

**FDPIR Funding Methodology Work Group
March 30, 2006 Conference Call Notes**

Attending	Not Attending
Lindsay Rayon, Muscogee (Creek) Nation	Sharon Thompson, St. Regis Mohawk
Red Gates, NAFDPIR Mountain Plains Region Vice-President/Standing Rock Sioux	Tony Nertoli, NAFDPIR President/Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians
Gale Dills, Cherokee Tribe of North Carolina	Ray Capoeman, NAFDPIR Western Region Vice-President/Quinault Nation
Thomas Yellowhair, Navajo Nation	
Susie Roy, NAFDPIR Midwest Region Vice-President/Leech Lake Chippewa	
Melinda Newport, Chickasaw Nation	
Laura Castro, FNS-HQ, FDD	
Don DeBoer, FNS-MPRO	
Chris Hennelly, FNS-SWRO	
Elvira Jarka, FNS-MWRO	
Madeline Viens, FNS-WRO	
Nancy Theodore, FNS-HQ (staff support)	

▪ **Draft Notes from the March 16, 2006 Conference Call**

Nancy Theodore asked each of the work group members in attendance to provide comments on or changes to the draft notes of the March 16, 2006 conference call. No comments or changes were provided, so the notes are approved as written and will be posted on the FDPIR Funding Work Group website.

▪ **Proposal to Add a Facilitator to the Work Group**

Laura Castro explained to the group that Nancy Egan, President of the WAFDPIR, wrote to FNS requesting that an independent facilitator be added to the work group. A facilitator could help the work group stay on track, and ensure that all members have an opportunity to express themselves in group discussions. Laura explained that FNS has several employees that are trained facilitators and do not work with FDPIR or any Food Distribution Program. If there were objections to using a FNS employee, FNS could attempt to engage a non-FNS facilitator, but it was not known whether funds would be available for this. Laura asked the work group members: 1) if they felt that a facilitator should be added to the work group, and 2) whether the facilitator should be a FNS employee or a non-FNS employee. Each work group member was asked to provide input. None of the work group members in attendance were opposed to adding a facilitator to the work group, and none objected to a facilitator that was a FNS employee; however, several work group members recommended that the trained facilitator have a background in budgetary matters.

▪ **Replacement for Yunus Lakhani**

A work group member asked if there would be a permanent replacement for Yunus Lakhani. Nancy confirmed that due to health reasons, Yunus would no longer be able to participate on the work group. Thomas Yellowhair, Navajo Nation, has been designated by the WAFDPIR as Yunus' permanent replacement. Laura Castro and Nancy spoke with Thomas Yellowhair on Friday, March 24, 2006 to ensure that Thomas was up-to-speed on the progress of the work group. They also discussed the proposed funding methodology developed by Yunus. Nancy and Laura pointed out to Thomas that Yunus' proposal contained a circular reference that resulted in an unintended effect. Thomas agreed to contact Yunus about the circular reference and see what needed to be done to correct it.

▪ **Additional Suggestions for Proposed Funding Methodologies**

Nancy reported that she had not received any additional proposals to date. Thomas Yellowhair reported that he expected to receive something from Yunus Lakhani by COB March 30. A work group member proposed that a deadline be established for the submission of additional proposals. Given the need to prepare for the NAFDPIR conference, which is scheduled the week of April 23-28, 2006, the work group members agreed that the deadline for new proposals would be COB April 5, 2006.

▪ **Preparation for the NAFDPIR Conference**

The agenda for the NAFDPIR conference includes a discussion of the progress of the FDPIR Funding Work Group during the USDA General Session on Monday, April 26 at 2:45pm. Nancy pointed out that since the work group is still considering two proposals and another may be proposed, it is doubtful that the work group will have sufficient time before the NAFDPIR conference to come to agreement on one or more proposals. Nancy suggested a mailing to all the Program Directors, to be sent prior to the NAFDPIR conference, that would help to familiarize them with the progress of the work group so they would have a better understanding during the presentation at the General Session.

This proposal was discussed by the work group members and it was agreed by all work group members in attendance that:

- Prior to the conference, a package would be sent to the Program Directors that provides a description of all of the proposals considered by the work group, and some background information on the progress of the work group (e.g., cost drivers considered, guidelines used to consider the various proposals, etc.).
- The package would not include any recommendations, but would identify those proposals still under consideration.
- This would provide the Program Directors with the opportunity to review the progress of the work group prior to the discussions at the General Session.
- The work group would request feedback at the General Session and the Program Directors would be encouraged to provide written comments following the conference (with a May 15 deadline).
- Following the conference, the feedback submitted by the Program Directors would be considered by the work group. However, it is understood that those comments would not reflect the official positions of the Tribes and States. When the work group comes to agreement on one or more proposals, a formal request will be made to the Tribal and State leaders for their input.

The work group members discussed the content of the package to be sent to the Program Directors. Nancy will prepare a draft package that will include the following:

- Cover page;
- List of work group members with contact information (i.e., email address and phone number);
- A brief history of efforts to develop a new funding methodology, and noting USDA's commitment to establish a new funding methodology;
- The guidelines used by the work group for considering funding methodology proposals (including the requirement that any proposal offered by the work group must include a gradual implementation plan to minimize dramatic changes in funding from year to year);
- A chart showing current Regional division of funds as percentage of total funds, with current participation rate as percentage of National participation level; and
- A description of the methodologies discussed by the work group, with disadvantages and advantages listed.

The work group will discuss the draft package during an upcoming conference call.

▪ **Funds provided to the North Dakota (ND) and Montana (MT) State Agencies for Administrative Functions (including warehousing and multi-food deliveries)**

Nancy explained that administrative funds are paid to the ND and MT State agencies to oversee the operations of local agencies. Included in those funds are monies to cover the cost of warehousing and transporting multi-food shipments from State-level warehouses to local agencies within and outside the States. In addition to making shipments to local agencies within their State, ND makes shipments to a South Dakota ITO, and MT makes shipments to ITOs in Wyoming and Utah. Although this issue does not have to be addressed prior to the NAFDPIR conference, the work group does need to address how administrative funding will be provided to ND and MT under the proposed funding methodologies.

[The grant amount calculation under Option 6B (the proposal developed in Dallas) calculates funding for the local agencies that are overseen by MD and MT, but does not address the administrative funding of the State agencies. There are three additional State administered programs—Nevada (which administers the program at the State level), Oregon (which passes all of the administrative funds through to the local agency, and North Carolina (which manages program expenditures at the State level).]

- **The next conference call is scheduled for Thursday, April 6 from 3-4:30pm Eastern time.**