

**General Administrator for the  
Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects Program  
Request for Application #12-006**

**Pre-Application Meeting Summary  
July 25, 2012**

**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Marilyn G. Gelber, President, Brooklyn Community Foundation  
Toya Williford, Program Director, Brooklyn Community Foundation

Elizabeth Thompson, Executive Director, Buckminster Fuller Institute  
Sophie Nichols, Outreach + Education, Buckminster Fuller Institute  
Sharifah Taqi, Program Manager, Buckminster Fuller Institute  
Will Elkins, Store Manager, Buckminster Fuller Institute

Lisa Garrison, NYCEF Program Director, Hudson River Foundation

Richard Allman, Consultant for Government and Community Relations, John E. Osborn P.C.

Lynn E. Dwyer, Assistant Director, Eastern Partnership Office, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation  
Timothy DiCintio, Vice President, Impact-Directed Environmental Accounts (IDEA), National Fish and Wildlife Foundation

Kathleen Kosciolk, Business Manager, NYS Pollution Prevention Institute

Richard E. Palumbo, Senior Project Manager, New York State Program, The Trust for Public Land

Richard Mazur, Executive Director, North Brooklyn Development Corporation

**SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Q1: Who is eligible to bid on projects?**

**A1:** *The details of the Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects Program's (Program's) project solicitation -- i.e., Request for Proposal (RFP) -- process have not been finalized at this time. The details ultimately will be determined collaboratively among the Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation [DEC] (collectively, the State), General Administrator (GA) and Greenpoint Community Advisory Panel (CAP). At the moment, the State does not anticipate that there will be restrictions on what entities may submit project proposals.*

**Q2: Will the GA participate with the CAP and the State in the discussions regarding the project selection process?**

**A2:** *Yes. In fact, the GA will be expected to play a leadership role in discussions related to the process of soliciting, developing and evaluating project proposals (aka project selection), and contribute substantively to them.*

**Q3: What is the timeline for disbursing Program funds?**

**A3:** *The RFA specifies a GA contract term of four years, with an option for this term to be extended by the State. The four-year timeline assumes a scenario in which it will take roughly one year to select all of the projects to be funded, and then three years to implement these projects fully. Under this scenario, project funding would occur pursuant to the first (and only) RFP, i.e., in one granting "round." However, the State and CAP have discussed alternative scenarios, under which grant funds would be disbursed pursuant to one or more additional rounds of granting.*

*No decision has been reached at this time regarding the number of granting rounds that ultimately will be used in the Program (and, therefore, the Request for Application [RFA] asks Applicants to include, as a contingency, projections of costs associated with additional rounds of granting in their Proposal Budgets). The number of granting rounds to be used in the Program will be the subject of future discussions among the State, GA and CAP, and the GA is expected to play a leadership role in these discussions and contribute substantively to them.*

**Q4: Is it anticipated that eligibility for grants will include a requirement that grantees reside in Greenpoint?**

**A4:** *It is a requirement of the Program that all funded projects must secure significant environmental improvements in Greenpoint (defined as the 11122 zip code and the entirety of McCarren Park). Whether the Program will limit funding to only those projects to be implemented by entities based in Greenpoint will be the subject of future discussions involving the State, GA and CAP. However, at the moment, the State does not anticipate that a funding recipient would need to be based in Greenpoint. The State believes it is possible, nonetheless, that when the project RFP is developed, it may reflect some level of preference for project implementers with Greenpoint operations.*

**Q5: The RFA specifies a two-month window for development of the project RFP. Is this timeframe realistic or perhaps overly ambitious?**

**A5:** *Thus far in the process, the State and CAP have established an excellent working relationship. With respect to the RFP, there is mutual agreement that the Program's highest priority is to attract high-quality projects that will be both successful in securing significant environmental improvements in Greenpoint and in reflecting the project preferences of the community. Therefore, while the State believes the two-month "window" is entirely appropriate, if there is a demonstrable need to extend this timeline in order to attract such projects, the State believes that there should be support for modifying it.*

