

**Greenpoint Environmental Benefits Project
CAP Meeting 1 Summary
December 1, 2011**

01-18-12

Note: These notes provide a summary of the discussions at the first meeting of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) on December 1, 2011. They represent an initial round of discussions with the CAP seeking members' input on the Greenpoint Environmental Benefits Project process and, as such, reflect a "work in progress."

Introduction

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

- Objectives of community consultation and decision-making process
 - Assist in identifying community preferences for categories of environmental projects to receive EBP funds
 - Assist in identifying community preferences relative to allocation of EBP funds among project categories
 - Assist in identifying community preferences for criteria for selecting non-profit fiscal administrators to administer the EBP funds

- Review of graphic showing Phase 1/Phase 2 of EBP Process
 - Suggestion to add timeframe to diagram
 - Suggestion that Phase 2 may need more detail

- Description of role of ESE
 - Organize and work with community advisory group
 - Develop materials and documents required as part of consultation and decision-making process for distribution and placement on website
 - Facilitate community advisory group and community meetings

- Description of role of community advisory group
 - Participate in community advisory group and community meetings
 - Contribute local knowledge to process
 - Conduct review of materials and documents prepared as part of process
 - Assist with outreach to community

- Description of role of State
 - Oversee and facilitate community consultation and decision-making process
 - Review materials prepared by ESE
 - Ensure process is productive and results in a clear description of community preferences

Name of Community Advisory Group

- A concern was raised that the community advisory group working on the Newtown Creek Superfund site was also called the "CAG" and it was confusing to have two groups with the same name

- A decision was made to rename the Greenpoint EBP CAG, the Greenpoint Advisory Group or “GAG.”
- Please note that this decision was revisited after the meeting and concerns were raised about the suitability of the name “GAG.” A recommendation was made to rename the group the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel or “CAP” (and CAP is used from hereon in the meeting summary).

Future Meeting Dates

- During the first CAP call, it was agreed that meetings would be held in the evenings from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm.
- The following dates for future CAP and Community meetings were agreed to:
 - CAP Meeting 2: January 23, 2012
 - Community Meeting 1: February 29, 2012
 - Community Meeting 2: March 21, 2012
 - CAP Meeting 3: April 18, 2012
- One member noted that some community residents find it difficult to get to the Newtown Creek Visitors Center and recommended that alternative locations be considered for the community meetings.

Review of Collaboration Principles

- It was noted by ESE that the principles will be revised to ensure a focus on internal CAP operations as well as State-ESE-CAP interaction (i.e., eliminate references to community meetings).
- The CAP agreed with the language in the first paragraph regarding respectful communication procedures.
- CAP members discussed the internal and external communication protocols and, with a few clarifications, were in general agreement with the principles:
 - Comments on external communication guidelines: need to clarify that, in the interest of transparency, CAP members are welcome to speak to other members of the community or the press if they are comfortable doing so, if not, they should refer the person to Christine Holowacz or ESE. When CAP members speak to the community, they speak on their own behalf, not on behalf of the CAP. To the extent CAP members wear different “hats” in CAP meetings, they should let other CAP members know.
 - It was decided that CAP meetings should be limited to CAP members, ESE and the State and interested members of the community should be directed to the website and encouraged to attend the community meetings. If a specific request is made to attend, the community member may attend a CAP meeting as an observer but no press is allowed.
- Decision Making Procedures:
 - ESE needs to revise the language regarding decision-making related to the EBP process, agreement was that the language should indicate the desire to work towards consensus while considering efficiency of the process, so if a consensus cannot be reached, a simple majority will be sufficient.
 - ESE needs to clarify that these procedures apply to Phase 1 and 2 of the community consultation and decision-making process.
- Conflict Resolution

- It was clarified that there was no conflict of interest for CAP members participating in Phase 1 of the consultation process who may want to submit proposals in Phase 2.

Preliminary Proposal regarding Community Preferences

This topic generated a lot of discussion about the general process outlined in the Consent Decree as well as the specific tasks. These notes do not necessarily reflect the order of discussion but have been organized into general topics for ease of review.

