

**Greenpoint Environmental Benefits Project Program
CAP Meeting 6 Summary
October 24, 2012**

Note: These notes provide a summary of the discussions at the October 24, 2012 meeting of the Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Subcommittee (the subcommittee is comprised of CAP members who are not in any way involved in an application for the General Administrator). These notes represent another round of discussions with the CAP Subcommittee seeking members' input on the process for the Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects Program (the "Program") and, as such, reflect a continuing "work in progress."

Summary of General Administrator Request for Application Review and Selection Process

- State provided an overview of the General Administrator (GA) Request for Applications (RFA) review and selection process, reporting that the RFA was released on July 6, 2012 and a pre-application meeting was held on July 25, 2012. Eight organizations attended. Three of these organizations submitted applications (two as a team), both of which were considered very strong.
- The State convened an Evaluation Committee consisting of two representatives from the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), two representatives from the NYS Office of the Attorney General (OAG), and one representative of Enviro-Sciences Engineering, the State's community outreach consultant.
- The Evaluation Committee used scoring criteria developed in conjunction with the CAP; prior to scoring the Evaluation Committee held interviews with both applicants lasting approximately two hours each.
- On Oct 11, 2012 the Evaluation Committee submitted final scores to the State's procurement officer and the State is in the process of finalizing the selection.
- The State anticipated announcing the selection at tonight's meeting. However, upon further consideration the State decided it was premature to make an announcement until a contract with the selected GA was in place
- To date, a recommendation for the GA has been made to the management at OAG and DEC.
- The State expressed hope that a contract could be in place (or close to in place) by mid-November and anticipates being able to make an announcement at that time.

In response to questions from the CAP-

- The State noted that it would be challenging to append a detailed Scope of Work (SOW) to the GA contract because the project requires an organic, and evolving process. It would not be beneficial to restrict the activities of the GA at the contract stage.
- The State noted the small number of applications was likely due to the detailed criteria and high quality RFA that was developed in coordination with the CAP. The State had expected two additional applications. Both applications that were submitted contained similar staffing and budget proposals and received high scores from the Evaluation Committee.
- Regarding new ideas emerging from the applications, the State reported that both applicants indicated that more than one round of project proposals would likely be needed.
- Regarding the provision of technical assistance (TA) to prospective project RFP responders, one applicant budgeted for TA consultants to assist in developing project ideas into viable project proposals.

Review of and Recommendations for Modifications to the Program Schedule

- The State reviewed the Program schedule presented to the community at the Community Meeting, noting the need for modifications due to the longer than anticipated GA selection process.
- CAP members expressed concern that delays in the schedule could cause residents to lose trust in the process.
- The State noted that the schedule could not be revised until the GA was under contract because the two GA applicants had different start up schedules.
- The State and CAP discussed several scenarios for a tentative schedule that included different ways to provide information to the community.
- It was suggested that the November community meeting be postponed until January, after the GA was under contract and ready to manage the Program activities.

Recommendation – CAP recommends that the State and CAP hold a press conference to announce the final GA selection and the convening of Community Meeting 2 in January 2013.

Recommendation – CAP recommends that a conference call be organized to inform the CAP of the final selection prior to the press conference.

Agency responses to CAP recommendations-

- The State indicated that it would present CAP recommendations to senior agency management for consideration.
- The State indicated that it had experience with joint community-state press releases.

CAP Discussion re: GA and GA Scope of Work

- The State and CAP discussed the CAP expectations for the CAP-GA working relationship and established CAP recommendations for communication and interaction (see below).
- In response to a question from the CAP about the difference between Community Meetings 2 and 3, the State reviewed the preliminary idea for a ranking process that would be conducted at Community Meeting 3 to identify community preferences for projects. The State emphasized the process was not fully developed and the CAP would help the GA develop the details. In principle, it is expected that the community will recommend that the State fund all or some of the projects/proposals that are given a favorable review by the technical review committee.
- The State queried whether the CAP saw a need to conduct some type of further visioning exercise with the community to help determine community priorities for the Program. It was noted that 'visioning' seemed comparable to the concept of identifying project categories that was presented in the State's initial model and then modified by the CAP. In this discussion, as well as additional discussions about Community Meeting 2 (see below), the CAP did not express support for further community visioning related to the Program.
- CAP members noted the need for some type of coordination of project ideas and project/proposal development in order to avoid disagreements and the duplication of similar projects in different parts of the community.
- CAP members noted the complications that will arise from soliciting different scale projects in one project RFP. It was noted that in a prior EBP program conducted in Greenpoint, different GAs handled large-scale and small-scale projects.
- It was noted that the CAP had several questions about the process going forward that could not be answered until the GA was selected.

- ESE noted that the CAP would be involved in the design of the RFP for project solicitation, the development of criteria for the selection of the technical review committee, the design of agendas for public meetings, and the design of the community process for ranking/identifying preferences for project selection.
- The State noted that both GA candidates have provisions for substantial local presence in the community, that there are plans to upgrade the Program website to make it more user-friendly, and that ESE will be retained to assist the CAP and the community during future phases of the Program.