**Q6: What is the role of the GA in developing the RFP? Are they a facilitator or a participant?**

**A6:** *The details of the RFP ultimately will be determined collaboratively among the State, GA and CAP. As outlined by the RFA, the GA is expected to play a leadership role in developing and disseminating the RFP. It is expected that a GA with experience in grant administration -- particularly grant program management -- will contribute substantively to the process.*

**Q7: Is there room for the GA to provide creative input into the project selection process or are they more of a facilitator or a grant administrator? Is the GA role focused on the "mechanics" of the process?**

**A7:** *As outlined by the RFA, the GA is expected to play a leadership role in all aspects of the project solicitation, development and evaluation (project selection) process. It is expected that a GA possessing the broad experience, resources and capabilities in program administration -- particularly grant program management -- described by the RFA will contribute substantively to the project selection process, including, ideally, providing creative input.*

*It should be noted that the Program has already changed significantly from its initial design. A graphical depiction of these changes was provided in a presentation made at the March 21, 2012 Greenpoint community meeting (see "Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects -- Presentation, 3/21/12" at the Program's webpage: [www.ag.ny.gov/environmental/greenpoint-environmental-benefit-projects](http://www.ag.ny.gov/environmental/greenpoint-environmental-benefit-projects)). The Program's re-design -- which was developed in partnership with the CAP -- demonstrates the State's commitment to developing and implementing the Program through a flexible, adaptive and collaborative process that actively solicits and incorporates new ideas, insights and creative input.*

**Q8: Please explain what level of assistance is contemplated in bullet 6 on page 5 of the RFA in which the GA is asked to provide assistance to prospective RFP respondents. As written, it appears to place a significant responsibility on the GA to assist groups in proposal development, even groups that may have ideas that are not necessarily eligible.**

**A8:** *As outlined in the RFA, the GA is expected to, "as necessary," provide assistance to prospective RFP respondents in developing proposals. As implied by the "as necessary" clause, the State anticipates considerable subjectivity related to the provision of these services and, therefore, expects the GA to exercise appropriate judgment in its related decision-making. For example, to prevent the disbursement of Program funds to only large entities with greater resources and experience, it may be appropriate for the GA to direct project development assistance toward smaller, less resourced and experienced organizations seeking to develop proposals addressing unique community project priorities. As another example, it may be appropriate for the GA to limit its assistance to proposals that reflect the project preferences of the community. Future discussions between the State, GA and CAP will focus on refining the specific approach(es) the GA will be expected to take in supporting proposal development.*

*It should also be noted that the State anticipates, as mentioned in the RFA, the RFP will include the solicitation of proposals for "small projects" (e.g., those with funding capped at \$50,000). While the specifics of such small project granting has not yet been determined (and will be the subject of future State, GA and CAP discussions), such funding may provide an alternative means of assisting prospective RFP respondents in developing high-quality project proposals, e.g., by serving as development grants.*

**Q9: Is the GA required to have all of the requisite staff in place at the time of award or will the State allow a “ramp up” period?**

*A9: Some period of “ramp-up” is anticipated. The State recognizes that the GA selected for the Program may need to add and orient new staff and, in the case of a GA partnership, integration of the partners may be necessary. However, the State and CAP have established an aggressive Program schedule for the purpose securing environmental improvements in Greenpoint as soon as possible, and believe that the existing schedule is reasonable and attainable. Therefore, there is an expectation that any GA “ramp up” will not unnecessarily or unduly delay this schedule. Applicants should clearly indicate in their Applications whether new staffing or integration of partnership organizations will be necessary.*

**Q10: Does the State have a preferred method, such as a percentage or a flat fee, for calculating the GA budget?**

*A10: No, Applicants can propose any strategy for budgeting. Further, as indicated in the RFA, Applicants may propose different budgeting strategies for different Program activities.*

**Q11: The RFA presents three potential scenarios for the way in which funded projects will be implemented. Is the State asking Applicants to select one of these approaches for their Applications?**

