

**FDPIR Funding Work Group
September 12, 2006 Conference Call Notes**

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

Melanie Casey was ill and could not facilitate the conference call.

General comments from the work group members: Nancy Theodore asked the work group members if they had any general comments.

- Red Gates said he was asked how certain FDPIR programs came to be administered by States and whether FNS could require that only ITOs could administer the program. Nancy Theodore pointed out that the regulations provide for the administration of FDPIR by ITOs if they are capable, but a State agency may administer the program if an ITO is not capable. Limiting the administration of FDPIR to ITOs might result in a loss of service to certain areas. For example, the Nevada State agency administers FDPIR on behalf of 10 Tribes. If the State agency was prevented from administering the program, there is a risk that none of the 10 Tribes would be able to take over the administration of the program.

Percentage of set-aside for Regional Negotiated Funding Amount – Following the September 6, 2006 conference call, Nancy Theodore asked the work group members to respond by email on their preference for the percentage to be used in the preliminary recommendation. Nancy reported that 10 members responded: 3 prefer 10%; 6 prefer 15%; 1 member responded that she would go with the majority vote. As a result of the work group’s discussion, it was agreed that 15% would be used in the preliminary recommendation, although the recommendation would note that 10% had also been considered. Tribal and State leaders will be asked to provide input.

Revisions to Attachment C – Attachment C describes the preliminary recommendation and the calculations for the Regional Negotiated Funding Amounts and the Basic Grant Amounts. Nancy Theodore revised Attachment C based on decisions that were made by the work group in the September 6, 2006 conference call. Nancy asked the work group members if any additional changes were needed. Minor word changes were offered.

Attachment C1 – Attachment C1 provides examples of how the Regional Negotiated Funding Amounts and the Basic Grant Amounts are calculated. Nancy Theodore asked the work group members if they thought Attachment C1 might be helpful to the Tribal/State leaders in understanding the preliminary

recommendations. This generated some discussion on how to respond to requests from Tribal leaders who want to see a demonstration of how the preliminary recommendation would impact their funding. The data needed to provide an accurate picture of allocation amounts at implementation (i.e., FY 2008 Federal appropriation amount, FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 participation data, FY 2004, 2005, and 2006 ITO/State agency expenditure data) is not available at this time. In addition, there is no way to know how the FNS Regional Offices would distribute the Regional Negotiated Funding Amount among the ITOs/State agencies. Therefore, any demonstration of the preliminary recommendation must include caveats that the allocation amounts listed are inaccurate and relatively meaningless. Don DeBoer noted that the work group's recommendation regarding gradual implementation should help allay any concerns about funding cuts.

As a result of the discussion, the majority of the work group members did not want to include Attachment C1 in the preliminary recommendation. Laura Castro suggested that Attachment C1 may be adapted for presentation during the consultation meetings.

Q&As – First, the work group reviewed the eight questions developed at the July meeting. Five of the questions had already been included in Attachment D (version 3), a compilation of Q&As that was provided to the work group members prior to the conference call. The three remaining questions from the July list will be incorporated in Attachment D or Attachment A, Background.

The work group also reviewed the 18 questions in Attachment D (version 3) and four additional questions offered by work group members. The purpose of the review was to determine if the questions were relevant or whether any questions should be deleted. Based on the discussions of the work group some of the questions will be reworded and the Q&As will be reorganized.

Consultation – Laura Castro reported that a proposal to attend the upcoming NCAI convention as part of the consultation process no longer appears to be viable. It does not appear that the work group will complete the preliminary recommendation package prior to the NCAI convention the first week of October. Also, FNS' Administrator, Roberto Salazar, has conflicting speaking engagements that week and would be unable to attend the NCAI convention. Other consultation options, including regional meetings, have been presented to the Administrator.

Next Conference Call – Nancy Theodore will contact the work group members to determine availability in October. She indicated that at least two conference calls may be needed to complete the remaining assignments.

Assignments:

Work Group Member(s)	Action	Due Date
Nancy Theodore	Revise Attachment D, Q&As, based on discussion in 9/12/06 conference call	--
All Work Group Members	Review the draft Q&As and provide the input to Nancy T. via email	prepare to discuss in next call (TBD)
Don DeBoer	Recommend a proposal for the handling of administrative funding for the MT and ND State agencies	prepare to report to work group in next call (TBD)

Work Group Member(s)	Action	Due Date
All Work Group Members	Provide input to Nancy T. via email on the how Nutrition Education funding should be allocated in conjunction with the preliminary recommendation	prepare to discuss in next call (TBD)
All Work Group Members	Review draft Action Plan and provide suggested changes to Nancy T. via email	prepare to discuss in upcoming call (TBD)
Nancy Theodore	Forward draft preliminary recommendation package to work group members	completed 8/24/06
All Work Group Members	Review cover letter and attachments of the draft preliminary recommendation package and provide Nancy T. with suggested changes via email	prepare to discuss in upcoming call (TBD)
FNS lead, with input from Work Group Members	Develop a plan for consultation	Nancy T. will report to work group on the Administrator's response to the decision memo