



**Request for City Council Committee Action  
From the Department of Health & Family Support**

**Date:** AUGUST 3, 2007  
**To:** HEALTH, ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
**Referral to:** WAYS & MEANS/BUDGET COMMITTEE  
**Subject:** INCREASE APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL GRANT

**Recommendation:**

Council authorization for the proper City officials to:

1. to accept an estimated additional revenue of \$116,500 for a federal grant for Reproductive Health Services for young males in Minneapolis, and
2. increase both the revenue budget (revenue source code 3210) and the 2007 appropriation in fund/org 0300-860-8618 by \$116,500.

**Previous Directives:**

November 7, 2003 authorization to receive a five year federal research grant of up to \$1,300,000 to improve reproductive health services for young males in Minneapolis

**Prepared or Submitted by:** Becky McIntosh, Director of Planning & Administration  
Phone: x2884

**Approved by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gretchen Musicant, Commissioner of Health

**Permanent Review Committee (PRC):** Approval \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable X  
**Policy Review Group (PRG)** Approval \_\_\_\_ Date of Approval \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable X

**Presenters in Committee:** Gretchen Musicant, Commissioner of Health

**Financial Impact (Check those that apply)**

- X Action requires an appropriation increase to the \_\_\_\_ Capital Budget or X Operating Budget.  
X Action provides increased revenue for appropriation increase.

**Background/Supporting Information Attached**

In 2003 the Department received a five year federal grant to improve reproductive health services for young males in Minneapolis totaling \$1.3 million for the period. This was based on an expected annual amount of \$260,000. Over time, however, the annual grant awards have been increased and the appropriated amount for the grant is now insufficient to cover the actual revenue. This request is to increase the appropriation to reflect the increased amount awarded for this grant.

Lynn, for appropriation purposes, I'm thinking it doesn't matter that funds were allowed to be carried over, thus increasing the award, that only the base awards count (highlighted in yellow). Am I correct? If yes, that would mean we are short \$116,500. A second part to the question is whether we should request this exact amount, or round it off to \$120K, or what? Pat's notes on this are below. Thanks.

Bill, we originally asked Council for approval of \$1.3 million (5 times the year 1 award of \$260,000). Because our Year 5 award will put us over this approved amount, we will need to seek approval again. I think the total in column 3 would be the accurate one - but it is a little confusing because the second NGA in Years 2 and 3 included an award of unexpended funds from the previous year, in a sense counting this money twice. You may want to check with Becky on which figure we use. Here's all the detail:

Notice of Grant Awards			
Project Year	Award Date	Amount	Comment
Year 1	09/30/03	\$260,000	
Year 2	09/24/04	\$267,500	
	03/28/05	\$312,059	Includes award of \$44,559 in unexpended Year 1 funds
Year 3	09/27/05	\$279,000	
	03/13/06	\$306,211	Includes award of \$27,211 in unexpended Year 2 funds
Year 4	09/21/06	\$300,000	Includes additional funding for required evaluation activities
Year 5	Requested	\$310,000	
<b>Total of maximum annual awards (in boldface)</b>		<b>\$1,488,270</b>	Note: if we did not include the re-award of unexpended funds, the total would be <b>\$1,416,500.</b>