

In connection with the **Request for Proposals** for the administration of the **Manhattan Cruise Terminal Community Fund (“MCTCF”)**, released by NYCEDC on June 16, 2026, the questions from potential Respondents and answers provided by NYCEDC are below.

I. General Questions

Q: Are you looking for a New York-based organization to do this work?

A: NYCEDC will accept proposals from a range of qualified respondents as described in Section IV, Part A of the RFP. A headquarters within New York City is not a prerequisite for application to the RFP, though organizations with demonstrated experience operating within New York City or with strong community connections to the Hell’s Kitchen neighborhood are encouraged to apply.

Q: Is it expected that funds will primarily be used for capital expenditures to make public realm improvements?

A: Priority use of the funds will be determined in partnership with NYCEDC, Councilmember Wilson’s office and Manhattan Community Board 4 (“CB4”). NYCEDC anticipates that the funds can and will be used for a range of projects, including public realm improvements and programmatic activity (e.g., environmental stewardship programs). Respondents should review the most recently published [Statement of District Needs](#) provided by CB4 to better understand the types of projects funds might support.

Q: Is there a shortlist of certain projects that the grant will award? Will the projects [be] for capacity building and planning?

A: Respondents should expect to propose an approach for grant selection and awarding, which could include a process for shortlisting grants aligned with the determined priorities of the fund. Priority use of the funds will be determined in partnership with NYCEDC, Councilmember Wilson’s office and Manhattan Community Board 4 (“CB4”). NYCEDC anticipates that the funds will be used for a range of projects, including public realm improvements and programmatic activity (e.g., environmental stewardship programs). Respondents should review the most recently published [Statement of District Needs](#) provided by CB4 to better understand the types of projects funds might support.

Q: Over the initial two-year term, what is the total pool of funds the Administrator will manage? Is it the approximately \$2 million available by the end of 2026, or that amount plus continued annual collections (projected at roughly \$650,000 to \$800,000 in 2026 and 2027)?

A: The Manhattan Cruise Terminal Community Fund is currently being funded by a \$1/passenger fee applied to all cruises that call to the Manhattan Cruise Terminal. By the end of 2026, the projected amount that has accumulated since the beginning from January 2024 will be approximately \$2 million. The fund is expected to continue accruing in perpetuity based on \$1/passenger. It is expected that funds will be available approximately six months after the passenger activity.

Q: Where does final project-selection authority sit among NYCEDC, the oversight committee, and the Administrator?

A: Final approval of the use of funds will come from NYCEDC's leadership; however, the oversight committee, which is expected to include NYCEDC, Councilmember Carl Wilson, and Manhattan Community Board 4, will ultimately determine what projects will be submitted for approval. The Administrator will serve as a third-party facilitator to carry out activities as described in the Scope of Services.

Q: Does NYCEDC expect the Fund Administrator to establish a dedicated investment or disbursement-approval committee to approve fund disbursements? If so, are there requirements for its size, composition, or membership (for example, how many members and who should serve on it), and how does it relate to the oversight committee described in the Scope of Services?

A: NYCEDC does not expect the establishment of a dedicated investment or disbursement approval committee to approve fund disbursements.

Q: How many funding rounds per year does NYCEDC anticipate, and is there an expected number and size range of awards, or is that to be defined by the Administrator in collaboration with the oversight committee?

A: NYCEDC anticipates that there will be 1-2 rounds of funding per year, maximum. Additionally, NYCEDC encourages Respondents to propose a range of grantmaking structures, including varying award sizes and potential number of grants in a funding cycle ; however, the expected number and size range of awards should be determined and finalized in collaboration with the oversight committee, which will at minimum consist of NYCEDC, Councilmember Carl Wilson and a representative of Manhattan Community Board 4.

Q: Who holds and disburses the Fund? Does NYCEDC retain custody and pay awardees directly, or is the Administrator expected to receive, hold, and disburse Fund monies to selected projects as a re-grantor or fiscal intermediary?

A: The Fund Administrator is expected to function as a fiscal intermediary. Although the funding disbursement process is still being finalized, NYCEDC currently anticipates retaining custody of the full fund balance and providing funds to the Fund Administrator upon completion of the project selection process. The Fund Administrator would subsequently distribute grant awards to the selected grantees.

Q: Who holds and disburses the Community Fund money: is it EDC directly, or is the administrator responsible for the actual funds distribution?

A: The Fund Administrator is expected to function as a fiscal intermediary. Although the funding disbursement process is still being finalized, NYCEDC currently anticipates retaining custody of the full fund balance and providing funds to the Fund Administrator upon completion of the project selection process. The Fund Administrator would subsequently distribute grant awards to the selected grantees.

