## **Defense Environmental Programs**

## **Annual Report to Congress**

for FY 2016

CLEARED For Open Publication

Jul 31, 2018

Department of Defense
OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW



## **June 2018**

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment

The estimated cost of this report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$46,000 in Fiscal Years 2016 - 2017. This includes \$33,000 in expenses and \$12,000 in DoD labor.

Generated on 2018Jan17 RefID: 1-8536ED5

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLES	ii
APPENDICES	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM	3
Environmental Restoration Goals	3
IRP Site Status and Funding	5
MRS Status and Funding.	7
BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding	8
III. EQ PROGRAMS	10
Compliance	10
Overall Trend Analysis	11
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	11
Natural and Cultural Resources	11
Overall Trend Analysis	12
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	12
Pollution Prevention	13
Overall Trend Analysis	13
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	14
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS	15
Overall Trend Analysis	15
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	16
Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals	16
V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES	18
Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana	18
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico	18
Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range (CMAGR), California	18
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, California	18
Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS), China Lake, California	18
VI. FY 2016 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUNDING AND REASONS FOR	R 19

## **TABLES**

Table 1:	Overall DoD Environmental Program Funding	2
Table 2:	Environmental Restoration Goals and Progress	4
Table 3:	IRP Site Status	5
Table 4:	IRP Funding	6
Table 5:	MRS Status	7
Table 6:	MMRP Funding	8
Table 7:	BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding	8
Table 8:	BRAC Funding Breakout	9
Table 9:	Compliance Program Funding	11
Table 10	: Natural and Cultural Resources Funding	13
Table 11	: Pollution Prevention Program Funding	14
Table 12	: Environmental Technology Program Funding	16

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

This Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 contains information to satisfy the following requirements:

- The funding invested in and progress of the Department of Defense's (DoD) environmental programs Environmental Restoration, Environmental Quality (EQ), and Environmental Technology in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2711 (Sections II-IV);
- The Department's ongoing decontamination activities on withdrawn or reserved lands in accordance with section 2916(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66) (Section V); and
- A list of DoD installations and Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) properties where DoD obligated funding in FY 2016, as well as reasons for increases in cleanup cost estimates since FY 2015, in accordance with language in House Report 113-113, accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014 (Section VI, Appendix A, and Appendix B).

DoD continues to support military readiness and the Warfighter by protecting the environment to ensure that DoD has the land, water, and airspace needed to perform the mission; by protecting the health of the military and civilian personnel and their families who live and work on DoD bases; and by working with surrounding communities to ensure that DoD operations can continue unimpeded. DoD is committed to continuous improvement, greater efficiency, and the use of new technology where feasible. In FY 2016, DoD obligated approximately \$3.6 billion for its environmental programs. This includes \$1.6 billion for environmental restoration activities, \$1.8 billion for EQ activities, and \$189 million for environmental technology activities. In the FY 2018 President's Budget (PB), DoD requested \$3.4 billion for its environmental programs to continue ensuring the protection of human health and the environment, and to sustain the resources required to support the readiness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Table 1 summarizes the overall DoD environmental program funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018.

Table 1: Overall DoD Environmental Program Funding (millions of dollars)\*

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested		
Environmental Restoration									
Active Installations and FUDS	\$1,521.2	\$1,352.6	\$1,286.5	\$1,221.0	\$1,161.1	\$1,082.3	\$1,008.6		
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Locations <sup>+</sup>	\$545.0	\$472.9	\$697.5	\$609.6	\$415.5	\$349.4	\$220.3**		
Restoration Total	\$2,066.2	\$1,825.5	\$1,984.0	\$1,830.6	\$1,576.6	\$1,431.7	\$1,228.9		
EQ									
Compliance	\$1,388.4	\$1,347.3	\$1,379.5	\$1,306.0	\$1,271.8	\$1,511.8	\$1,442.7		
Natural and Cultural Resources	\$387.7	\$384.3	\$444.6	\$377.2	\$443.4	\$429.0	\$424.2		
Pollution Prevention	\$97.9	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$75.4		
EQ Total	\$1,874.0	\$1,797.1	\$1,921.3	\$1,777.5	\$1,802.3	\$2,008.0	\$1,942.3		
Environmental Technology	Environmental Technology								
Technology Total	\$213.6	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$202.6		
DoD Total <sup>++</sup>	\$4,153.8	\$3,817.7	\$4,108.5	\$3,792.6	\$3,568.3	\$3,622.7	\$3,373.8		

<sup>\*</sup> Includes all applicable congressional funding additions for FY 2012 through FY 2017.

For more information on DoD's environmental programs, please visit: http://www.denix.osd.mil.

<sup>+</sup> BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue. Omits Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) actuals.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Excludes \$50.5 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

<sup>++</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

#### II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

The Department began environmental restoration in 1975 under its Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The IRP addresses contamination from hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations in the United States. In 2001, DoD established its Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) to address former defense sites (referred to as munitions response sites (MRSs)) known or suspected to contain unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents. Through these programs, DoD complies with applicable environmental laws, such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), also known as Superfund.

The Department remains focused on continuously improving its environmental restoration program by updating relevant policies, working with stakeholders, and developing and implementing new advanced technologies to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup. These initiatives help ensure that DoD makes the best use of available resources to steadily move sites through the cleanup process and achieve program goals while protecting human health, safety, and the environment. The Department measures cleanup progress against the Response Complete (RC) milestone, which occurs when the cleanup activities are complete (although DoD or a subsequent owner may continue to monitor the site). Of the more than 39,700 IRP sites and MRSs in the inventory, DoD has achieved the RC milestone at almost 32,900 sites (83 percent).

#### **Environmental Restoration Goals**

The Department relies on environmental restoration goals to drive cleanup progress toward achieving the RC milestone. The DoD Components prioritize resources to meet the goals listed in Table 2 in a cost-effective manner. The goals demonstrate progress in a streamlined and transparent fashion.

The Department's newest environmental restoration goal, established in FY 2014, focuses on reducing the risk that FUDS MRSs could pose to human health and the environment. The goal is to implement interim risk management or start a munitions response action at 90 percent of FUDS MRSs that have not achieved RC by the end of FY 2018. The Department began interim risk management activities in FY 2015. These activities include mailing letters to property owners that provide explosives safety education material and establishing a call center to answer questions.

Table 2 lists the RC goals and summarizes the Department's progress toward achieving them. The table presents the number of sites subject to these goals; the total number and percentage of sites that have achieved the goals from the beginning of the program through FY 2016; the number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals in FY 2017 and FY 2018; and the total number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals from the beginning of the program through FY 2018.

Table 2: RC Goals and Progress\*

Goals	Number of Sites Subject to the Goals	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites that Achieved the Goals through FY 2016	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2017	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2018	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals through FY 2018
Achieve RC at 90% and 95% of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations and IRP sites at FUDS properties by the end of FY 2018 and FY 2021, respectively	37,242	31,717 (85%)	716 (2%)	950 (3%)	33,383 (90%)

<sup>\*</sup> Excludes potentially responsible party sites, which are sites where DoD has identified an individual or company that is potentially responsible for contributing to the contamination. Also excludes sites where a DoD Component cannot obtain rights of entry to complete investigations.

Through FY 2016, the Department achieved RC at 85 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties. DoD is currently on track to meet the FY 2018 RC goal but projects falling just short of the FY 2021 RC goal; DoD projects achieving RC at 94 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties, by the end of FY 2021. These projections are based on the sites in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) inventory as of the end of FY 2016.

Additional information about the status of DoD's cleanup efforts and funding can be found on the DoD Cleanup Landing website at http://www.denix.osd.mil/cleanup/.

#### **IRP Site Status and Funding**

Table 3 summarizes the cleanup status of IRP sites at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations. The table presents the number of sites in the inventory, the number of sites at Remedy In Place (RIP)<sup>1</sup> and RC through FY 2015 and FY 2016, and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2015 to FY 2016.

**Table 3: IRP Site Status** 

		RIP			RC		
	Total IRP Inventory (FY 2016)	Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2015	Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2016	Change in RIP Status from FY 2015 to FY 2016	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2015	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2016	Change in RC Status from FY 2015 to FY 2016
Active Installations							
Army	11,263	10,477	10,525	48	10,202	10,250	48
Department of the Navy (DON)*	4,034	3,728	3,739	11	3,396	3,473	77
Air Force	7,254	5,840	5,995	155	5,231	5,453	222
DLA	215	194	195	1	185	186	1
Active Total	22,766	20,239	20,454	215	19,014	19,362	348
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	3,104	2,461	2,548	87	2,424	2,512	88
BRAC Locations							
Army	2,108	1,996	1,999	3	1,952	1,960	8
DON*	1,130	1,057	1,068	11	900	907	7
Air Force	5,133	4,879	4,906	27	4,717	4,768	51
DLA	48	48	48	0	47	47	0
BRAC Total	8,419	7,980	8,021	41	7,616	7,682	66
DoD Total	34,289	30,680	31,023	343	29,054	29,556	502

<sup>\*</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

FY 2016 Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Department measures the number of sites at RIP, which occurs when cleanup systems are constructed and operational.