*A11: No. At this time, no decision has been made on whether or not additional not-for-profit entities -- to be called "Project Administrators" or "PAs" -- will be contracted to administer the implementation of certain projects or groups of projects. This matter will be the subject of future discussions among the State, GA and CAP. For this reason, all three potential scenarios should be addressed as contingencies in Applications.*

**Q12: Can an entity be a GA and a PA?**

*A12: Yes. In fact, under Scenario 1, the GA would be expected to administer the implementation of all projects funded by the Program (i.e., the GA would essentially function as a single PA). Alternatively, under Scenario 3, the GA would be expected to administer the implementation of certain projects or project groups (i.e., functioning as a PA for these projects/project groups), while one or more PAs would be expected to administer the implementation of others.*

**Q13: The settlement between New York State and ExxonMobil required the company to pay \$19.5 million for environmental benefit projects in Greenpoint. What is the Program budget? Has the State allocated a portion, such as percentage, of the total budget to the GA?**

*A13: Applicants should assume that the total budget for the Program is the full amount of the payment made for environmental benefit projects in Greenpoint, \$19.5 million. The State has neither allocated any portion of this total budget to the GA nor, at this time, identified what portion of the budget should be allocated to the GA. The State expects that, in Applications for the GA position, Applicants will propose what they believe to be an appropriate and necessarily budget for performing the Scope of Services and achieving the Program Objective outlined in the RFA.*

**Q14: Will the GA receive the entire \$19.5 million upfront or will the State make allocations of the funding to the GA over a period of time.**

**A14:** *The GA will be allocated the full Program budget at the time they enter into a contract with the State that governs the position. All aspects of the Program will be funded from this allocation. As outlined in the RFA, the GA will be expected to provide fiscal and fiduciary management of these funds.*

**Q15: Does the State have investment criteria for the Program funds?**

**A15:** *No. The State will require that Program funds be deposited in a segregated, interest-bearing account maintained by the GA. As outlined in the RFA, the State expects the GA to exercise wise and prudent investment strategies with respect to these funds in order to minimize risk, while maximizing the net investment income earned. The RFA describes how Applicants will be evaluated regarding their demonstration of experience, resources and capabilities related to fiscal management, including maintaining grant funds through prudent investment and achieving positive returns on invested funds, particularly with respect to funds of \$1 million or more.*

**Q16: Does the State anticipate that the entire \$19.5 million will be disbursed in one year or in a series of years?**

**A16:** *The State and CAP have preliminarily discussed the merits of single and multi-year rounds of granting by the Program, but no decision has been made. As outlined by the RFA, the GA will be expected, at the end of the project solicitation, development and evaluation process, to make recommendations to the State on whether additional rounds of granting should be conducted. The final decision regarding additional granting rounds will be made through discussions between the State, GA and CAP. Consequently, the RFA indicates that Applicant budgets should include projections of costs associated with additional rounds of granting as a contingency.*

**Q17: Can the GA submit a proposal for project funds or are they "conflicted out"?**

**A17:** *The State believes that it would be a conflict of interest for the GA to apply for project funds since they are expected to manage the solicitation, development and evaluation of project proposals, and also to make recommendations to the State on projects to receive funding from the Program.*

**Q18: Will the GA be required to sign a contract with the State?**

**A18:** *Yes. As indicated in the RFA, the GA will be required to enter into a contract with the State that governs the GA position. An example State contract has been placed on the Program's webpage for review. The RFA also identifies legal provisions -- under "Terms of the Position" and in Appendix A: Standard Clauses for OAG Grant Contracts -- that can be expected to be included in the GA contract. The State anticipates that standard State contractual provisions will be supplemented in the GA contract with specific -- and to the extent possible, quantifiable -- obligations that correspond to the Scope of Services outlined in the RFA.*