Q: Does NYCEDC have expectations regarding the minimum or maximum grant award size or numbers of awards per funding cycle?

A: NYCEDC encourages Respondents to propose arrangements for the grant size and number of awards in a funding cycle; however, the expected number and size range of awards should be

determined in collaboration with the oversight committee, which will at minimum consist of NYCEDC, Councilmember Carl Wilson and a representative of Manhattan Community Board 4.

Q: The RFP mentions that the fund will have approximately \$2 million by the end of calendar year 2026. Is the engagement's "Year 1" and "Year 2" structure based on the calendar year or NYC's fiscal year?

A: Year 1 and Year 2 of the engagement period should be taken to mean the first and second years of the contract term beginning on the contract start date, rather than the calendar year or NYCEDC's fiscal year.

Q: Is there an M/WBE utilization requirement linked to this RFP?

A: There are no M/WBE utilization requirements associated with this procurement.

II. Scope Specific Questions

Q: What level of rigor are you looking for in the evaluation? We want to ensure it is appropriate for the size and scope of the work that grantees are doing.

A: As described in Task III of the Scope of Services in Part IV, Section D of the RFP, the Respondent will be expected to provide quarterly progress reports on key project milestones and an annual impact report. The Respondent can expect collected metrics to include outreach metrics (e.g., number and type of organizations engaged, number of events held, number of attendees, etc.), project metrics (e.g., number of applications received, number and type of projects awarded), demographic data on participants where available, and other metrics contextualized to the projects awarded by the Fund. All metrics will be determined in partnership with NYCEDC and the selected Respondent.

Q: Does NYCEDC anticipate the community engagement and outreach to be held or produced in multiple languages? If so, can you share what languages we might expect?

A: Respondents should anticipate providing multilingual outreach and engagement materials as needed to effectively reach Hell's Kitchen neighborhood residents. NYCEDC expects the primary language needs to be English, Spanish, and Mandarin, and welcomes Respondents' recommendations for additional languages based on their assessment of the community.

Q: To support public engagement, will NYCEDC provide resident contact lists, outreach support, or communications channels, or is the consultant expected to build participation independently? Aside from the Community Board, does NYCEDC have existing relationships or community ambassadors at each site that the consultant can leverage?

A: Respondents should assume responsibility for developing and executing community engagement and participant recruitment efforts as outlined in Task II of the Scope of Services in Part IV, Section D of the RFP. NYCEDC does not anticipate providing resident contact lists or conducting direct, community-level outreach on the selected Respondent's behalf. However, NYCEDC will support the selected Respondent by facilitating introductions to relevant stakeholders, community partners, and institutional networks in the target area, where appropriate, to help advance engagement efforts. NYCEDC may also support outreach through its communications channels and social media platforms, where feasible and appropriate, to help promote engagement opportunities and community participation.

Q: In the Executive Summary and Scope, the Consultant is said to be responsible for “overseeing fund disbursement.” Please confirm that actual disbursement of funds to the grant recipients and any budgetary accounting related thereto will be handled by NYCEDC, and the Consultant will have responsibility solely for tracking funding authorizations in its reports to the OC.

A: As outlined in Task II of the Scope of Services in Part IV, Section D of the RFP, the Respondent should expect to serve as a fiscal conduit and award funds directly to the grant recipients. Although the funding disbursement process is still being finalized, NYCEDC currently anticipates retaining custody of the full fund balance and providing funds to the Fund Administrator upon completion of the project selection process. The Fund Administrator would subsequently distribute grant awards to the selected grantees.

Q: Who will conduct and maintain grantee compliance (reporting, check in, follow up, etc.) throughout the course of the grant?

A: Grantee compliance is a task expected of the Fund Administrator as a function of Task II, described in Part IV, Section D of the RFP.

III. Cost Proposal and Administration Fee Questions

Q: (i) How and when is the administration fee paid, whether as a fixed annual amount, a percentage of collections, or a percentage of disbursements, and (ii) on what invoicing schedule?

A: (i) NYCEDC has not prescribed a specific administration fee structure. Respondents should propose a compensation approach in their cost proposal, which may include a fixed annual fee, a percentage of annual receipts, a percentage of disbursements, or some other reasonable methodology.

(ii) NYCEDC anticipates that Task Order Services will generally be invoiced on a monthly basis. Cost proposals should be competitive, maximize funding available to the community, and be supported by a compelling narrative explaining the proposed fee structure, covered costs, and payment methodology.

