out #2))
- The State noted that the term 'General Fiscal Administrator' did not capture the full responsibilities of the role so it will now be designated 'General Administrator' (GA)

Review of State procurement guidelines and opportunities for CAP involvement in RFA (Hand-Out #3)

- The State noted that at the last CAP meeting there was a discussion about potential conflicts of interest for CAP members who might want to bid on or be part of a team that bid on the GA position and how those conflicts might preclude some CAP members from helping develop the RFA for the GA;
- At the last CAP meeting, the State committed to reviewing State procurement guidelines to determine impacts on CAP involvement in the GA RFA process;
- The State reported that, upon review, State procurement rules bar any CAP member who is associated with an organization that may apply for the GA position from participating in the RFA development process, since such involvement could be perceived to provide an unfair advantage to their associated organization;
- The State also reported that State procurement guidelines bar CAP members participating in the GA application review and GA selection process;
 - The State emphasized again that this EBP process is breaking new ground for the State; and
 - Since the State is not used to collaborating with communities in procurements, State procurement guidelines are not very flexible on community involvement at this time.
- As a result of the procurement guidelines, the State explained that a subgroup of the CAP (or CAP Subcommittee) would need to be formed to assist the State in developing the RFP (e.g., identifying criteria to be included in the RFP).
- However, the State also noted that that the procurement guidelines would allow for ESE to be a member of the RFA evaluation committee and polled the CAP members as to whether they wanted ESE on the GA evaluation committee.

Decision: CAP unanimously agreed that ESE should, if the terms were acceptable to ESE, participate in the GA evaluation committee.

In response to questions from CAP members regarding conflicts of interest and CAP involvement in the GA RFA development process, the State indicated the following:

- The State emphasized that CAP members should use good judgment and err on the side of caution when considering participating in GA RFA discussions;
- The potential for financial benefit from the GA contract is the principle criterion for determining if a conflict exists;
- For those CAP members representing multiple organizations, if any of these organizations are interested in the GA role, then those CAP members should not participate in the GA RFA development;
- Community Board members may serve on the CAP Subcommittee;
- The State recognized that many CAP members may be associated with project proposals; but this does not disqualify those members from participation in the CAP Subcommittee discussions related to the GA RFA;
- The State clarified that there is no conflict if the funders of CAP member organizations are applying for the GA position;
- The State indicated that membership in Open Space Alliance's Community Committee or "Com Com" did not represent a conflict, but suggested that CAP members that are on OSA's Board recuse themselves from any portions of OSA Board meetings that deal with the GA RFA proposal or response to it;
- The State clarified that if a CAP member is on a Board of Directors of an organization interested in the GA position, even as a volunteer, that would be a conflict;
- The State clarified that employment with a prospective GA applicant is a conflict; and
- The State also opined that State procurement guidelines would allow for representatives of elected offices to participate on the RFA evaluation committee.

Following the discussion period, ESE polled the CAP members regarding participation in the CAP Subcommittee. The following CAP members indicated they would not participate due to potential conflicts of interest:

- Rich Mazur and Paul Pullo – due to a potential GA application from the North Brooklyn Development Corporation
- Stephanie Thayer - due to a potential GA application from OSA
- Laura Hoffman - employee of St. Nick's Alliance
- Leah Archibald - employee of EWVIDCO/St. Nick's Alliance (not in attendance)
- Dewey Thompson - OSA Board member (not in attendance)

The following CAP members will participate in the CAP Subcommittee:

- Phillip Musegaas
- Christine Holowacz
- Ryan Kuonen
- Katie Denny
- Kate Zidar
- Emily Mijatovic
- Rami Metal
- Michael Heimbinder
- Laura Treciokas

Following a determination of membership in the CAP Subcommittee, those CAP members not participating left the meeting. The meeting continued with a discussion about the GA RFA.