**Q19: What is the role of the State, GA and CAP in the final selection of projects?**

**A19:** *The State is responsible for approving the specific projects that will receive funding from the Program. However, the State, GA and CAP will collaborate in refining and implementing the project solicitation, development and evaluation process, including developing the RFP, the designing the technical/budgetary review and scoring of proposals, and defining community preferences relative to project proposals.*

**Q20: How has the community outreach process worked thus far?**

**A20:** *With the assistance and involvement of the State's Outreach Consultant (OC), Environmental Sciences Engineering/ARC Engineering & Construction, P.C. (ESE), the State has established a very close and successful working relationship with the CAP and community in thus far developing and implementing the Program. Details of steps the State has taken to-date to engage and partner with the community are provided in the RFA.*

*The State is committed to continuing to fully engage and partner with the Greenpoint community in the Program, and to ensure the community has a direct, continuing role in guiding the Program's development and implementation. The GA is expected to fully support this commitment.*

**Q21: Can CAP members receive project grants and how is the appearance of a conflict of interest avoided?**

**A21:** *The State believes that CAP members, and entities on which they serve or by which they are employed, should be eligible to propose and receive project funding through the Program. The State believes this is appropriate given the structuring of the project solicitation, development and evaluation process, as outlined in the RFA.*

*In this process, all proposed projects will be subject to an extensive technical and budgetary review and scoring, conducted by an Independent Review Committee (IRC). CAP members will not be eligible to serve on the IRC. Only those projects deemed by the IRC to be of sufficient quality to merit consideration for Program funding will be presented at one or more Greenpoint community meetings. These meetings will be designed to identify -- to the greatest degree possible -- specific community preferences related to project proposals. The State has the ultimate responsibility for approving projects to be funded by the Program.*

*The CAP membership has extensive experience with community development and environmental improvement efforts, including environmental benefit projects. As such, the CAP recognizes the critical importance of the Program being implemented in a transparent and objective manner. The State is confident that this commitment, coupled with the structuring of the project solicitation, development and evaluation process, will safeguard against both actual and perceived conflicts of interests in the selection of projects for funding.*

*Nonetheless, the State, GA and CAP will need to practice continuing vigilance in identifying -- and incorporating measures into the Program that safeguard against -- actual and perceived conflicts of interest in all aspects of the Program.*

**Q22: Can the state provide a copy of the graphic showing the project selection process?**

**A22:** *A graphical depiction of the Program's design, including the project selection process, can be found on the Program's webpage at "Greenpoint Environmental Benefit Projects -- Presentation, 3/21/12."*

**Q23: What size projects are anticipated, could they range from \$20,000 to \$1,000,000?**

*A23: Currently, except for the special "small grants" (which are tentatively to be capped at \$50,000), no cap has been established for general project funding. The State, GA and CAP will address the possibility of setting a funding cap as a part of its planned discussions related to the RFP. Final decisions on whether to cap project funding at a certain amount will be made at that time.*

**Q24: Can you explain more about the roles of the GA and the PA in project implementation?**

*A24: The RFA provides details on the respective roles of the GA and PA(s) under several potential project implementation scenarios. Depending on a number of factors -- including, but not limited to, the number and nature of projects selected for funding -- the State and CAP has agreed that it may be beneficial to contract with one or more PAs to assist the GA by administering the implementation of certain individual projects or groups of projects. For example, a complicated, multi-year construction project related to stormwater management may be most efficiently and effectively administered by a PA with experience specifically related to such projects. Or, there may be a series of projects that are of a similar type (e.g., environmental education) that could best be administered by a local organization with specific experience related to this project type.*

*As described in the RFA, PAs would be expected to administer project implementation in a similar manner to the GA, i.e., performing oversight of implementation, providing support and assistance to project implementers, and assisting in the sharing of project implementation progress with the CAP and Greenpoint community at-large. If PAs are contracted, the GA's role would be to oversee each PA, including conducting routine reviews of their administration of project implementation.*

**Q25: Have there been discussions about setting aside some of the Program budget to create a sustainable investment fund to develop small-scale enterprises? Is that something the GA could propose?**