Table 4 summarizes IRP funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

Table 4: IRP Funding\* (millions of dollars)

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested			
Active Installations										
Army	\$274.8	\$212.8	\$201.9	\$216.8	\$200.5	\$139.6	\$165.1			
DON⁺	\$259.3	\$239.0	\$262.1	\$240.9	\$243.5	\$238.5	\$230.7			
Air Force	\$481.2	\$431.2	\$403.4	\$398.2	\$352.9	\$333.1	\$268.9			
Defense-wide**	\$11.6	\$10.7	\$11.0	\$7.9	\$5.8	\$6.6	\$9.0			
Active Total	\$1,026.9	\$893.7	\$878.4	\$863.9	\$802.8	\$717.8	\$673.6			
FUDS Properties										
FUDS Total	\$226.5	\$195.2	\$172.3	\$143.8	\$156.5	\$149.4	\$152.2			
BRAC Locations**										
Army	\$90.2	\$86.5	\$207.2	\$106.1	\$66.7	\$43.9	\$43.7			
DON <sup>+</sup>	\$213.4	\$164.9	\$119.2	\$181.1	\$149.9	\$148.9	\$122.7			
Air Force	\$92.3	\$118.9	\$154.3	\$94.1	\$79.0	\$81.9	\$45.6			
Defense-wide**	\$0.0	\$3.7	\$3.2	\$2.6	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.2			
BRAC Total	\$395.9	\$374.0	\$483.8	\$384.0	\$297.7	\$277.2	\$214.2			
DoD Total***	\$1,649.3	\$1,462.9	\$1,534.4	\$1,391.6	\$1,256.9	\$1,144.5	\$1,040.0			

<sup>\*</sup> This table includes funding for all program management requirements at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

In recent years, the presence of perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in drinking water has become an emerging issue. PFOS and PFOA are part of a class of man-made chemicals used in many industrial and consumer products to make the products resist heat, stains, water, and grease. In the 1970s, DoD began using aqueous film forming foam (AFFF), which contains PFOS, and in some cases PFOA. AFFF is mission critical because it quickly extinguishes petroleum-based fires. On May 19, 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued Lifetime Health Advisories (LHAs) recommending the individual or combined levels of PFOS and PFOA in drinking water be below 70 parts per trillion. While it is only guidance under the Safe Drinking Water Act and is not a required or enforceable drinking water standard, DoD began taking actions to address impacted drinking water based on the new LHA.

The Department followed a comprehensive approach to identify installations where DoD used AFFF containing PFOS or PFOA. As of December 31, 2016, DoD has identified 393 active and BRAC installations with one or more areas where there is a known or suspected release of PFOS and/or PFOA. This list includes sites that DoD is currently addressing as part of its DERP, and new areas not currently included in the DERP (e.g., airplane crash sites, aircraft hangar suppression systems). These known or suspected PFOS and PFOA release areas are in various stages of assessment, investigation, and cleanup. Throughout the CERCLA process, DoD will work in concert with regulatory agencies and communities and will share information

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>++</sup> FY 2012 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

in an open and transparent manner. Now that DoD has an initial list of known and suspected release areas, the DoD Components are following the CERCLA process to investigate these releases to confirm if a release occurred. The DoD Components will collect information on the nature and extent of the releases to determine if cleanup actions are necessary. The Department considers the EPA's health advisory information when addressing risk to human health under its cleanup program consistent with EPA risk assessment guidance. DoD expects that environmental cleanup costs will increase due to the investigation and cleanup of PFOS and PFOA. As additional information becomes available, DoD will include a best estimate of these costs in our environmental cleanup costs. As of December 31, 2016, the Department has spent approximately \$202 million on sampling, analysis, and response actions to address PFOS and PFOA.

#### **MRS Status and Funding**

Table 5 summarizes the cleanup status of MRSs at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations. The table presents the number of MRSs in the inventory; the number of MRSs at RIP and RC through FY 2015 and FY 2016; and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2015 to FY 2016.

**Table 5: MRS Status** 

		RIP				RC	
	Total MRS Inventory (FY 2016)	Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2015	Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2016	Change in RIP Status from FY 2015 to FY 2016	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2015	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2016	Change in RC Status from FY 2015 to FY 2016
Active Installations							
Army	1,367	1,099	1,131	32	1,098	1,129	31
DON*	401	164	176	12	163	171	8
Air Force	1,045	713	748	35	697	743	46
DLA	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Active Total	2,820	1,976	2,055	79	1,958	2,043	85
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	2,253	868	1,001	133	868	1,001	133
BRAC Locations							
Army	178	125	126	1	125	126	1
DON*	40	19	18	-1	19	18	-1
Air Force	139	124	124	0	121	121	0
DLA <sup>+</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BRAC Total	357	268	268	0	265	265	0
DoD Total	5,430	3,112	3,324	212	3,091	3,309	218

<sup>\*</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

Table 6 summarizes MMRP funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

Table 6: MMRP Funding (millions of dollars)\*

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested		
Active Installations									
Army	\$71.3	\$76.7	\$67.5	\$53.1	\$34.3	\$30.6	\$50.8		
DON⁺	\$48.6	\$48.2	\$53.9	\$45.4	\$56.2	\$50.8	\$50.8		
Air Force	\$44.5	\$56.2	\$16.1	\$30.8	\$15.0	\$38.4	\$24.9		
Defense-wide**	\$1.6	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$2.6	\$1.6	\$0.0		
Active Total	\$166.0	\$181.5	\$137.6	\$129.3	\$108.2	\$121.3	\$126.4		
FUDS Properties									
FUDS Total	\$101.8	\$82.0	\$98.2	\$84.1	\$93.7	\$93.6	\$56.5		
BRAC Locations**									
Army	\$46.6	\$38.6	\$129.9	\$181.8	\$42.1	\$48.2	\$36.1		
DON <sup>+</sup>	\$33.5	\$38.1	\$14.4	\$22.0	\$11.8	\$12.3	\$8.8		
Air Force	\$4.1	\$0.3	\$5.0	\$2.6	\$1.1	\$0.4	\$0.0		
Defense-wide**	N/A								
BRAC Total	\$84.2	\$77.1	\$149.3	\$206.4	\$55.0	\$60.9	\$44.9		
DoD Total***	\$351.9	\$340.6	\$385.2	\$419.8	\$256.9	\$275.9	\$227.7		

<sup>\*</sup> This table does not include program management for the MMRP.

#### **BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding**

Table 7 summarizes funding for planning and compliance projects, such as facility assessments and surveys, at BRAC locations from FY 2012 through FY 2018.

**Table 7: BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding\* (millions of dollars)** 

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested			
BRAC Locations	BRAC Locations									
Army	\$41.6	\$21.1	\$46.9	\$18.5	\$64.5	\$10.7	\$11.6			
DON⁺	\$3.6	\$0.2	\$0.7	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.1			
Air Force	\$19.8	\$0.6	\$16.7	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$0.5	\$0.0			
Defense-wide**	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0			
DoD Total**	\$65.0	\$21.9	\$64.3	\$19.2	\$64.9	\$11.2	\$11.6			

<sup>\*</sup> Includes prior year funds and land sale revenue.

Beginning in FY 2014, Congress consolidated the BRAC accounts, providing DoD with increased flexibility to use unobligated prior year funds across the BRAC cleanup inventory. The Department continues to use its remaining balances from prior years to supplement its

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA. DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>++</sup> FY 2012 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

<sup>+++</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program

<sup>\*\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

<sup>++</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

annual appropriations and use anticipated land sale revenue to meet annual BRAC cleanup funding needs. Table 8 summarizes BRAC funding, including annual appropriations, prior year funds, and land sale revenue from FY 2016 through FY 2018.

**Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout (millions of dollars)** 

	<b>-</b>		=14.0040
	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested*
Army			
Annual Appropriation	\$15.1	\$21.5	\$43.1
Prior Year Funds	\$69.7	\$29.0	\$20.4
Land Sale Revenue	\$88.5	\$52.4	\$27.8
Army Total Funding⁺	\$173.4	\$102.9	\$91.4
DON**			
Annual Appropriation	\$151.3	\$144.6	\$131.6
Prior Year Funds	\$10.6	\$6.6	\$0.0
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.0	\$10.0	\$0.0
DON Total Funding <sup>+</sup>	\$161.9	\$161.2	\$131.6
Air Force			
Annual Appropriation	\$51.9	\$50.4	\$45.6
Prior Year Funds	\$28.1	\$32.3	\$0.0
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.4	\$0.1	\$0.1
Air Force Total Funding <sup>+</sup>	\$80.3	\$82.8	\$45.6
DLA			
Annual Appropriation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Prior Year Funds**	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.2
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DLA Total Funding⁺	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.2
DoD Total <sup>+</sup>			
Annual Appropriation	\$218.3	\$216.5	\$220.3
Prior Year Funds	\$110.3	\$70.4	\$22.5
Land Sale Revenue	\$88.9	\$62.5	\$27.9
* EV 2018 amounts include enticipated by	\$417.5***	\$349.4***	\$270.8***

<sup>\*</sup> FY 2018 amounts include anticipated land sale revenue.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals and the DoD total may not equal FY totals.

<sup>\*\*</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

<sup>+++</sup> A portion of the prior year funds is from a settlement DLA received from Sunoco to perform cleanup activities at the former Defense Supply Center Philadelphia.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> This total differs from the value in Table 1 and the Operation & Maintenance Overview (\$415.5 million) because this value includes the \$2 million of prior year funds from DI A

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> This total differs from the value in Table 1 and the Operation & Maintenance Overview (\$220.3 million) because this value includes \$50.5 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

#### III. EQ PROGRAMS

The Department's EQ Programs address compliance with environmental laws and regulations, protection of natural and cultural resources on DoD lands, and pollution prevention. In FY 2014, DoD updated its budget-reporting format for these programs to increase consistency and provide additional detail and insight on funding allocations. Because of the change in format and definitions, the DoD Components have shifted funding between programs and re-categorized some of the funding. Therefore, it is not possible to compare FY 2016 obligations to pre-FY 2014 actual funding below the program level (i.e., compliance, conservation, pollution prevention).

#### **Compliance**

The DoD Compliance Program provides resources to comply with applicable requirements, such as Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations, for installations located in the United States. Additionally, the Compliance Program includes applicable environmental compliance, remediation, and planning requirements for installations located outside of the United States (i.e., overseas installations). Under this program, DoD activities include sampling and analyzing pollutant discharges to air and water, maintaining environmental permits for regulated activities, providing safe drinking water, and disposing of regulated waste. The Compliance Program also includes projects to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities and install air pollution controls to meet new regulatory standards. DoD strives for excellence in its Compliance Program. For example, in FY 2016, the Department maintained a Clean Water Act permit compliance rate above 90 percent and exceeded the national average drinking water compliance rate at 92 percent. In addition, DoD's solid waste diversion rate was 69 percent in calendar year 2016, about double the calendar year 2014 national recycling rate of 34.6 percent.

Table 9 summarizes Compliance Program funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

FY 2012 FY 2014 Actual FY 2013 FY 2018 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 Requested Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual \$380.2 \$419.7 Army \$341.6 \$389.6 \$347.6 \$368.6 \$397.5 Navy \$403.0 \$358.1 \$374.3 \$354.9 \$359.8 \$351.1 \$366.3 Air Force \$295.9 \$298.5 \$293.9 \$283.5 \$302.2 \$358.6 \$346.9 **Marine Corps** \$131.1 \$113.2 \$115.6 \$148.1 \$103.4 \$119.1 \$107.9 Defense-wide<sup>3</sup> \$216.8 \$187.7 \$215.5 \$171.9 \$137.8 \$285.5 \$201.9 DoD Total\* \$1,388.4 \$1,347.1 \$1,379.5 \$1,306.0 \$1,271.8 \$1,511.8 \$1,442.7

**Table 9: Compliance Program Funding (millions of dollars)** 

<sup>\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

#### **Overall Trend Analysis**

Overall Compliance Program funding decreased from FY 2012 through FY 2016, in part because the Budget Control Act led to a trend in reductions. For FY 2017, DoD total funding exceeded FY 2014 levels due to increased requests across most of the DoD Components to fund efforts delayed in FY 2015. For FY 2018, DoD anticipates that funding will decrease, partly due to completion of one-time military construction projects.

#### **Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts**

- From FY 2015 to FY 2016, funding for the Marine Corps decreased (-30.2 percent) due to the completion of a military construction project to meet drinking water standards at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina. The Department also experienced a decrease (-19.8 percent) in Defense-wide funding due to completion of DLA's compliance related cleanup and reductions in underground storage requirements.
- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, the Marine Corps 15.2 percent increase in funding was due to a \$12.8 million Clean Air Act project at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina, and increases in wastewater and storm water project funding. The 18.7 percent increase in Air Force funding was due to the additional funding for Manpower Cross Cutting Compliance Programs. In addition, Defense-wide funding increased by 107.2 percent due to two DLA military construction projects to replace petroleum, oil, and lubrication storage facilities at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, and Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipates that Defense-wide funding will decrease (-29.3 percent) due to completion of one-time military construction projects. Decreases are also due to reductions in DLA's compliance related cleanup and completed projects to meet underground storage requirements.

The Department is committed to ensuring safe drinking water for the people living and working on our installations. As such, in June 2016, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment directed the Military Departments to test for PFOS and PFOA worldwide where DoD supplies drinking water. Under this policy, DoD has tested 83 percent of the 515 drinking water systems as of March 2017. Where the test results were above the EPA LHA level, DoD is following the EPA advisory recommendations. Where DoD purchases drinking water, installations are encouraged to work with their drinking water supplier to test the drinking water if not already tested. If the results of these tests are above the EPA LHA level, the installation will work with the drinking water supplier to take appropriate actions.

#### **Natural and Cultural Resources**

The Department manages its natural and cultural resources and complies with existing laws (e.g., Endangered Species Act, Sikes Act, National Historic Preservation Act) to enable continued access to testing and training lands. This also ensures the long-term sustainability of our Nation's natural and cultural heritage. The Department manages approximately 27 million acres of land that contain high quality, unique habitats and provide food and shelter for more than 550 species-at-risk and more than 430 federally listed threatened or endangered species. Of

these, 61 listed species and 74 species-at-risk are only found on DoD lands. The Department also manages and maintains cultural resources at 337 DoD installations that contain nearly 130,000 archaeological sites.

Table 10 summarizes natural and cultural resources funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

FY 2012 FY 2013 FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 Army \$156.7 \$182.0 \$174.6 \$182.2 \$187.3 \$209.2 \$183.5 \$75.3 \$59.3 \$75.0 \$57.2 \$65.6 \$60.5 \$71.7 Navy \$88.4 Air Force \$68.1 \$58.7 \$80.0 \$53.4 \$53.4 \$51.7 \$35.7 \$46.1 \$27.3 \$26.8 \$36.8 \$37.4 **Marine Corps** \$34.8 Defense-wide\* \$51.9 \$49.5 \$68.9 \$57.1 \$75.3 \$69.1 \$79.9 \$444.6 \$377.2 \$443.4 \$424.2 DoD Total<sup>+</sup> \$387.7 \$384.3 \$429.0

**Table 10: Natural and Cultural Resources Funding (millions of dollars)** 

#### **Overall Trend Analysis**

Funding for natural and cultural resources activities increased overall between FY 2012 and FY 2014. This increase was primarily due to congressional funding additions from FY 2012 through FY 2014 related to conservation in support of ranges, and the DoD Components' funding to address threatened and endangered species requirements. Beginning in FY 2016, the DoD Components were able to increase the amount of funding for natural and cultural resources activities above FY 2013 levels. The Department will continue to meet legal requirements and funded items with FY 2017 deadlines that it needs to maintain military readiness in the year of execution. FY 2017 funding levels, increased from FY 2013, are a result of Army's need to address listed and at-risk species that were delayed by fiscal constraints caused by the Budget Control Act. For FY 2018, total funding is expected to remain relatively constant from FY 2017 levels.

#### **Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts**

- From FY 2015 to FY 2016, Navy funding increased 14.7 percent mostly due to an increase in natural resources manpower costs. Air Force funding increased 65.5 percent due to a \$16.6 million increase in executing the backlog of Integrated Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan requirements to promote sustainable ranges. Finally, Defense-wide funding increased 31.9 percent due to increases in Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) Program funds from the FY 2015 amounts.
- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding increased by 11.7 percent as listed and at-risk species funding grows to become the Army's largest single funding category. Marine Corps funding increased 37.3 percent due to increases in integrated natural resource planning as well as threatened and endangered species management. Air Force funding decreased (-39.6 percent) due to a return to previous funding levels.

