BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Apalachicola Bay Watershed Restoration

PROPOSAL NUMBER

FL-2

LOCATION

Apalachicola Watershed within Florida

SPONSOR(S)

Florida

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

Planning/Technical Assistance/Implementation

Ben Scaggs

REVIEWED BY:

12/2/14

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:

While the budget summary table does not contain separate cost categories for construction, monitoring, adaptive management, environmental compliance, engineering and design, operation, maintenance, and data management, the budget narrative indicates those cost categories are included as part of the implementation cost category.

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.