*A25: The possible creation of a "set-aside" fund, to be used for any number of purposes (including a sustainable investment fund), is a matter that merits further consideration by the State, GA and CAP, and substantive contributions to these discussions by the GA are expected.*

*The State and CAP have already had preliminary discussions on creating a set-aside of some Program funds, including for the purpose of resourcing the long-term operation and maintenance of funded projects. At this time, however, no decisions have been made regarding the establishment of any such fund. As mentioned in the RFA, the State also anticipates that the RFP will include the solicitation of proposals for "small projects" (e.g., those with funding capped at \$50,000). While the specifics of such small project granting have also not yet been determined (and will be the subject of future State, GA and CAP discussions), this funding could serve as development grants, potentially assisting in the development of small-scale enterprises.*

*As a practical matter, the State believes that the best "mechanism" for establishing a set-aside fund may be through the RFP process, i.e., a full proposal would be developed and submitted in response to the RFP, and then the proposal would be vetted through the IRC and community preferencing process.*

**Q26: Has the overarching strategy for the use of the funds been decided or will the GA have some role in developing the process?**

**A26:** *As indicated in the RFA, the objective of the Program is to fund projects that will secure significant environmental improvements in Greenpoint by addressing areas of concern for the community. In achieving this objective, the State is committed to implementing a transparent and objective process, and fully engaging and partnering with the Greenpoint community.*

*The State is committed to developing and implementing the Program through a flexible, adaptive and collaborative process that actively solicits and incorporates new ideas, insights and creative input. It is expected that a GA with experience in program administration will play a leadership role in the continued development and implementation of the Program, and contribute substantively to it.*

**Q27: Can an entity submit a proposal for a project and be a PA on another group of projects?**

**A27:** *The State believes that, in concept, the same entity could serve as both a project implementer and a PA. However, the State believes that there may be significant practical impediments to, and risks to the Program's success involved in, having a single entity simultaneously serve in both capacities. For example, the State would be concerned about whether a single entity would have the necessary staffing and other resources to serve successfully in both capacities at the same time.*

**Q28: How will the list of Greenpoint community project ideas be used? Some are very specific while other ideas don't seem as fully developed.**

**A28:** *The list of community project ideas -- which will be further refined through a future community meeting -- is being developed for several reasons. The list provides an indication of the type of projects the community would like to have funded through the Program. As such, the preliminary list has been used in the RFA to identify prospective GAs with experience, resources and capabilities related to the management of grant programs involving the listed project types. In the development of the RFP, the list will be used to ensure that the solicitation is properly focused on attracting the listed project types. In addition, by identifying project types that can be expected to engender community support, the list is intended to serve as a resource to prospective RFP respondents. In fact, the future community meeting mentioned above is being conducted for the purpose of both further refining the list, and linking community members advancing listed project ideas with entities capable of developing those ideas into project proposals.*

**Q29: Does the State have a cap on the overhead rate that can be charged by the GA?**

**A29:** *No. The State expects Applicants to propose what they believe to be an appropriate and necessarily budget (including overhead rate) for performing the Scope of Services and achieving the Program Objective outlined in the RFA.*

**Q30: Can you explain the role of the PA?**

*A30: The RFA provides details regarding the role that PAs may play, under several potential scenarios, in administering the implementation of projects. Depending on a number of factors, the State and CAP has agreed that it may be beneficial to the Program to contract with one or more PAs to assist the GA by administering the implementation of certain individual projects or groups of projects. PAs would be expected to administer project implementation in a similar manner to the GA, i.e., performing oversight of implementation, providing support and assistance to project implementers, and assisting in the sharing of project implementation progress with the CAP and Greenpoint community at-large.*

**Q31: Do you anticipate that there will be an RFP for PAs?**

*A31: To this point, the State and CAP have not discussed the process through which PAs -- if the decision is made to contract one or more of them -- would be solicited and selected. This matter will be taken up by the State, GA and CAP in the future. It is expected that a GA with experience in program administration will take a leadership role in this discussion and contribute substantively to it.*