<sup>\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

• From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Army requested funding will decrease (-12.3 percent) due to reduced costs for threatened and endangered species management and to update and implement Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans. The Department expects Navy funding to increase (18.5 percent) because of project management needs and challenges associated with managing agricultural lands. Defense-wide funding is expected to increase (15.6 percent) mostly due to increases in REPI Program funding.

#### **Pollution Prevention**

The Department created the Pollution Prevention Program to reduce or eliminate the use of hazardous materials, minimize waste generation, prevent natural resources losses, and reduce air emissions from industrial processes and pollutant discharges to wastewater treatment systems. DoD also implements energy, water, and fuel efficiency measures that, while not funded with environmental dollars, further reduce pollution and better use existing resources. Together, these pollution prevention investments have the potential to reduce costs throughout DoD. The flexible framework for this program not only helps DoD prioritize cost-effective initiatives, but also ensures safe, uninterrupted operations, and sustains military readiness.

Table 11 summarizes Pollution Prevention Program funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested
Army	\$37.4	\$23.9	\$31.6	\$36.2	\$27.4	\$21.2	\$23.1
Navy	\$11.7	\$6.6	\$7.4	\$4.1	\$8.3	\$4.2	\$4.2
Air Force	\$22.2	\$15.2	\$30.1	\$21.0	\$23.0	\$18.2	\$17.5
Marine Corps	\$21.4	\$15.8	\$21.2	\$20.7	\$13.4	\$12.9	\$15.4
Defense-wide*	\$5.2	\$4.0	\$6.9	\$12.3	\$15.0	\$10.7	\$15.2
DoD Total⁺	\$97.9	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$75.4

**Table 11: Pollution Prevention Program Funding (millions of dollars)** 

#### **Overall Trend Analysis**

Overall funding for the Pollution Prevention Program decreased from FY 2012 through FY 2015 with fluctuations that included a significant decrease in FY 2013 funding driven by reductions called for in the Budget Control Act. In addition, because Pollution Prevention is not directly linked to legal requirements, the DoD Components reduced pollution prevention funding to preserve funding for other programs. The Department experienced a decrease in FY 2016 funding because the Department used funds for compliance activities to meet legal requirements after Budget Control Act reductions. Pollution Prevention declines as the DoD Components apply funding to legal requirements in other EQ Programs. Declines in total funding continue from FY 2017 to FY 2018, with the completion of a Navy military construction project in 2016.

<sup>\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

#### **Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts**

- From FY 2015 to FY 2016, Army funding decreased (-24.3 percent) due to decreased investments in pollution prevention management and initiatives to reduce toxic and hazardous substances in the Army's supply chain. Navy funding increased by 102.4 percent due to a military construction project at Indian Island Washington to minimize air pollutant emissions. Marine Corps funding decreased (-35.3 percent) due to adjusted manpower costs and incorporating pollution prevention into everyday operating procedures. Defense-wide funding increased 22 percent.
- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding decreased (-22.6 percent) mostly due to efforts to reduce the use of hazardous material. Navy funding decreased by 49.4 percent due to the completion of the military construction project at Indian Island Washington. Air Force funding decreased 20.9 percent due to completion of some hazardous material reduction efforts. Defense-wide funding decreased 28.7 percent mainly due to lack of air pollution reduction efforts.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Marine Corps funding will increase 19.4 percent, mainly focusing on hazardous material/waste reduction and pollution prevention activities, and Defense-wide funding will increase 42.1 percent due to DLA overestimating the amount of funding required in FY 2017 in the PB 2017.

#### IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

OSD oversees the Military Departments' and Defense-wide environmental technology programs. OSD directly administers the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP).

Table 12 summarizes environmental technology program funding from FY 2012 through FY 2018 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense-wide accounts.

**Table 12: Environmental Technology Program Funding (millions of dollars)** 

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested				
Army*	Army*										
Army Total	\$54.2	\$45.5	\$47.5	\$44.9	\$54.7	\$60.3	\$55.6				
DON⁺											
DON Total	\$42.4	\$39.8	\$37.3	\$28.8	\$35.5	\$33.4	\$36.9				
Air Force											
Air Force Total	\$15.7	\$9.3	\$10.6	\$9.3	\$8.3	\$0.0	\$0.0				
Defense-wide	**										
SERDP**	\$64.2	\$58.6	\$62.3	\$56.4	\$54.3	\$63.2	\$71.8				
ESTCP**	\$31.8	\$38.0	\$39.8	\$39.4	\$31.3	\$21.2	\$32.2				
Deployed Warfighter Protection Program	\$5.3	\$3.9	\$5.6	\$5.7	\$5.3	\$4.9	\$6.1				
Defense- wide Total	\$101.3	\$100.5	\$107.7	\$101.4	\$90.9	\$89.3	\$110.1				
DoD Total***	\$213.6	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$202.6				

<sup>\*</sup> The National Defense Center for Energy and Environment is included in the Army Program line.

#### **Overall Trend Analysis**

The Department's funding for environmental technology decreased from FY 2012 to FY 2015 due to a lack of congressional earmarks and the reductions made to meet the Budget Control Act. However, funding increased again in FY 2016. Funding decreased in FY 2017 because DoD progressively captured environmental technology requirements in other funding lines such as material substitution, production processes, operation and maintenance, and weapons system acquisition program elements. The Department anticipates that funding will increase in FY 2018 due to additional investment in Defense-wide environmental technology initiatives, including research and product development to address PFOS and PFOA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> DON includes Navy and Marine Corps.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies.

<sup>++</sup> SERDP/ESTCP values are for environment only and do not include energy projects.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

#### **Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts**

- From FY 2015 to FY 2016, Army funding increased by 21.8 percent for pollution prevention projects, and Navy funding increased by 23.3 percent for improved monitoring technologies and research on shipboard water treatment systems. A decrease in Air Force environmental technology funding (-10.8 percent) is due to funding higher Air Force priorities and taking risk in environmental technology to fund environmental mandates. ESTCP funding decreased (-20.6 percent) due to a congressional add in FY 2015 that restored ESTCP funding to recent historical levels—an add that was not repeated in FY 2016. The SERDP budget decreased by 3.7 percent to about \$10 million below historic levels. The FY 2016 PB Request was \$65.8 million, and Congress reduced this request by \$10 million. Defense-wide funding also decreased 10.4 percent.
- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding increased 10.2 percent. The Air Force did not request, nor did it receive, environmental technology funding; therefore, its FY 2017 environmental technology program amount was \$0. SERDP funding increased (16.4 percent) and ESTCP funding decreased 32.3 percent.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipates that DON funding will increase 10.5 percent, SERDP funding will increase 13.6 percent, ESTCP funding will increase 51.9 percent, Deployed Warfighter Protection funding will increase 24.5 percent, and Defense-wide funding will increase 23.3 percent.

#### **Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals**

The mission of the environmental technology programs is to address high-priority environmental challenges. The DoD Components' environmental technology investments focus on unique Military Service requirements and complement other Defense-wide investments. SERDP, ESTCP, and the DoD Components work together to coordinate and leverage these investments.

Advances in environmental technology have allowed the Department to be more cost-efficient when spending resources for environmental cleanup and compliance. For example, DoD is developing groundwater cleanup technologies that are used across the Department and throughout the private sector. The Department projects falling just short of its goal of achieving RC at 95 percent of its IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations and IRP sites at FUDS properties by the end of FY 2021. A majority of the sites that will not reach RC by that date are complex groundwater sites. DoD programs are currently investing in scientific endeavors to improve our fundamental understanding of these sites and developing technologies to manage or remediate them.

The Department is also transitioning technologies to reduce life-cycle costs in the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of multiple weapons systems. In FY 2016, DoD transitioned SERDP- and ESTCP-sponsored research on advanced geophysical classification, a process for determining whether a buried metal object is likely a military munition or harmless debris, to the contractor community. The Intergovernmental Data Quality Task Force published a Quality Assurance Project Plan template covering these new technologies. Additionally, the DoD Environmental Data Quality Workgroup established the DoD Advanced Geophysical

Classification Accreditation Program to ensure that private-sector practitioners of these new methods can collect high-quality data and correctly analyze them in support of DoD cleanup projects. This, and other Environmental Technology Program efforts, benefit both the environment and the military mission.

Looking ahead, the Department's environmental technology investments will focus on DoD's evolving needs. SERDP solicited research into the fate, transport, and remediation of PFOS and PFOA shortly after the EPA released the 2009 Provisional Health Advisories for these compounds. Follow on research beginning in 2014 has targeted developing several approaches for treating groundwater containing PFOS and PFOA. These efforts have matured from the bench scale to field demonstrations that will begin under ESTCP in 2017, with additional demonstration under evaluation that would begin in 2018. SERDP initiated three projects in 2017 aimed at developing fluorine-free fire-fighting foams to replace aqueous film forming foam, a source of the PFOS and PFOA contamination.

