BUDGET REASONABLENESS REVIEW

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Egmont Key Restoration and Storm Damage Reduction

PROPOSAL NUMBER

ACOE-T-1

LOCATION

Hillsborough/Tampa Regional Area, Florida

SPONSOR(S)

Department of the Army

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

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:

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.