**Q32: If more or more PAs are determined to be necessary, will they be paid a fee for their work?**

*A32: Yes, and they would be funded from the Program budget.*

**Q33: How should the fee for the GA be calculated, on a percentage basis, on a flat fee basis, or budgeted based on staffing needs?**

*A33: The State expects Applicants to propose what they believe to be an appropriate and necessarily budget for performing the Scope of Services and achieving the Program Objective outlined in the RFA. Applicants can propose any strategy or fee structure for budgeting, including, as indicated in the RFA, different budgeting strategies for different Program activities.*

**Q34: What are the requirements for the GA to report to the State?**

*A34: The RFA references a number of reporting requirements for the GA in relation to the Scope of Services. The specific requirements of individual reports, including their substance and timing, will ultimately be defined through provisions of the GA contract and/or in the work plan the GA will prepare for the Program. The GA is expected to substantively contribute to defining these reporting requirements based on their experience, resources and capabilities.*

**Q35: The State typically has a prescribed procurement process as well as requirements for prevailing wages, etc when it comes to funding capitol projects, will those requirements apply to this Program?**

*A35: The New York State Finance Law and procurement requirements apply to procurements of commodities, services and technology by State agencies. The selection and contracting of the GA qualifies as a State procurement. However, the process of acquisitioning goods and services by the GA (e.g., project selection and funding, and contracting PAs) may not qualify as procurement by a State agency, and thus may be subject to separate and distinct procedures, conditions and restrictions. Once the GA has been contracted, the State will provide complete guidance to the GA on the substance and applicability of State requirements governing GA procurements.*

**Q36: What is the GA's responsibility for communication with the community?**

**A36:** *As a general matter, the GA will be responsible for the overall administration of the Program, performing the Scope of Services and achieving the Program Objective -- both of which address the Program's commitment to implementing a transparent and objective process, and fully engaging and partnering with the Greenpoint community.*

*As indicated in the RFA, the State expects to retain an OC to support the Program by taking the lead on developing and implementing community outreach and consultation activities. The OC will be contacted by the State, and funded (estimated, at this time, at a sum not to exceed \$100,000) from the Program budget. The GA will be expected to work closely with the OC to ensure consistent and effective collaboration with the CAP and the Greenpoint community at-large, including assisting the OC to develop and execute a community outreach plan in support of the Program. It is expected that a GA with experience in community engagement and collaboration will contribute substantively to the Program's community outreach and consultation activities.*

**Q37: Who will serve on the Committee that reviews project proposals (i.e., the Independent Review Committee)?**

**A37:** *The membership of the IRC has not been determined, and will be the subject of future discussions among the State, GA and CAP. However, at this time, the State anticipates no reason to that IRC membership would not be open to qualified members from both the private and public sectors, including government and academia.*

*The GA will be responsible for establishing and administering the IRC, and ensuring the review is completed in a timely manner. As indicated in the RFA, the IRC will be tasked with defining a threshold score that identifies project proposals of sufficient quality to merit further consideration for Program funding. The goal will be to forward to the community for vetting only those projects deemed by the IRC to be of "fundable" quality.*

**Q38: Is there a sign-in sheet with a list of pre-application conference attendees and can that sheet be distributed?**

**A38:** *Names and affiliations of conference attendees appear at the beginning of this document.*

**Q39: How will the Program be evaluated? Are there metrics for determining its success?**

**A39:** *The Program's objective is to fund projects that will secure significant environmental improvements in Greenpoint by addressing areas of concern for the community. The project solicitation, development and evaluation process outlined in the RFA is intended to yield high-quality projects that will secure significant environmental improvement and address the preferences of the Greenpoint community.*

