



**GREENPOINT
COMMUNITY
ENVIRONMENTAL
FUND**

gcefund@northbrooklyn.org
www.gcefund.org
718.389.9044 ext. 15

Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Meeting Wednesday, May 7, 2014

Note: The following is a summary of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) meeting held on 5/7/2014. The notes represent an ongoing dialogue with the CAP related to the development and implementation of the Greenpoint Community Environmental Fund (GCEF).

Introduction, Purpose, and Meeting Goals: Amanda Bassow, National Fish and Wildlife Federation (NFWF), described the primary goals of the meeting, which included discussion about: 1) the Large and Legacy Grant Process; 2) community outreach and engagement regarding Small Grants; 3) community outreach and engagement regarding Large and Legacy Grants, including the community preferencing process.

Notes, Updates, and Other Business:

- Filip Stabrowski, North Brooklyn Development Corporation (NBDC), introduced two new members of the CAP: Ingrid Bromberg Kennedy, Greenpoint resident and member of the McGolrick Park Neighborhood Alliance; and Mike Schade, Greenpoint resident, co-chair of the Newtown Creek Community Advisory Group, and member of the McGolrick Park Neighborhood Alliance. Mike Schade (participating via conference line) introduced himself and shared his experiences and interests with the CAP.
- Laura Treciokas, NBDC, introduced an updated version of the CAP Internal Protocols document and highlighted the proposed revisions, including attendance guidelines and guidelines for engaging with the media. In order to ensure the effective functioning of the CAP, NBDC proposed that the protocols be revised to indicate that CAP members who miss three consecutive CAP meetings may be asked to withdraw from the CAP. Further, the protocols were proposed to be revised to indicate that, while CAP meetings are not open to the public, members of the public who are interested in attending could submit a request through the General Administrator's Community Liaison and the CAP would vote (by simple majority) on whether to approve such attendance. Laura Treciokas also took the opportunity to emphasize the importance proposed revisions to the protocols designed to address real or perceived conflicts of interest among CAP members. CAP members in attendance were generally supportive of the changes. However, since there were not sufficient members present to constitute the required quorum, it was decided that the proposed changes would require approval via email. The proposed revisions to the protocols were subsequently approved by the required majority of the CAP.
- Laura Treciokas engaged the CAP on the question of how well its current composition reflects the diversity of the Greenpoint community. Several CAP members indicated



that the existing CAP did reflect the diversity of the community, and that the recruitment process to date has been active and thoughtful. Nonetheless, CAP members suggested that increased representation from the Greenpoint school community (school principals, parent-teacher coordinators), organized labor (such as Acme workers or film industry workers), and the business community (such as the Greenpoint Chamber of Commerce, the Greenpoint Lions Club, the Pulaski Association of Professional and Business Men's, and the Marie Sklodowska-Curie Professional Women's Association) may benefit the CAP. A CAP member suggested that a mechanism other than nomination or outreach by existing CAP members be developed to continue to identify and recruit new CAP members. Peter Washburn, NY Office of the Attorney General (OAG), said that the GCEF website, which is being redesigned to enable more interactivity and public participation, could serve as such a mechanism.

Large and Legacy Grant Process Update: Amanda Bassow and Lynn Dwyer, NFWF, discussed the next steps in the Large and Legacy Grant Process.