Recommendation - CAP recommends that the GA be asked to provide ideas about how to address different scale projects (i.e., "small" and "large" projects) in the RFP.

Recommendation – CAP recommends that the GA and CAP have monthly phone updates with an itemized agenda distributed in advance so CAP members could decide about need to participate. CAP also recommended that subcommittees be identified for specific tasks (e.g., RFP, SOW). CAP also recommends that meetings for the CAP as a whole be held at key project milestones.

Discussion Regarding CAP Preparation for Second Community Meeting

- ESE reviewed the purpose of Community Meeting 2 – to connect residents with project ideas to experienced proposers with capacity to prepare substantive proposals; the meeting may also include some type of screening process to eliminate ideas that are inconsistent with State EBP policy and a process to help combine ideas into larger proposals; it is also an opportunity for the community to meet the GA.
- The CAP raised several questions about Community Meeting 2 including the following – Who is the audience for the meeting? What is the outcome sought for the meeting? Would it be better to have the meeting after the release of the project RFP, rather than before, when more details about the selection process would be available?
- A CAP member suggested a questionnaire with project criteria for residents with project ideas. Other members questioned whether or not residents would respond.
- A CAP member suggested the need for facilitated meetings to take the existing list of preliminary project ideas and turn them into substantive project concepts.
- ESE suggested a meeting design in which tables would be set up by project category from the preliminary project list in order to facilitate conversations between proposers and community members. Ideally this process would also facilitate the combining of similar ideas into one and/or larger projects.
- A CAP member suggested the need to review alternative meeting designs such as America Speaks, in which technology is used to network with real time polling to help shape ideas. Another CAP member suggested a model based on the DOT Bike Share meeting where participants rotated among tables.
- ESE suggested that the meeting would also fulfill an important need to provide feedback to the community on the preliminary project ideas and to maintain Program momentum.

Recommendation – CAP recommends that the Program proceed with Community Meeting 2 in January and provide the date/location at the press conference announcing the GA selection.

Recommendation – CAP will form a subcommittee to design Community Meeting 2. The following CAP members volunteered for the Community Meeting 2 design subcommittee – Ryan Kuonen, Kate Zidar, and Laura Hofmann.

Discussion of Follow Up Items

Draft Report

- ESE reported that they had prepared a draft report summarizing the work done with the CAP and the community during the first phase of the project. The first draft was submitted to the State for review, and in response to their comments, ESE prepared a second draft of the report. The State is in the process of reviewing the second draft, which will be distributed to the CAP once the review is complete.

Fact Sheet #5

- ESE also reported that since the last Fact Sheet was distributed in July, it was time to distribute another Fact Sheet to advise the community of the status of the Program. ESE noted that a draft Fact Sheet had been distributed on Tuesday with the agenda and asked if anyone had comments.

Recommendation - CAP recommends that Fact Sheet #5 go out now. Comments will be accepted until Monday, Oct 29th, with distribution of the final to immediately follow.

Proposal for a Documentary Film

- ESE noted that a documentary filmmaker, Jonathon Jackson, was interested in making a documentary about the Program and in particular would like to interview members of the CAP. ESE provided materials to the CAP for review. The State opined that the CAP was an independent entity and could decide for itself whether members should participate in the documentary.

Recommendation – A CAP discussion of the proposal for participating in the documentary was postponed to the next meeting. CAP members were encouraged to review the materials provided.

CAP Membership

- ESE pointed out that with the Program entering a new phase, it was a good time to check in on membership and consider whether new members should be added to the CAP. For example, ESE noted that with Stephanie Thayer's departure from OSA and the CAP, it might be a good idea to invite Kurt Cavanaugh to join the CAP.
- ESE also noted that with the new phase of the Program and the need for continued outreach, there is a need to ensure that the CAP is as representative as possible of the many groups, ideas and perspectives that exist in the Greenpoint community.
- In response to a question from a CAP member about the origin of this question of representativeness, ESE explained that the comprehensiveness of the outreach prior to the first community meeting, specifically to the Latino community. In this instance, broadening CAP representation may help the CAP to broaden community outreach.

- Some members of the CAP recommended that new members be Greenpoint residents, and actively involved in the community or a community group to ensure that they represent a constituency.
- There was also a recognition that the CAP has developed a good working relationship and that any new member will need some time to come up to speed with the Program and the process.

Recommendation- Regarding CAP membership-

- *ESE will invite Kurt Cavanaugh from OSA to join the CAP*
- *Ryan Kuonen will invite Manuel Nuziga*
- *Kate Zidar will explore the possibility of inviting young people to join the CAP*

Greenpoint EBP Program Boundary

- ESE noted that the State had approved the CAP's proposed modification to the definition of "Greenpoint" as used in the Program. The boundary is now defined as "that area bounded by the 11222 zip code and the entirety of McCarren Park." The information (including a map) has also been posted on the website.