The Department will continue to invest in current initiatives and focus on future initiatives, including developing and demonstrating technologies to address munitions in the underwater environment; identifying the science and tools needed to meet DoD's obligations to adapt to a changing environment; and researching technologies to manage and treat chemicals of emerging concern. The Department is also continuing the critical work of reducing future liability and life-cycle costs by eliminating toxic and hazardous materials from the production, operation, and maintenance processes.

.

#### V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES

The Department maintains decontamination programs to remove UXO resulting from Defense-related activities on withdrawn or reserved lands. Below are descriptions of DoD's ongoing decontamination activities during FY 2016 at ranges identified in the NDAA for FY 2014.

#### **Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana**

In FY 2016, the Army conducted range clearance activities on approximately 7 acres of withdrawn land at the Limestone Hills Training Area. The Army advised the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that the property was suitable for BLM management for multiple uses in accordance with the NDAA for FY 2014.

#### White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

In FY 2016, the Army did not conduct decontamination activities on the 5,100 acres of withdrawn land at White Sands Missile Range. It will conduct decontamination activities in the future as needed.

#### Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range (CMAGR), California

In FY 2016, the Marine Corps conducted ongoing decontamination activities on approximately 1,331 acres of withdrawn land at CMAGR. Decontamination activities included surface and subsurface clearance operations, soil grading and stabilization, and destroying UXO. The Marine Corps removed, certified safe, and transported over 125 tons of munitions and range-related debris.

Also in FY 2016, the Marine Corps conducted other range maintenance as part of ongoing decontamination activities on approximately 2,587 acres of land that was no longer within CMAGR. Pursuant to the NDAA for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66), the Department of the Navy relinquished 1,958 acres of withdrawn land and transferred 629 acres of land for which it held the administrative jurisdiction to the Department of Interior as part of the realignment of the boundary of the range to the Bradshaw Trail, an unimproved road used for off-highway vehicle recreation by the public.

#### Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, California

In FY 2016, the Marine Corps did not conduct any decontamination activities on the withdrawn lands at MCAGCC Twentynine Palms.

#### Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS), China Lake, California

In FY 2016, the Navy conducted ongoing decontamination activities on 5,000 acres of withdrawn land at NAWS China Lake. Decontamination activities included surface clearance, trash removal, destroying UXO, venting operations, soil stabilization, and grading target sites.

# VI. FY 2016 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUNDING AND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2015

The House Report (House Report 113-113) accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014, requests the Secretary of Defense provide information regarding funds invested in DoD's Environmental Restoration Program and the cost to complete cleanup at environmental restoration sites (hereinafter referred to as the "cost estimate"). Specifically, the report must:

- 1. Provide the amount of environmental restoration funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property in FY 2016; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2015 to FY 2016; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2016 (detailed in Appendix A); and
- 2. Account for any increase of 10 percent or more in an installation's or property's projected cost estimate over the prior year estimate (detailed in Appendix B).

Appendix A lists the 569 DoD installations and 488 FUDS properties where DoD obligated funds in FY 2016. It also compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2015 and FY 2016 to determine how much the Department reduced its liability at each location.<sup>2</sup> At 198 DoD installations and 290 FUDS properties, the cost estimates either decreased by the amount invested or decreased to zero, and therefore no explanation is needed. At the remaining 371 DoD installations and 198 FUDS properties, the cost estimates did not decrease by at least the amount invested in FY 2016. Appendix A includes an explanation of why the liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested at each of these locations.<sup>3</sup>

Appendix B lists the 305 DoD installations and 129 FUDS properties where the FY 2016 cost estimates increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2015 estimates. It compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2015 and FY 2016 to determine the dollar amount and percentage increases at each location.<sup>2</sup> Appendix B also includes the reason(s) the cost estimates increased between FY 2015 and FY 2016 at each location.<sup>4</sup>

FY 2016 Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The FY 2015 cost estimates are adjusted for inflation and work completed in FY 2016 to compare the estimates more accurately.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> If a location's liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested in FY 2016 but the cost estimate change was less than \$25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers \$25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> If a location's FY 2016 cost estimate increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2015 estimate but the cost estimate change was less than \$25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers \$25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.

### FY 2016 DEP ARC

## Appendix A

# Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2016 Environmental Restoration Funding and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2015.

This Appendix provides the amount of environmental restoration funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property in FY 2016; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2015 to FY 2016; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2016.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for		•	Change	Bassan(a)
State	Component	Installation Name 1LT CHARLES L. WAPLES	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Arm),	USARC	217	0	23	(404)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Army	USARC	217	U	23	(194)	ino explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	0	234	72	306	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Comiconout	,	121 001 11 0 101 11 12 11 007 11 10	Ŭ	20.		000	rouse, one respense to address additional risk, additional earnisms.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate
							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
		ABERDEEN PROVING					ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Maryland	Army	GROUND	109,964	107,267	9,511	6,814	also be caused by changes in schedule.
-							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59	58	72		estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	0	0	247	247	No explanation required.
							1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
							the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	11,330	12,869	410	1,949	in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama	A	ANNUCTON ADMAY DEDOT	00.044	40 444	0.000	400	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	20,644	18,111	2,699	166	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		ARMY RESEARCH					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Army	LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	350	551	98	299	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maccachacotto	,	EASON TORT WATER TOWN		001	00	200	additional cost may also be educed by changes in concedure.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		ARMY RESEARCH					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Virginia	Army	LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	1,273	1,418	5	150	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY,					
Florida	Army	49-A	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
		BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION					
Wisconsin	Army	PLANT	75,735	42,504	815	(32,416)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maryland	Army	FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1 107	estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	2,070	1,054	67		No explanation required.
restructly	,y	<u> </u>	2,010	1,001	0.	(0.0)	то одранации годинов.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kentucky	Army	LEXINGTON FACILITY	320	1,154			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,359	1,215			No explanation required.
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	161	0			No explanation required.
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	17,843	12,237	1,762	(3,844)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Miccoun	,y	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY	551	7.02		101	additional cost may also be educed by changes in concadio.
Michigan	Army	AIRFIELD	1,759	1,203	127	(429)	No explanation required.
- G	ĺ		,	,		, ,	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,350				in regulatory document review or approval).
Arizona	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	6,758	3,257	50		No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	384	272	32	(80)	No explanation required.
		CHARLES MELVIN PRICE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Army	SUPPORT CENTER	2,501	2,501	93	93	estimating methodology or model.
0,000	Λ ******	CLACKAMAS/CAMP	60	24	000	054	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oregon	Army	WITHYCOMBE COLD REGIONS RESEARCH	69	34	986	951	estimating methodology or model.
		AND ENGINEERING					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New Hampshire	Army	LABORATORY	6,455	6,524	5,736	5 805	estimating methodology or model.
110W Hamponile	, arriy	CORNHUSKER ARMY	0,400	0,024	5,750	0,000	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Nebraska	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	56,363	53,357	3,122	116	estimating methodology or model.
	1	<u></u>	55,000	22,301	<u> </u>		

