

**FDPIR Funding Work Group
July 11, 2007 Conference Call Notes**

Attending	Not Attending
Yunus Lakhani (Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Assoc), NAFDPIR Regional Vice President for the Western Region	Susie Roy (Leech Lake Chippewa), NAFDPIR Regional Vice President for the Midwest Region
Thomas Yellowhair (Navajo Nation), representing WAFDPIR	Gale Dills (North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services/Cherokee Tribe of North Carolina), representing the Southeast Region ITOs
Nancy Egan (Shoshone-Paiute Tribes), representing all FDPIR programs as NAFDPIR President	Mary Trottier (Spirit Lake), representing the Mountain Plains Region Executive Board
Red Gates (Standing Rock Sioux), NAFDPIR Regional Vice President for the Mountain Plains Region	Linday Rayon (Muscogee (Creek) Nation), representing the NAFDPIR Regional Vice President for the Southwest Region
Melinda Newport (Chickasaw Nation), representing ONFACT	
Betty Jo Graveen (Lac Du Flambeau), representing the Midwest Region ITOs	
Cindy Wheeler, Program Specialist, FNS-SERO	
Madeline Viens, Assistant Director, Field Operations, FNS-WRO	
Chris Hennelly, Program Specialist, FNS-SWRO	
Elvira Jarka, Director, Special Nutrition Programs, FNS-MWRO	
Laura Castro, Chief, Policy Branch, FNS-HQ	
Don DeBoer, Senior Program Specialist, FNS-MPRO	

Work Group Staff Support: Nancy Theodore, Program Analyst, FNS-HQ
Work Group Facilitator: Melanie Casey, Program Analyst, FNS-HQ

- Nancy Theodore referenced the schedule of upcoming conference calls, which was provided to the members by email, and asked the members to advise her if they were unable to participate in any of the calls and wished to have someone represent them. Nancy stated that FNS wanted to ensure that each region was properly represented.
- Nancy Theodore also provided a brief summary of the progress of and status of the work group for incoming members:
 - The work group met in April 2007 to review the comments submitted on the work group's November 2006 preliminary proposal.
 - The work group developed new proposals in response to the comments, and six proposals are under consideration (See revised Attachment I attached for a description of the proposals).

- The goal of the work group is to provide FNS Administrator Roberto Salazar with a final recommendation that includes one or more proposals for a funding allocation process for FDPIR that is objective, equitable, easy to understand, and achieves the greatest level of acceptability among the ITOs and State agencies.
- The goal for each individual member of the Work Group is to ensure that he or she supports at least one proposal in the final package that will go to Mr. Salazar.
- The work group members reviewed the draft notes from June 12 meeting and changes were suggested (see revised draft notes attached).
- The work group members provided comments on the group's past and future work as follows:
 - The current budget submission process is viewed by some Tribes as "negotiation." Some Tribal leaders have asked if there will be negotiation guidelines, should the work group recommend a proposal that includes a process for negotiation. They want to know, under the guidelines, what would be negotiable and what would not be negotiable.
 - Some Tribal and State officials have indicated that they will want an opportunity to comment on the final recommendation of the work group; the work group will need to consider this in making its recommendation to Mr. Salazar.
 - What is the inflation factor used for budgeting FDPIR administrative funding and how is it developed? Response: The FY 2008 President's Budget recommended an inflationary increase of \$938,000 or 3.638% over the FY 2007 administrative funding allowance of \$27,019,000. This proposed increase was based on the "State and local consumption expenditures and gross investment" indicator, which is a line item in the "Table 1.6.4 Price Indexes of Gross Domestic Purchases" developed by the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis. This line item measures the prices paid for goods and services purchased by State and local governments.
- Because Proposals D and H have similar features and involve a similar approach (i.e., Approach #1 on Attachment I: ITOs/State agencies would submit budgets based on need and the total of those budgets would be compared to the annual FDPIR appropriation), Nancy Theodore suggested that the work group may want to review Proposals D and H to determine whether they should remain as stand-alone proposals or combined under one proposal.
- The work group members reviewed a chart provided by Nancy Theodore that displayed the descriptions of Proposal D and H side-by-side. The work group members made changes to the descriptions, which are included in the revised Attachment I (attached). Following discussions of the two proposals, the work group members agreed to eliminate Proposal D as they felt that Proposal H adequately represented Approach #1 and could be explained.
- Next conference calls:

August 2, 2:30-4:30pm ET
 August 14, 2:30-4:30pm ET
 August 20, 2:30-4:30pm ET
 September 6, 2:30-4:30pm ET
 September 17, 2:30-4:30pm ET

Attachments