*The success of funded projects will be measured by their adherence to project-specific completion timelines and budgets, as well as attainment of project-specific environmental benefit metrics, which the State anticipates will be included in the RFP as a required element of all project proposals. The State anticipates that these and other success metrics will be governed by the Memorandum of Agreement that the GA completes with each project implementer, and monitored on an on-going basis by the GA in its role in project implementation. Thus, the GA will be expected to play a leadership role in the development and implementation of measures of the Program's success.*

**Q40: As a follow-up to Q39, the satisfaction of the community regarding the process and the Program should be an equally important measure of success. How will such community satisfaction be measured?**

**A40:** *The State is fully committed to engaging and partnering with the Greenpoint community in a manner that ensures its satisfaction with the Program. At this time, the State is confident that, due to the extremely close relationship the State has established with the CAP and community at-large, the community is -- at the very least -- satisfied with the Program.*

*However, the State recognizes the critical importance of sustaining community satisfaction with the Program into the future. It will, therefore, be incumbent upon all involved with the Program -- and, especially, the GA (which is expected to lead the overall administration of the Program) and OC (which is expect to lead the development and implementation of community outreach and consultation activities) -- to monitor, measure and maintain the community's satisfaction with the program. For example, the State anticipates the development and implementation of metrics for gauging community satisfaction to be an element of the OC's work plan.*

*As the Program proceeds, the State, GA, OC and CAP will need to further identify and implement specific mechanisms to monitor, measure and maintain community satisfaction, and it is expected that a GA with experience in program administration will play a lead role in this discussion and contribute substantively.*

**Q41: Is the program perhaps too ambitious?**

**A41:** *While the State is committed to developing and implementing the Program through a flexible, adaptive and collaborative process, the State believes the Program's objectives are both appropriate and attainable. It is expected that a GA with experience in program administration will play a leadership role in ensuring that the Program achieves its objectives.*

**Q42: Is the CAP membership set at the current level? Could the GA add members?**

**A42:** *The CAP is independent of the State. The State defers all decisions related to the organization and operation of the CAP -- including its membership -- to the CAP itself.*

**Q43: How often does the CAP meet?**

**A43:** *To date, the CAP has met on an as-needed basis, which has translated into approximately one meeting per month. In the future, it may be appropriate for the State and CAP to consider whether regularly-scheduled meetings of the group would benefit the CAP and the Program.*

**Q44: Do you think it is overly ambitious to try to spend all of the money at once, especially given the other funds and prior experience with other funds in the community?**

**A44:** *The State has no opinion on whether Program funds should be dispersed through single or multiple rounds of granting. The State and CAP have had preliminary discussions regarding the merits of both approaches to granting, but no decisions have been made. However, whichever approach is ultimately decided upon, the State is confident that the Program will be successful.*

*The State appreciates the value of having the experience of other funds and grant programs inform the Program's development and implementation. It is expected that a GA with program administration experience -- particularly, knowledge of relevant current and past government community development or environmental improvement efforts in the Greenpoint area -- will contribute substantively to "learning from" the experience of other funds and grant programs.*

**Q45: What is the anticipated general scope of services and performance period for the OC's facilitation?**

*A45: As indicated in the RFA, the State expects to retain an OC to support the Program by taking the lead on developing and implementing community outreach and consultation activities. This includes administering the CAP and conducting Greenpoint community meetings, as well as designing and executing approaches for specific community engagement and partnership purposes, such as facilitating community decision-making (e.g., identifying community preferences related to project proposals) and gauging community satisfaction with the Program.*

*The GA will be expected to work closely with the OC on these and other activities focused on ensuring consistent and effective collaboration with the CAP and the Greenpoint community at-large, including assisting the OC to develop and implement a community outreach plan in support of the Program.*

*The OC will be contacted by the State and funded (estimated, at this time, at a sum not to exceed \$100,000) from the Program budget. As with the GA, it is expected that the contract term for the OC will be for a period of four years, with an option for this term to be extended by the State. It is expected that the OC will take the lead in developing and implementing the Program's community outreach and consultation activities over the full term of its contract.*