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,406	8,074	781		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	10,406	9,571	443	(392)	No explanation required.
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	138,243	44,835	7,374	(86,034)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	1,402	600	448	(354)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	39,934	43,495	2,703		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	79,917	38,722	12	(41 183)	No explanation required.
Colorado	,	FIRESTONE CSMS	144,322	143,116			No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	31,316		554		No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	161	61	54		No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	15,959	16,544	1,838		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	•	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
							greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	17,493	40,089	2,715	25,311	by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	40,296	34,501	147		No explanation required.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	9,005	6,091	154	(2,760)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,436	6,249	396	209	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	8,140	9,628	363	1,851	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	12,266	11,199	1,138	71	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)			_	Reason(s)
Otate	Component	mstanation Hame	Ιπιατίστι (ψοσο)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	incuson(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019		108	597	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	15,079	6,499	417	(8,163)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236			Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	53,982	29,426	1,415	(23,141)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6,587	5,473	5,171	4.057	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
2 2 2 3 3 3	,,		0,00.	3,	5,	.,	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ť				·	·	,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	estimating methodology or model.
New York		FORT HAMILTON	130	0	32		No explanation required.
Arizona		FORT HUACHUCA	2,210	1,889	245		No explanation required.
California		FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	4,263	2,044	136	(2,083)	No explanation required.
L		FORT INDIANTOWN GAP					
Pennsylvania	Army	TRAINING SITE	1,281	274	112		No explanation required.
South Carolina		FORT JACKSON	10,331	6,045	2,937		No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	5,027	4,842	147	(38)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
			1				dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1.168	95	413	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
1 44 1040	,,	OR LEAVE INVOICE	000	1,100	33	710	reads, site respected to address additional flort, additional samplings.
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793	Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			(4 )	(+ /	(+ /	(4 )	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570	26,255	667	20,352	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	11,504			(1,600)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,064		131		Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wisconsin	Army	FORT MCCOY	230	205	6	(19)	No explanation required.
District of							
Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	161	116	4	(41)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	2,171	1,377			additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	30				No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	29,039		<u> </u>		No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	13,326	9,404	964	(2,958)	No explanation required.
							A) Dustrat Coope Added as entire results due to other site level are inst
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
0-1161-	A	FORT ORD	005 774	044600	45.074	00.000	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
California	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003			
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	10.005				No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	12,035	6,259	1,273	(4,503)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural
							attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology
							was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	2,232				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	17,297	9,936	396	(6,965)	No explanation required.
Housii	Avenue	EODT SHAFTED	4.470	2 400	F00	2.402	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii Illinois	Army Army	FORT SHAFTER FORT SHERIDAN	1,478 8,229	3,433 6,920			estimating methodology or model.  No explanation required.
IIIIIIOIS	AIIIIy	FOR I SHEKIDAN	8,229	6,920	101	(1,208)	ino expianation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)				Reason(s)
			(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost
							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost
							for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	3,998	11,625	466	8,093	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
A11		FORT MAINING LIT	40.407	57.040	4.070	00.000	estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT FORT WILLIAM HENRY	40,127	57,812	4,378	22,063	to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Montana	Army	HARRISON	10	10	20	20	No explanation required.
Montana	7	FORT WINGATE DEPOT	10				The explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	ACTIVITY	76,584	64,915			No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	GERSTLE RIVER TEST SITE	0	0	243	243	No explanation required.
<b>.</b> .	1.						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska Nevada	Army	HAINES PIPELINE HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	2,490				estimating methodology or model.
Nevaga	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	135,811	90,028	7,733	(38,050)	No explanation required.  1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
							the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
							or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
T	Δ	HOLSTON ARMY	40.550	40.011	000	040	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Tennessee	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	10,553	10,241	622	310	schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		LUNTED ABANCAIDEIELD		0.004	000	7.054	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,433	9,081	203	7,851	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
1	A	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION	40.000	45.004	7.470	0.474	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
lowa	Army	PLANT	46,669	45,961	7,179	6,471	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		JEFFERSON PROVING					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	Army	GROUND	5,494	3,608	2,987	1 101	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	7,816	14	11		No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,362	1,320	56		No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	0	210		No explanation required.
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	85,999	18,773	133		No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	284	122	87		No explanation required.
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	379	91	69		No explanation required.
		JOINT BASE LEWIS-					
Washington	Army	MCCHORD	53,088	43,967	2,565	(6,556)	No explanation required.
		JOINT BASE MYER-					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1,002	contract or contract method.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	20,656	20,762	1,644	1,750	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		IKANIOAO ADAWA ANAMIINITIONI					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
17	A	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	5.070	40.000	500	5 700	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	5,072	10,208	590 44		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
Idaho	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE	744	270	44	(430)	ino explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	SITE	0	^	441	111	No explanation required.
Hawaii		KUNIA FIELD STATION	801	622	19		No explanation required.
i iawan	Alliy	LAKE CITY ARMY	301	022	19	(100)	ino explanation required.
Missouri	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	130,920	109,428	1,878	(19 614)	No explanation required.
	,		100,020	100,420	1,570	(10,014)	1
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	28,452	5,751	1,995	(20.706)	No explanation required.
			20,102	٥,. ٥ ،	.,500	(=0,: 00)	1

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
<b>5</b>	1.			4 504			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	A	LOMPOC BRANCH	4 000	4 000	470	(4.00)	No evalenction required
California	Army	DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS LONGHORN ARMY	1,608	1,032	476	(100)	No explanation required.
Toyon	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	56,888	53,545	1,534	(1 900)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY	30,000	55,545	1,534	(1,009)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	710	estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Army	AWWONTTON PLANT	2,270	2,347	042	719	lestimating methodology of model.
		MAKUA MILITARY					1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	0	747	124	8/1	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tannasaa		MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	20.500	04 400	4 047	4.40	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Tennessee	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL	32,509	31,438	1,217	140	estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	CONCORD	47,533	33,609	13,062	(862)	No explanation required.
Calliottila	Allily	CONCORD	47,555	33,009	13,002	(002)	ino explanation required.
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,513		79	31	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	0	25	25	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST	3,561	3,562	1,715	1,716	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Utah	Army	FED WILLIAMS WEST	473	282	4,721	4.530	estimating methodology or model.
	1	ı· ==	-110	202	7,121	1,000	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	,y	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,885	2,866	100	81	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER				(1.010)	
California	Army	AND FORT IRWIN	16,861	13,520			No explanation required.
California		OAKLAND ARMY BASE	18,686	15,398	314	(2,974)	No explanation required.
A ::		PAPAGO MILITARY	4 500	4 0 4 0	004	450	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION PARKS RESERVE FORCES	1,563	1,340	681	458	estimating methodology or model.
California	Λ ττου (	TRAINING AREA	9,797	280	0 505	(4.042)	No explanation required
Calilornia	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY	9,797	200	8,505	(1,012)	No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland		RESERVATION	767	1,096	106	135	contract or contract method.
New Jersey	·	PICATINNY ARSENAL	87,822	23,614	1,057		No explanation required.
ivew sersey	Allily	I IOATINIT ANGENAL	01,022	23,014	1,037	(03,131)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,813	30,171	860	218	caused by changes in schedule.
	,		55,515				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	93,597	96,899	156	3,458	estimating methodology or model.
	1		,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857	24,012	102 589	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Airiiy	RADFORD ARMY	120,200	204,007	24,012	102,303	Solieudie.
Virginia	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	15,406	13,556	196	(1.654)	No explanation required.
7 gs	,y	RAVENNA ARMY	10,100	. 0,000	.00	(1,00.)	
Ohio	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	27,219	17,846	3,789	(5,584)	No explanation required.
Texas Alabama	Army Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT REDSTONE ARSENAL	20,663 950,686		814 22,250		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.  No explanation required.
Delaware	Army	RIVER ROAD TRAINING SITE	950,686				No explanation required.
Delaware	Allily	RIVER ROAD TRAINING SITE	1	<u> </u>		/	ino expianation required.
California	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	20,758	7,445	1,072	(12,241)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777	8,388	323	1,934	estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	213,907	201,076	10,247	(2,584)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,556	2,218	364	26	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Army	SAGINAW	160	2,210	40		No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	72,527	60,966	792	\ /	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	21,201	18,106	1,154		No explanation required.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	8,009	5,399	601	(2,009)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	29,963	29,725	787	549	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	0	1,784	165	1,949	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	19,400	18,516	189	(695)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,066	,			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Coat Fatiguate Change Handlated to Change in Coana Actual contract
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	02	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massacriusetts	Allily	SUDBURT TRAINING ANNEX	930	969	02	93	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
		SUNFLOWER ARMY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		TABLIEE! ABAN/ANOO!! E					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Namela Canalina	A	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE	470	4 0 40	005	4 04 4	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
North Carolina	Army	PLANT	170	1,049	335	1,214	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,039			521	or model.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	39,145	34,457	1,484	(3,204)	No explanation required.
		TOOELE ARMY DEPOT					
Utah	Army	SOUTH	21,653	2,315	1,865	(17,473)	No explanation required.
l		TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL					L
Hawaii	Army	CENTER	1,946				No explanation required.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	15,630	13,666	78	(1,886)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			,				1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
							the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change
		TWIN CITIES ARMY					Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Minnesota	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4,806	or model.
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228		in regulatory document review or approval).
New Jersey	Army	USARC CAVEN POINT	0	0	40	40	No explanation required.
		USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA					
Ohio	Army	59)	268	140			No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	USARC LODI	48	47	21	20	No explanation required.
		USARC NIAGARA FALLS					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Army	(AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		VIETNAM VET MEM USARC					
Illinois	Army	(SOUTH)	142	0	92	(50)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509			in regulatory document review or approval).
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	26	0	6	(20)	No explanation required.
<b>T</b>	1.	VOLUNTEER ARMY		00.00-		(4.4.=)	No combact to a second condition
Tennessee	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	21,916	20,020	450	(1,446)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1,351	estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	5,711	3,601	196	(1,914)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
_	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
NAT		WELDON SPRING TRAINING	4.005	4 000		(4)	No combone Communication
Missouri	Army	AREA	1,965	1,909	55	(1)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		WEST POINT MIL					New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New York	Army	RESERVATION	56,048	57,510	438	1 900	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
IVOW TOTA	Allily	RESERVATION	30,040	37,310	+30	1,300	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii		WHITE SANDS MISSILE	1,402	2,200	113	000	estimating methodology of model.
New Mexico		RANGE	8,028	3,568	123	(4 337)	No explanation required.
TTOW WICKIGO	, unity	101101	0,020	0,000	120	(4,007)	i to explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,233	2,185	350		estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	16,823	10,907	5,206		No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	91,311	77,484	10,309		No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	7,154	5,390	464	(1,300)	No explanation required.
California		ALAMEDA NAS	59,766	45,301	8,799		No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	15,027	12,723	412	(1,892)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
			1				greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	by changes in schedule.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	37,722	42,751	2,030	7,059	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
District of						(=00)	
Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	3,864	2,627	638	(599)	No explanation required.
			40.475	47.040	0.770	0.044	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2,214	in regulatory document review or approval).
Manuford	Nova	ANNAPOLIS US NAVAL ACADEMY	9,675	11,015	7	1,347	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS	9,675	11,015	/	1,347	
California	Novac	DAM FACILITY	1 220	607	1,044	412	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Navy Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	1,239 33,796	607 32,038	397		No explanation required.
Washington		BANGOR NSB	76,166	77,848		, , ,	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	,		2,0.0	.,500	1 3 3	_,=,=,=	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	48,146	50,738	1,530	4,122	estimating methodology or model.
							1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
South Carolina		BEAUFORT MCAS	29,445	32,499	3,707		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	21,513	14,861	533	(6,119)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM NATCAPREG	315	504	297	486	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	297,943	345,881	8,178	56,116	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	16,545	17,315	4,120	4,890	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine New York	Navy Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS CALVERTON NWIRP	30,640 21,729	30,124		702	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	121,437				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

