

**FDPIR Funding Work Group  
September 6, 2007 Conference Call Notes**

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

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

- The following information had been provided to the work group members prior to the conference call:
  - August 22, 2007 and September 5, 2007 emails from Nancy Theodore transmitting spreadsheets that show proposed Regional allocation amounts for Proposals E, I, and K using FY 2008 proposed funding amounts; a chart comparing the proposed Regional allocations under Proposals E, I and K; a side-by-side comparison of the features of Proposals E, I, and K; and a revised Attachment I that included revisions suggested in the August 20, 2007 conference call;
  - August 24, 2007 and September 5, 2007 emails from Nancy Theodore transmitting draft notes from the August 20, 2007 conference call.
- Nancy Theodore summarized the draft notes from the August 20, 2007 conference call and asked the work group members if they had any changes to the draft notes from the August 20, 2007 conference call, or comments about the August 20, 2007 conference call. No changes to the draft notes were offered, and no comments on the August 20, 2007 conference call were offered.
- Nancy Theodore reported that Roberto Salazar has been invited to address the members of the National Congress of American Indians at the November 11-16, 2007 meeting in Denver, Colorado, and is expected to report on the final recommendations of the work group. It is hoped that the work group will complete its recommendation soon.

- Nancy Theodore reported that Yunus Lakhani was unable to participate in the conference call. Nancy emailed Yunus requesting written clarification of his proposal (Proposal J). Nancy forwarded Yunus' responses in a September 6, 2007 email to the work group. Nancy pointed out that Yunus' response indicated that his proposal represents Approach #3 (i.e., formula to determine all or part of each ITO's/State agency's allocation). Since the work group was currently involved in discussions on Proposals E, I, and K, which represent Approach #2 (i.e., formula to determine Regional Office allocation, with individual budget negotiations with ITOs/State agencies), Nancy stated that the work group would address Yunus' proposal when it discussed the other proposals for Approach #3.
- Nancy Theodore led a discussion of Proposals E, I, and K, reviewing the side-by-side comparison of the features of Proposals E, I, and K; the chart comparing the proposed Regional allocations under Proposals E, I and K; the spreadsheets that show proposed Regional allocation amounts for Proposals E, I, and K using FY 2008 proposed funding amounts; and the revised Attachment I that included revisions suggested in the August 20, 2007 conference call.
- There was significant discussion within the work group on Proposals E, I, and K and the merits of the features/factors in each proposal. There seemed to be agreement that a proposal under this approach should include a factor for participation (factor A), but there wasn't agreement on which other factor should be included. Half of the attending work group members expressed preference for the factor that would allocate funds to the Regional Offices based on the number of programs with tailgating, home delivery, multiple warehouses and/or stores (factor B of Proposal E); while the other half of the attending work group members expressed preference for the factor that would allocate funds to the Regional Offices based on the number of programs within each Region (factor C of Proposal I). Some work group members suggested that the description of Proposal I include a statement on how it addresses tailgating, home delivery, multiple warehouses and/or stores.
- The next discussion focused on Proposal K (which combines factors A, B, and C) and the weights for the three factors. Five of the attending work group members supported a 50% weight for factor A (participation); 25% weight for factor B (tailgating, home delivery, multiple warehouses and/or stores); and 25% weight for factor C (number of programs in the Region). One work group member supported equal weights for the three factors; and two work group members had no opinion on the weights for Proposal K.
- At the conclusion of the discussion on Proposals E, I and K, Nancy Theodore stated that she would send the work group members a revised spreadsheet for Proposal K that reflected the weights preferred by the majority of the attending work group members.
- Next, the work group members discussed the four parking lot issues:
  1. Funding methodology for allocating Nutrition Education funding – There seemed to be agreement that the final recommendation to Mr. Salazar should include a recommendation for a separate stream of funding for FDPIR Nutrition Education.
  2. Use of administrative funding by North Dakota and Montana State agencies for ordering, warehousing, and distributing commodities to seven independent ITOs - There seemed to be agreement that the final recommendation to Mr. Salazar should include a recommendation that FDPIR administrative funding should not be used to support costs incurred by the Montana and North Dakota State agencies for the ordering, warehousing, and distributing commodities to the seven independent ITOs.

3. Address capital expenditures in a funding methodology - There seemed to be agreement that the final recommendation to Mr. Salazar should include a recommendation for a separate stream of funding for FDPIR capital expenditures.
  4. Serving different areas (urban vs rural) – Who can participate? – This issue was discussed and there seemed to be agreement that this issue was not relevant to the funding methodology and could be handled by the Food Distribution Division of FNS as a separate issue via a clarification to the ITOs/State agencies. Nancy Theodore agreed to send the work group members copies of the proposed and final rules that implemented the legislative provision to allow Oklahoma tribes without traditional reservation boundaries to participate in FDPIR.
- For discussion in the next conference call, Nancy Theodore stated she would draft a sample transmittal letter to Mr. Salazar that will include Proposal H (Approach #1) and Proposal K (Approach #2) and the recommendations above from the discussions of the parking lot issues. The work group will discuss the language in the sample transmittal letter in the September 17, 2007 conference call. Nancy reiterated the expectation that every work group member would support at least one of the proposals in the final recommendation when it is completed by the work group.
  - Next conference call:  
September 17, 2:30-4:30pm ET