Q: Given that collections are variable and seasonal, how is the fee treated in a lower-collection year?

A: As part of the budget narrative, Respondents will be expected to describe their strategy for managing funding shortfalls in funding in years where passenger activity is lower.

Q: Is there a maximum allowable administrative fee or percentage that may be charged to the Community Fund?

A: While NYCEDC is not imposing a cap on the fee or annual dollar amount, Respondents should expect to provide competitive price proposals that maximize funding for the community and minimize overhead expenses for program administration. The cost proposal should be supported by a compelling narrative that details the anticipated use of the funds.

Q: Where will the OC meetings be facilitated? Community board, EDC, or another public office, or will the consultant be responsible for engaging a location?

A: The Consultant will be responsible for identifying and securing locations for oversight committee meetings, whether conducted in person or virtually. Where feasible, NYCEDC may make NYCEDC facilities available and will assist in coordinating with relevant public offices and community boards to identify appropriate meeting spaces. Respondents should assume responsibility for meeting logistics and venue coordination as part of their proposed approach.

Q: Is the budget intended to cover all consultant costs, including translation, interpretation, survey printing, workshop materials, catering, participant incentives or stipends, and childcare? Can you clarify what materials NYCEDC will cover, if anything?

A: Respondents should expect to propose a comprehensive budget that assumes coverage of all costs necessary to deliver program outcomes. At this time, NYCEDC cannot provide additional funding beyond what is provided from the fund itself.

IV. Subcontracting Questions

Q: May respondents submit as a team or joint venture, or engage subcontractors, and if so, how are qualifications weighed for a team as opposed to a single organization?

A: Respondents are welcome to submit as a team, a joint venture, or otherwise engage subcontractors in the delivery of services. All responses will be subject to the same selection criteria across qualifications, experience, proposal quality, and cost proposal as described in Section V, Part B of the RFP.

Q: The informational presentation for this RFP on your website includes a slide that states that none of the activities in Tasks II and III may be performed by the subcontractor. However, this language is not included in the RFP.

A: Please defer to what is written in the RFP. Subcontractors may be used to perform any items identified in the Scope of Services, however, a majority of the work must be performed by the Lead Respondent.

Q: What are the actual subcontracting rules for this proposal? Does the presentation supersede the RFP, and will an addendum be issued? Could the respondent propose an alternative division of tasks?

A: Please defer to what is written in the RFP. If the Respondent is proposing as a team, the subcontracted party must be able to perform the tasks as identified in the Scope of Services in Part IV, Section D of the RFP. It is the responsibility of the Lead Respondent to determine the division of labor amongst its subcontracted partners.

Q: At the June 23, 2026 pre-proposal info session, NYCEDC indicated Tasks II and III may not be performed by subconsultants. Could NYCEDC clarify whether this means subconsultants may not lead these tasks, or may not be involved in them at all?

A: Please defer to what is written in the RFP. NYCEDC welcomes subconsultants to be involved in each of the tasks, however, the Lead Respondent must perform the majority of the work overall.

V. Submission and Formatting Questions

Q: Is there a page limit or a required format for the proposal? The RFP does not appear to specify one, so we want to confirm before preparing our response.

A: There are no page limits or file size limits for proposal submission. The RFP should be submitted as one PDF file named "MCTCF Fund Administrator Proposal - [Respondent's Name]". Refer to Section V, Part D of the RFP for additional information.

Q: Are there any formatting guidelines regarding number of pages, font size, etc.?

A: There are no formatting requirements regarding number of pages, font size, or other stylizations of the submission. For all submission requirements, please refer to Section V of the RFP for additional information.

Q: Are there any formatting requirements or templates for the budget?

A: There are no formatting requirements or templates for the budget. For all submission requirements, please refer to Section V of the RFP for additional information.

Q: The RFP requires three years of audited financial statements. For a respondent that does not have audited statements, are reviewed or unaudited financial statements acceptable?

A: Per the requirements outlined in Section V, Part A of the RFP, NYCEDC requires respondents to submit three (3) years of audited financial statements. Reviewed or unaudited financial statements will not be accepted as a substitute for this requirement.

Q: Are 3 years of audited financial statements a firm requirement, or are alternatives (e.g., copies of filed federal tax returns) acceptable? As background, we are part of a group of three small LLCs that might reasonably be considered a candidate to perform this work. But as 1-2 person small businesses, we do not have audited financials.

A: Per the requirements outlined Section V, Part A of the RFP, NYCEDC requires respondents to submit three (3) years of audited financial statements. Reviewed or unaudited financial statements will not be accepted as a substitute for this requirement.