

**FDPIR Funding Work Group
February 21, 2007 Conference Call Notes**

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

Following the roll call, Nancy Theodore asked Mary Trottier and/or Red Gates to explain to the work group Mary Trottier's role in participating in the conference call. Red explained that the ITOs/State agencies in the Mountain Plains Region had been asked to volunteer to participate on the work group to ensure Regional balance on the work group members. Mary Trottier is the tentative appointee from the Mountain Plains Region. Red confirmed that written notification of Mary Trottier's appointment would be provided.

Review of draft notes from February 8, 2007 conference call - Nancy Theodore asked if any of the work group members wanted changes made to the draft notes. Two changes were offered:

- 1) On page 3 of the draft notes, change "Linday Rayon" to "Nancy Egan" in the last bullet in the section on the January 31, 2007 Senate Committee Hearing.
- 2) Red Gates will provide additional written comments on the Rapid City meeting (page 2 of the draft notes).

General comments from the work group members on the February 8, 2007 conference call - Nancy Theodore asked the work group members if anyone had any comments about the February 8, 2007 conference call. No comments were offered.

Review of Group Decision Making Processes – Melanie Casey reviewed the material she covered in the February 8, 2007 conference call and the handout provided to the work group members. This was

followed by a discussion by the work group on the various decision making options that may be employed in group situations. Some of the comments by the work group members are summarized below:

- Linday Rayon asked about resolving issues when there are polar opposites.
- Thomas Yellowhair commented that as the work group moves forward to a final recommendation the options may be primarily limited to consensus.
- Red Gates commented that “consensus” was not a term he was familiar with, and he has had questions about the concept of reaching consensus since the work group began. He stated that he still has some questions about “consensus,” although none that he wished to address at the moment.
- Nancy Egan commented that WAFDPIR had requested that a facilitator be added to the work group to help the work group in its discussions. She pointed out that the options of “compromise” and “consensus” had been used by the work group during the June 2006 meeting in developing the preliminary proposal.

Discussion of balance of work group members, and role of ITO/State Food Distribution Program representatives on the work group –

Nancy Theodore reported that comments were made at the Rapid City meeting concerning the membership of the work group, and concerns were expressed that the Mountain Plains Region was under represented. She also reported that Roberto Salazar promised to ask the work group to find a way to include additional representation from the Mountain Plains Region. She asked the work group members to comment on the proposal to include additional representation from the Mountain Plains Region. Some of the comments by the work group members are summarized below:

- Thomas Yellowhair read from the Rapid City meeting transcript and confirmed that Mr. Salazar stated that he would ask the work group to “find a way to include additional representation” from Mountain Plains Region and that the work group will determine how to do that.
- Several work group members commented on their understanding of how the work group composition was originally determined.
- It was agreed that the Mountain Plains Region would advise the work group of its appointee.

There was also a discussion of the role of the NAFDPIR President on the work group.

- Nancy Theodore asked Tony Nertoli to confirm his understanding of his role, i.e., whether it was his role as the NAFDPIR President to solely represent all ITOs/State, or did he also represent his region. Tony confirmed that his role was to represent all ITOs/State agencies, not the MWRO.
- Elvira Jarka commented that the MWRO was under represented since Susie Roy was the only representative of the ITOs in the Midwest Region, and she proposed the addition of another work group member from that region.
- It was agreed that Nancy Theodore would contact Susie Roy on behalf of the work group and ask Susie to seek a representative from the ITOs in the Midwest Region. [Nancy attempted to contact Susie, but she is out of the office until February 26. Nancy will try to reach Susie when she returns to the office.]

Another issue concerning membership was raised. Both the WAFDPIR and NAFDPIR are holding elections this year. Several work group members are elected officials in these associations and their continued involvement in the work group is in question if they are not reelected.

- A request was made to address this at the meeting in April.
- Nancy Theodore suggested that the work group may want to send a letter to the associations requesting that the work group members continue in their capacity on the work group despite any

changes that result from the election. She suggested that this be discussed in future calls/meetings of the work group.

- Madeline Viens suggested that a letter be sent soon to the WAFDPIR, since the association will be meeting in March and holding their elections at that time.

Discussion of change in FNS' position on streamlining the funding allocation process – Nancy

Theodore reported that Roberto Salazar and Kate Houston have considered the comments expressed at the meetings with Tribal leaders in January 2007 and have reconsidered FNS' position on streamlining the FDPIR funding allocation process. Although federal program resources are expected to continue to shrink, FNS does not believe it would be in the best interest of the program if streamlining efforts jeopardized the ability of the ITOs and State agencies to negotiate 100 percent of their federal funding. However, this does not mean that the FNS has given up on the goal of an objective and equitable funding allocation process. FNS believes that there is still an urgent need for a change in the way funds are allocated to the Regional Offices. Mr. Salazar would like the work group to consider alternatives that would preserve the ability of ITOs/State agencies to negotiate their federal funding with the Regional Offices, while providing an objective and equitable means of allocating the available funding among the Regional Offices.

- It was requested that Mr. Salazar provide his request in writing so the work group is clear on what it is being asked to consider.
- Tony Nertoli commented on a January 5, 2007 letter from Mr. Salazar that concerned the NAFDPIR Resolution 2006-03. Tony read from that letter. Nancy Theodore also confirmed that no decision on implementation of the Resolution had been made by FNS as of the date of the conference call. The January 5, 2007 letter explained that the final appropriation for FDPIR was in question until Congress took action. It was not known whether FDPIR would receive an increase over the FY 2006 appropriation. Consequently, FNS was unable to provide a final decision on the Resolution request from NAFDPIR until Congressional action on the FY 2007 appropriation is completed. The appropriation issue was not resolved until February 15.
- A work group member questioned whether actual negotiations are being conducted given the limited funding in some regions.
- Mary Trottier explained how the negotiation process worked in the Mountain Plains Region.
- This topic will be discussed further in the next conference call. As indicated above, the work group is requesting written confirmation from Mr. Salazar, and discussions are needed on what this change means in regard to how the work group should proceed.

Next Conference Call – March 8, 3-4:30pm Eastern Time