BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

The Mississippi Gulf Coast Forest Restoration and Conservation Initiative

PROPOSAL NUMBER

USDA-3

LOCATION

MS Gulf Coastal Plain

SPONSOR(S)

Department of Agriculture

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

Planning, Technical Assistance

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:

Budget narrative written at high level; specificity of discrete projects are found in the body of the proposal narrative but dollar amounts are not directly linked. While the overall budget appears reasonable, further delineation of costs would be helpful to decision-makers.

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.