- Amanda Bassow announced that invitations to submit full proposals for Large and Legacy Grants were issued on 4/30/14. NFWF, NBDC, and the OAG are working with a CAP Subcommittee (consisting of Ryan Kuonen, Ann Carroll, Manuel Zuniga, Tamara Gubernat, Fernando Villafuerte, and Joanna Micek) to finalize the guidance for applicants invited to submit Large and Legacy Grant Full Proposals. NFWF is also in the process of consulting (over the phone) with Large and Legacy Grant applicants who were not invited to submit full proposals.
- Lynn Dwyer announced that approximately 50 percent of applicants for Large and Legacy Grants were invited to submit full proposals, amounting to roughly \$28 million in requested funding. The slate of full proposal invites consists of the following: 4 greenstreets/community greening projects; 3 waterfront restoration projects; 7 greening community facilities projects; 4 open space projects; and 8 environmental stewardship projects. Large and Legacy Grant applicants are informed that, by virtue of submitting a full proposal, they are consenting to having general information about their projects shared with the public. There was discussion about the timing of making information on specific Large and Legacy Grant proposals available to the Greenpoint public. It was agreed that, since there was no certainty about which full proposals ultimately would be submitted, the most appropriate time to share full proposal submissions was after the proposals were received.
- Amanda Bassow noted that, given the fact that the amount of funding requested by applicants invited to submit full proposals exceeds the total amount of available GCEF funding, applicants will be told they should not assume that they will receive funding for their projects. Peter Washburn said that there should also be no expectation that the entire amount of available GCEF funding will be exhausted this year (the GCEF has already committed to a second round of Small Grant funding). He added that the decision on a subsequent round of Large and Legacy Grant funding would have to await the submission and review of full proposals, and that the CAP will continue to be engaged in decision-making on this matter. A CAP member asked whether applicants who were not invited to submit full proposals were given any advice on re-applying. NFWF replied, yes, these applicants were

offered constructive critiques and feedback on their proposals, and, as appropriate, provided suggestions that applicants consider applying for funding from other sources (e.g., the Newtown Creek Environmental Benefits Program). Another CAP member suggested that more technical support be provided to applicants that were not invited to submit full proposals; NFWF responded that only those pre-proposals that did not meet the basic threshold of providing an environmental benefit for the Greenpoint community, or those projects that were not sufficiently well-developed were turned down. Peter Washburn added that, from the State's perspective, technical assistance is most appropriate and effective with projects with identifiable and fixable problems; projects with fundamental problems that would require substantial assistance to remedy, or would require an entirely different approach or otherwise need to be fundamentally altered, were declined.

Community Outreach and Engagement Regarding Small Grants:

- Filip Stabrowski announced that GCEF has scheduled a Small Grant Awardee Celebration and Networking Event for 5/19/14. The purpose of the event is to celebrate the first round of Small Grant funding under the GCEF, and to provide an opportunity for grantees to meet each other, engage with the public and, if possible, create opportunities for collaboration and/or resource sharing. The CAP was encouraged to attend. Lynn Dwyer explained the format of the event, including small “breakout” groups organized by project type and led by GCEF facilitators in order to encourage discussion. She added that NFWF has already conducted a webinar for Small Grant recipients about the contracting process. Courtney Kwiatkowski, NFWF, will be present at the networking event to answer any further questions about the grant contracting process.
- Filip Stabrowski also announced GCEF's participation in the annual Go Green! Greenpoint! Festival in McCarren Park on 6/7/14. GCEF will have a table with information about the program and NFWF and NBDC staff will be available onsite to answer any questions from the public. CAP members and GCEF grant recipients were invited to attend.
- It was announced a web design consultant has been engaged with the aim of enhancing the GCEF website.
- Laura Treciokas announced that the GA intends to create and distribute a quarterly newsletter to update the community on the GCEF. Because the newsletter is expected to have a strong visual component, photographs related to the GCEF or GCEF-sponsored projects are actively sought.
- The GA is also planning another communication tool, a GCEF brochure. This brochure would replace the existing GCEF Fact Sheet.
- Emily Mijatovic, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol's Office, offered to include any GCEF-related information in Assemblyman Lentol's periodic constituent emails.

Community Outreach and Engagement Regarding Large and Legacy Grants:

Laura Truettner, Enviro-Sciences Engineering (ESE), began the conversation about community decision-making within the GCEF program by asking whether the CAP is still in support of including community preferencing as part of the Large and Legacy Grant selection process. CAP members indicated strong support for this option, arguing that

community input is not only important in the selection of projects funded with Greenpoint oil spill settlement monies, but is needed to foster community “ownership” of GCEF projects and their successful outcome. Some CAP members, who pointed to the Participatory Budgeting process, expressed concern about the process by which community preferences would be determined. In particular, concern was expressed about the perceived advantage enjoyed by projects with the resources to mobilize community support, and whether otherwise strong proposals might be rejected solely because of a lack of those resources. Another CAP member acknowledged this risk, but argued that the community would feel disenfranchised if their preferences were not taken into account, and that this element is a critical source of legitimacy for the GCEF.

