BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

GULF of MEXICO ESTUARY PROGRAM

PROPOSAL NUMBER

EPA-3

LOCATION

Gulf Coast estuaries: Lower Laguna Madre (TX); San Antonio/Matagorda Bays (TX); Sabine/Neches (TX);Calcasieu/Mermentau Basin (LA); Atchafalaya/Vermillion (LA); Mississippi Sound (MS); Perdido (AL,FL); Pensacola (FL); Choctawhatchee (FL); St. Andrews (FL); Apalachicola (FL); Suwannee (FL)

SPONSOR(S)

Environmental Protection Agency

TYPE OF FUNDING REQUESTED (Planning, Technical Assistance, Implementation)

Planning/Technical Assistance/Implementation

Ebonye T. Allen

REVIEWED BY:

27 January 2015

DATE:

High-Level Budget Narrative

Does the narrative include a budget summarizing these major categories of effort and includes costs associated?

	YES	NO	N/A
1. Construction	○	○	◉
2. Implementation	◉	○	○
3. Monitoring	○	○	◉
4. Adaptive Management	○	○	◉
5. Planning	◉	○	○
6. Environmental Compliance	○	○	◉
7. Engineering and Design	○	○	◉

	YES	NO	N/A
8. Operations	●	○	○
9. Maintenance	○	○	●
10. Adaptation (including what will happen with project if deauthorized/decommissioned)	○	○	●
11. Overhead/indirect Costs	●	○	○
12. Contingency	○	○	●
13. Data Management	○	●	○
14. Is there any element of the budget that appears unreasonable?	○	●	○

Notes:

This budget reasonableness review does not replace the more in-depth budget/financial reporting review that is required before a federal grant or interagency agreement can be awarded. Should this proposal be selected for funding, the proposing entity must comply with all budget and financial performance reporting in federal grants and interagency agreements.