State   Component   Installation Name   Estimate   Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)   (\$000)				FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
State   Component   Installation Name   Inflation (\$000)   (\$000)   (\$000)   (\$000)   Reason(s)				Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional asmpling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change in Scope – Change in Cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change under the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cape Prince Wales  Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or or origoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This estimate Change in Scope in Schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or origoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This estimate Change in Scope in Schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or origoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This cost of prior or origoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This estimate Change unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.		DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		
(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC  1,994  1,655  269  (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost South Carolina  Navy CHARLESTON FISC  792  2,658  21,888  22  1,888  23  1,888  24  25  265  265  27  27  285  285  29  29  20  20  20  21  20  20  21  20  20  21  20  20	State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC  1,994  1,655  269  (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost South Carolina  Navy CHARLESTON FISC  792  2,658  21,888  22  1,888  23  1,888  24  25  265  265  27  27  285  285  29  29  20  20  20  21  20  20  21  20  20  21  20  20								
Scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Caper Rince Wales  Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Cha								
project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)  New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  California Navy CAMP PENDLETON MCB 54,073 60,877 8,382 15,186 also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES  NAVY NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cast Estimate Change Unrelated to Change								
dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathways such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional sampling). 3)  New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES  Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost cost cost cost cost cost cost cost								
intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)  New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  California Navy CAMP PENDLETON MCB 54,073 60,877 8,382 15,186 also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES  Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may not explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may not explanation required.  Florida Navy CECIL FIELD NAS 10,482 11,418 928 1,864 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost 2,658 25 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change in ost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC  1,994  1,655  269  (70)  No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also								
Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Florida Navy CECIL FIELD NAS 10,482 11,418 928 1,864 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Scope – Change in Co								
California Navy CAMP PENDLETON MCB 54,073 60,877 8,382 15,186 also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in Scope – Change in Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost Estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
California Navy CAMP PENDLETON MCB 54,073 60,877 8,382 15,186 also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Florida Navy CECIL FIELD NAS 10,482 11,418 928 1,864 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
California Navy CAMP PENDLETON MCB 54,073 60,877 8,382 15,186 also be caused by changes in schedule.  CAPE PRINCE WALES Alaska Navy NCCOSC 1,994 1,655 269 (70) No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
Alaska Navy CECIL FIELD NAS 10,482 11,418 928 1,864 additional cost may also be caused by change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.	California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	54,073	60,877	8,382	15,186	
Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.				- ,		-,	-,	
CECIL FIELD NAS  10,482  11,418  928  1,864  4 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  South Carolina  Navy  CHARLESTON FISC  792  2,658  22  1,888  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  South Carolina  Navy  CHARLESTON NS  3,195  4,908  59  1,772  estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina  Navy  CHERRY POINT MCAS  95,596  75,752  2,450  (17,394)  No explanation required.	Alaska	Navy	NCCOSC	1,994	1,655	269	(70)	No explanation required.
CECIL FIELD NAS  10,482  11,418  928  1,864  4 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  South Carolina  Navy  CHARLESTON FISC  792  2,658  22  1,888  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost  South Carolina  Navy  CHARLESTON NS  3,195  4,908  59  1,772  estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina  Navy  CHERRY POINT MCAS  95,596  75,752  2,450  (17,394)  No explanation required.								
Florida Navy CECIL FIELD NAS 10,482 11,418 928 1,864 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.								
South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON FISC 792 2,658 22 1,888 estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.	Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	10,482	11,418	928	1,864	
South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.	South Carolina	Novac	CHARLESTON FISC	700	0.650	22	4 000	
South Carolina Navy CHARLESTON NS 3,195 4,908 59 1,772 estimating methodology or model.  North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.	South Carolina	inavy	CHARLESTON FISC	792	2,008	22	1,000	
North Carolina Navy CHERRY POINT MCAS 95,596 75,752 2,450 (17,394) No explanation required.	South Carolina	Navv	CHARLESTON NS	3 195	4 908	59	1 772	
Virginia   Navy   CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST   375   118   170   (87)   No explanation required.				,		,	( ,,== ,	
	Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	375	118	170	(87)	No explanation required.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1								
1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project								
change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical								
dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property								
reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)								
Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the								
project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new								
requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay								
in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost								
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
	California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	105,400	106,436	9,699	10,735	estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)				Reason(s)
							1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,512	40,445	1,684		Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	60,950	59,721	4,397		1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oregon	Navy	COOS HEAD NAV OCEAN PROCESSING FAC.	462	281	146	(35)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	2,852			, ,	New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	18,418	20,404	2,387		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		_	_	Reason(s)
				(Vocas)	(4000)	( <del>Cool)</del>	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate
							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620	2,979		also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	7,222	5,581	357		No explanation required.
California Maine	Navy Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF CUTLER NCTS	3,368 26,392	3,377 20,548	11 1,187		No explanation required.  No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	20,407	20,070		, , ,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	17,846	17,651	458	263	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	34,076	32,156	2,433	513	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	24,653	23,265	1,592	204	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	installation Name	illilation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	neason(s)
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	DET	35,403	22,880	787	(11,736)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	28,617	27,097	1,757	237	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	6,005	7,451	415	1,861	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	181,400	175,886	687		No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90				contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,972	1,432	80	(460)	No explanation required.
_							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	18,849	18,709	1,300	1,160	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	10,607	13,675	4,255	7,323	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	172,664	180,418	4,478	12,232	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Slte. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Indiana	Navy	INDIANAPOLIS NAWC	905				No explanation required.
mulana	inavy	IINDIANAPOLIS NAVVO	905	/ 02	150	/	ino expianation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost		Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
			20.405			0.054	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425				also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	11,873		1,310		No explanation required.
Missouri Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,182		47 34		No explanation required.
IVIISSOUTI	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,017	961	34	(22)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	76,021	77,590		2,545	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	24,359	19,998	639	(3,722)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,934				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	D.D		Estimate			Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	mistaliation Name	innation (\$000)	(4000)	(4000)	(\$000)	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
L							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	caused by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.     Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	285,186	299.359	1,635	15.808	caused by changes in schedule.
g	1.16.1		200,100		.,000	.0,000	outdood by changes in concedence
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3.093	Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
			2,000	, ,		-,	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	763		132		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	4,784	1,800	87	(2,897)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to
							a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural
							attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology
							was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
							Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost
							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost
							for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	63,960	66,444	3,120	5.604	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
			,	,	-, -	-,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
							or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
California	NI	MARE ICLAND NOV	04.745	60.467	0.440	4 000	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California Texas	Navy Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY MCGREGOR NWIRP	64,715 26,890				No explanation required.
Texas	inavy	WICONLOCK INWINE	20,090	24,743	1,152	(995)	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	2,794	3,431	88	725	needed, technology was ineffective).
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	19,116				No explanation required.
1311100000			10,110	10,000		(2,000)	110 Oxpicitation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost		Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	_	_	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	6,752	675	711	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
·····co.co.pp.			5,1.0	0,102	0.0		
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
			40.040	45.005			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California California	Navy Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS MOFFETT FIELD NAS	46,316 58,839				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	47,646	,		, , , ,	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	omponent	Installation Name  NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate			Reason(s)  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
State Col	omponent		Inflation (\$000)			(\$000)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
				(\$000)	(\$000)		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
Hawaii Nav	avy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167				promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
			,	41,994	1,913	1,740	Requirement).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Connecticut Nav		NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328			caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana Nav	avy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	120	114	12	6	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Rhode Island Nav	avy	NEWPORT NETC	60,510	65,826	17,956		also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia Nav	avy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	31,606	19,150	1,640	(10,816)	No explanation required.