- Preliminary EBP Project Categories

- The CAP agreed to make the following changes to the preliminary list of project categories:
 - Add “Urban Forestry”
 - Add “Air Quality Improvements”
 - Amend “Community Facilities” category by adding “with a significant environmental improvement”
 - Add “Water Access” because it was different than waterfront access
 - Add “Biological Remediation of soil and/or water”
 - Eliminate “Recreation” because it was not necessarily connected with a significant environmental improvement and to the extent it was, it was covered by the category “community facilities with a significant environmental improvement”
- The category “maintenance of open space and/or park space” was suggested but the CAP decided such activities might not lead to a significant environmental improvement and probably included work that other City agencies should be doing.
- Several members thought it was important to select project categories that would allow the construction of a project that would not otherwise be funded by a City, State, or Federal government agency.
- Transportation/transit was proposed and discussed but ultimately not supported because of the desire to select project categories that would not be funded by a City, State or Federal agency. Further, to the extent such projects provided an environmental benefit, they would be covered under Air Quality Improvements.

- Project selection process and criteria for Fiscal Administrators

- Several CAP members questioned how the number of project categories and the funds allocated to each project category could be determined upfront without more information about the projects themselves, especially information on project costs.
- There was some discussion of how the number of project categories might affect the decision-making process, including the concern that splitting categories (e.g., multiple water categories) could dilute votes or support for that overall category.
- ESE reviewed the rationale for the current approach which was designed to support a fair and efficient project selection process:
 - Fiscal administrators need guidance as to the type of projects the community wants;
 - Fiscal administrators need at least preliminary guidance as to the amount of money that should be allocated to each category; and
 - Without guidance, the fiscal administrators could end up with more projects than monies allotted or with unsuitable projects that don’t provide a significant environmental benefit.
- After some discussion about both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the process, one idea was to identify community preferences for project categories that could later be grouped into “themes”, and then to allocate available EBP funds among the themes. However, the details of how such a process would work remain to be determined.

- Several CAP members thought the community meetings should be used to identify a large list of project categories, rather than using the meetings to eliminate project categories.
 - There was a question of how many fiscal administrators should be selected (with some members expressing a preference for one)- it was recognized that the need for fiscal administrator expertise had to be balanced with the number of future project selection processes each administrator would conduct.
 - A question was raised as to whether all fiscal administrators would be directed to go through an RFP process.
 - While it was understood that projects had to be implemented within zip code 11222, a question was asked whether organizations outside that zip code could respond to RFPs and the answer was yes. It was decided that fiscal administrators should be advised to advertise as widely as possible.
 - ESE will prepare recommendations for Phase 2 of the community consultation process that will cover both the overall process and specific directions to fiscal administrators
- Allocation of funds by project category ranking
 - There was a concern that the proposed process would lead to "bad" projects if fiscal administrators were allocated a certain amount of money but the solicitation process did not yield a sufficient number of projects deemed worthy of receiving EBP funding. The thought was that the number and value of projects should determine the amount of money allocated to each fiscal administrator.
 - ESE noted that funds would have to be allocated in order to hire fiscal administrators.
 - The State indicated that, if necessary, monies could be reapportioned among fiscal administrators prior to the final selection of projects for funding; such reapportionment should not be a lengthy process.
 - There was general agreement that the allocation of funds should be based on a ranking process, not a simple voting process.
 - Some preliminary criteria for project categories were discussed, but were not finalized:
 - Community benefit
 - Environmental benefit
- Summary of Discussion
 - A list of project categories should be reorganized into broad "themes."
 - The "themes" could be used as one criterion in selection of fiscal administrators and in the solicitation process.
 - Individual project categories could be ranked to determine a preliminary allocation of funds with the understanding that, if necessary, monies could be reapportioned between fiscal administrators prior to the final selection of projects to be funded.
 - Details of the process remain to be worked out and it was agreed that work could be done via email over the next month.

Outreach Plan

- Contact Lists: If ESE provides a pdf of a document (e.g. meeting minutes, facts sheets), elected officials and organizations (including Riverkeeper and GWAPP) could distribute the pdf to their contact lists.
- CAP members agreed to make phone calls and distribute flyers and post cards to encourage meeting attendance.
- In response to a request to provide support with mailings, Rami Metal will talk to Councilmember Levin.
- There was general agreement that both mail and email are needed in Greenpoint and that in addition to a website, there should be a document repository at a local library.
- CAP indicated that materials would need to be translated into Spanish and Polish.