**Q46: Will the OC continue to facilitate community meetings for the term of the contract with the selected GA?**

*A46: As part of its responsibilities related to developing and implementing community outreach and consultation activities, the OC will be expected to lead the planning and administration of community meetings over the full term of its contract. The GA will be expected to support the OC in these activities.*

**Q47: Will the OC be responsible for maintaining the website for the term of the contract?**

*A47: Currently, the State hosts and maintains the Program's webpage. As an element of the Program's community engagement, the OC plays a substantial role in providing content for this page. For example, CAP meeting notes, Program factsheets, etc. developed by the OC for general community outreach purposes, are placed on the site. The State expects the OC's role with respect to populating the webpage will continue over the full term of its contract.*

**Q48: Do you anticipate that the webpage will be maintained at the New York State Office of Attorney General location as the "landing page" for all information about the Program, i.e., request for proposal, applications, updates etc.?**

*A48: The purpose of the webpage is to support the Program's commitment to engaging and partnering with the Greenpoint community by serving as a public resource on the Program, its progress and its achievements. As such, the State believes that the Program's webpage should continue to serve as the public portal to information related to the Program.*

*However, the State is committed to continuing to develop and refine the webpage as a resource. For example, it may be appropriate for the Program's webpage to re-direct visitors to certain information (e.g., RFPs) "housed" at other locations (e.g., the GA's website). For this reason, the Program webpage, including its location, design and functioning, will be the subject of future discussions among the State, OC, GA and CAP, and it is expected that the GA will contribute substantially to these.*

**Q49: Will ESE continue to be contracted as the outreach consultant (OC) for the Program? Is the \$100,000 "set-aside" in the Program Budget for the outreach consultant for ESE?**

**A49:** *As indicated in the RFA, the State has ESE to serve as the OC, and assist the State to effectively collaborate with the community in executing the Program. While the State's current contract with ESE concludes with the selection of the GA, the State anticipates re-contracting with ESE to serve as the Program's OC for a period of four years, with an option for this term to be extended by the State. The OC will be funded from the Program budget. Applicants should assume, for the purposes of budgeting, that the "set-aside" for the OC will not exceed \$100,000.*

**Q50: As part of the AG's settlement with ExxonMobil was there any separate provision made for monitoring public health impacts of the spill on community residents?**

**A50:** *The State of New York's settlement with ExxonMobil (i.e., the Consent Decree in the matter of State of New York v. Exxon Mobil Corporation, No. 07-CV-2902 [KAM/RML] [E.D.N.Y.], ordered on March 1, 2011) does not include provisions related to monitoring public health impacts of the spill on community residents.*

**Q51: If the answer to Q50 is no, is there the expectation that this community benefits fund could/would also provide resources for on-going health monitoring in the community?**

**A51:** *The State has no expectations related to the funding of any particular projects. As indicated in the RFA, the GA is expected to manage a grant program that solicits, develop and evaluates proposals for projects that serve the community's environmental improvement priorities. A key component of the GA's related activities will be to lead the development of an RFP that solicits responsive project proposals. Such an RFP must be consistent with the terms of the legal settlement between the State of New York and ExxonMobil and the DEC's "Environmental Benefit Projects (EBP) Policy," and also be responsive to the community's ideas for environmental benefit projects and project types (e.g., see Appendix B of the RFA). The details of the RFP have not been finalized at this time, and will be ultimately will be determined collaboratively among the State, GA and CAP.*

**Q52: Does the GA have a seat on the IRC?**

**A52:** *The GA is expected to establish and administer the IRC for the purpose of conducting a technical and budgetary review, and scoring of proposals. The GA is also expected to develop summary documents and other materials necessary to support the work of the IRC. The GA will not serve on the IRC.*

**Q53: Will the GA have final approval of the grant awards?**

**A53:** *As the conclusion of the solicitation, development and evaluation of project proposals, the GA is expected to prepare a report to the State that includes recommendations on projects to be funded by the Program. The State has responsibility for the final approval of all projects to receive Program funding.*