BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Coastal Alabama Comprehensive Watershed Restoration Planning Project

PROPOSAL NUMBER

AL-3

LOCATION

Coastal and Intertidal 12-digit HUC Watersheds in Mobile and Baldwin Counties, Alabama

SPONSOR(S)

Alabama

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:

The line item for Watershed Plan Development (which is roughly 86% of the total proposal cost) does not provide specificity as to what dollar amounts are to be spent on specific activities. The activities are specified in the proposal narrative, but with no layout of what costs are associated with each activity.

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.