Laura Truettner provided some clarification of the current thinking on a community preferencing process. The general idea would be to ask the community to express preferences on a subset of Large and Legacy Grant projects (i.e., those receiving high scores by the Independent Review Committee [IRC]). Community members would be able to register multiple votes, but, in order to prevent “ballot-stuffing,” they would need to vote for at least two projects. To promote fairness, all applicants participating in the preferencing process would be provided with the same resources to promote their projects to the community. One CAP member asked whether listing several preferences, as opposed to single votes, might reduce the amount of “ownership” the community feels over the program. Another CAP member asked whether placing the Large and Legacy Grant projects on the same ballot would be unfair, because Legacy Grants might be able to mobilize larger constituencies than Large Grants. Another CAP member asked whether the IRC could distill the quantifiable benefit of each project (in layman’s terms) to allow the public to clearly discern the differences between projects.

Laura Truettner suggested that applicant lobbying could be managed by limiting the amount of time during which project information would be made available to the public. For example, the GCEF could allow applicants two weeks to disseminate information and provide each applicant with standard dissemination materials (posters, fact sheets). It was noted that limiting public availability of project information too much could result in fewer people voting – thus, increasing the power of lobbying. Peter Washburn asked whether the public could be asked about reserving GCEF funding for a subsequent round of Large and Legacy Grants. One CAP member cautioned against this because if the public prefers to reserve funding for a second round, but is dissatisfied with the proposed second round projects, it may want to return to the first round projects that were rejected. Another CAP member argued that community members should be allowed to express preference for a single project if they feel that no other projects were worthy of funding. Laura Truettner suggested that community members could be required to express preferences for a minimum of two projects. Another CAP member added that it would be important to provide project information in Polish, so that Greenpoint’s older (Polish-speaking) residents will be able to participate.

The CAP then turned to the community preferencing eligibility criteria. One CAP member argued that non-resident business owners and property owners should be allowed to participate. Another CAP member suggested that people who work in Greenpoint should

be included as well. Another CAP member disagreed, arguing that business and property owners should be allowed to lobby but not participate directly – that only Greenpoint residents should be allowed to participate in the community preferencing process. There was further discussion among the CAP about how the Greenpoint “community” should be defined. Peter Washburn added that the key question is whether the community feels that it is being included in the decision-making process. Joe Haas, OAG, opined that the most important information provided by the community preferencing process may be which projects do not receive community support. Amanda Bassow asked whether, if eligibility is restricted to Greenpoint residents, it might make sense to mail a ballot to each Greenpoint address. Concerns were raised among the CAP over the costs of this option.

Closing Business – Future CAP Meetings: The dates for the next two CAP meeting were proposed for Thursday, June 19, 2014 and Wednesday, July 23, 2014.

Participants in 5/7/2014 CAP meeting:

Christine Holowacz	Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee (NMC)
Heidi Shea Springer	Greenpoint Gardens
Ronald Vancooten	La Guardia College
Phillip Musegaas	Riverkeeper
Leah Archibald	EWVIDCO
Joanna Micek	Greenpoint resident
Katie Denny	Open Space Alliance Community Committee
Ryan Kuonen	Brooklyn Community Board 1
Michael Heimbinder	Newtown Creek Alliance
Mike Schade*	McGolrick Park Neighborhood Alliance
Zeeshan Ott	State Senator Daniel Squadron’s Office
Emily Mijatovic	Assemblyman Joseph Lentol’s Office
Joe Haas	OAG
Peter Washburn	OAG
Michelle Moore	DEC
Amanda Bassow	General Administrator (GA)/NFWF
Lynn Dwyer	GA/NFWF
Margaret Kostecki	GA/NBDC
Rich Mazur	GA/ NBDC
Laura Treciokas	GA/NBDC
Filip Stabrowski	GA/NBDC
Laura Truettner	State Outreach Consultant, ESE

*denotes participants attended meeting by telephone conference