BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Beneficial Use of Dredged Material to Create Emergent Tidal Marsh in Upper Mobile Bay

PROPOSAL NUMBER

ACOE-5

LOCATION

Mobile County, AL

SPONSOR(S)

Department of the Army

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

Planning, Implementation

Ben Scaggs

REVIEWED BY:

12/1/14

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 estimate appear reasonable based on previous/similar Army Corps of Engineers work done elsewhere. Budget narrative in this proposal lacks specificity on cost categories and no information is provided on how total budget estimate was derived.

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.