Virginia Nav	avy	NORFOLK NSY	10,709	9,843	659	(207)	No explanation required.
California Nav	,	NORTH ISLAND NAS	86,723	78,048	8,071	(604)	No explanation required.
California Nav		NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	1,079	704	26	(349)	No explanation required.
Guam Nav	210/	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	42.645	44,242	1,235		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Viscinia	None	OCEANA NAS	44.055	70.400	0.500	20.100	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	44,855	76,432	6,523	38,100	in schedule.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	11,763	15,065	775	4,077	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,218		116		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	18,925	74,882	1,102	57,059	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	D-D		Estimate			Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		_	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	innation (\$000)	(4000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Incason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	35,414	33,633	4,495	2,714	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-
							scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g.,
							newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
							estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	13,259	16,775	3,657	7,173	schedule.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
							contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
Hawaii		PEARL HARBOR NS	130,190			2,327	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii		PEARL HARBOR NSB	343		8		No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	8,023	6,076	1,057	(890)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
DoD			Adjusted for			Change	
State Comp	ponent In	stallation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
							national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
							promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
							Requirement). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change
							A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator
							(e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project
							scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards
							or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or
							directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate
							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Florida Navy	,	ENSACOLA NAS	64,024	61,378	4,143	1,497	also be caused by changes in schedule.
Tiorida INAVy	1.	LINGACOLA NAG	04,024	01,570	7,143	1,431	also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
	Dr	ENGACOLA NITTO CORRY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Florida Navy		ENSACOLA NTTC CORRY TATION	5,817	6,036	533		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Tionaa ivavy		TATION	5,017	0,000	333		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania Navy	, Pi	HILADELPHIA NS	1,269	1,272	36		estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania Navy	, Pl	HILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	462	329	130		No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Alaska Nava	.	OINT DADDOW NADI	24.045	20.200	0.600	100	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska Navy California Navy		OINT BARROW NARL OINT MUGU NAWS	31,815 19,512	29,280 16,598	2,638 2,580		No explanation required.
California Navy		OMONA NIROP	19,512	0,590			No explanation required.
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i							
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Machineter		ORT HADLOCK NOC PAC IV DET	0.000	0.007		00	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Washington Navy California Navy		ORT HUENEME NCBC	2,983 10,611	2,927 9,578	89 345		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
Maine Navy		ORTSMOUTH NSY	13,315	5,348			No explanation required.
Trains Travy		UGET SOUND FISC	10,010	0,040	300	(1,-100)	i to oxplanation roquilou.
Washington Navy		REMERTON	3,427	3,342	83	(2)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate			Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		_		Reason(s)
Otate	Component	mstanation Hame	imation (4000)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(4000)	reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		PUGET SOUND FISC					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Washington	Navy	MANCHESTER	585		115		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington		PUGET SOUND NS	21,063	20,407	238		No explanation required.
Washington	/	PUGET SOUND NSY	107,794		2,396		No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	121,786	106,458	8,075	(7,253)	No explanation required.
		ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Puerto Rico	Navy	GARCIA	14,310	18,590	399	4,679	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Nova	CAN OF EMENTE IOLAND MALE	4 702	1 0 4 7	400	(50)	No ovalenation required
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,792	1,247	492	(53)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	4,133	6,507	3,772	6 146	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Camorna	Ivavy	CAN DIEGO NOCCCO	4,100	0,007	5,112	0,140	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	964	1,478	171	685	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
L	1						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	293,111	308,855			estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	3,008	2,485	504	(19)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,918	8,144	533	759	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	40,099	40,262	837		work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926	41,425	2,408	25,907	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	SPOKANE NMCRC	402	0	374		No explanation required.
J		ST INIGOES NISE EAST					
Maryland	Navy	COAST DET	941	394	314	(233)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	9,170	8,817	1,192	839	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		TREASURE ISLAND NS					1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost
California	Navy	HUNTERS PT ANNEX	270,211	218,615	60,622	9,026	for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,387	19,756	998	367	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	18,581	17,007	1,316		No explanation required.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	17,767				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	319,278	245,533	21,723	(52,022)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,210	5,775	10	575	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	4,008	6,762	290	3,044	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	In a fall of a series	Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	B(6)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6 429	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
. ccyrrama	Italy		12,220	12,000	0,010	0,120	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
District of							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	54	241	44	231	needed, technology was ineffective).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
							or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
District of							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
District of	Nova	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7.050	25.045	1 171	10.067	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVT TARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18,267	schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
District of							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289	217	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	D - D		Estimate			Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		_	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	instanation Name	innation (\$000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	ineasur(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
							or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66,950	70,115	3,526	6.691	schedule.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4,106				No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	32,166	20,557	4,936	(6,673)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
							promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
		WILLIAMSBURG FISC					Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope
Virginia	Navy	CHEATHAM ANNEX	22,284	40,078	4,202	21,996	
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,839	49,305	2,986	1 452	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
1 Olinsyivania	itavy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS	55,059	+0,000	2,300	1,732	nioodod, tooliilology was illolitotivoj.
Virginia	Navy	DIVISION	26,150	16,324	789	(9,037)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	52,231	52,455	2,441	2,665	estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	19,025	30,587	1,348	12,910	schedule.
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	91	2,929	78	2,916	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171	35,462	373	30,664	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,540	3,107	76		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
			,				1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	23,762	34,788	2,748	13,774	or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	66,673	49,347	1,784	(15,542)	No explanation required.
	1	l					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	862	876	24	38	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	75,769	124,428	8,215	56,874	schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	7,113	11,771	567	5,225	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	22,556	21,709	2,692	1,845	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
	1	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL					
Michigan	Air Force	AIRPORT	5,717	3,922	. 88	(1,707)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	45,453	70,556	1,201	26,304	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	D-D		FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	73,817	82,569	5,859		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	3,266	6,565	2,144	5,443	Site.
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	12,872	10,669	1,688		No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	3,356	4,061	95		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana		BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	53,258	43,384	1,618		No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	54	105	5		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	11,789	19,138	165		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
					, (voos)		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate
							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
							ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
California	Air Force	BEALE	333,406	352,760	4,888	24,242	also be caused by changes in schedule.
Galliottila	7 11 1 0100	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY	000,100	002,700	4,000	2-1,2-12	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	764	991	10	237	estimating methodology or model.
		BELLOWS AIR FORCE					3 37
Hawaii	Air Force	STATION	11,573	8,743	55	(2,775)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	10,032		180		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	4,118	2,192	10	(1,916)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,194	11,703	255	1,764	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	RIPMINGHAM	607	1 000	26	1 217	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	209	6,300	135	6,226	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM  BLUE ASH AIR GUARD	627	1,908	36 135	1,317 6,226	Standards or Regulations – DoD F policy or directive that redefines the 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup (e.g., feasibility study or remedial ascope). 2) Standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards of the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in DoD policy or directive to the standards or Regulation change in Regula

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)			(\$000)	Reason(s)
Connecticut		BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295			,	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Connecticut	All I olce	OTO (NDT)	293	7,000	240	7,007	010.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	8,229	8,978	295	1,044	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	28,193				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	841	227	511	(103)	No explanation required.
Alaska		BULLEN POINT	741	848	674	781	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	14,038	10,359	171	(3.508)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	0	465	1,680	2,145	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
							change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
							CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
							technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
							remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate
	۱	CAMP BLANDING MIL	405	700	0.0	007	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	methodology or model.
Machineton	Λ:	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD	F4.F	4.050	0.4	040	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Washington	Air Force	STATION	515	1,050	84	619	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
		CAMPION AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	14,266	14,503	316	553	estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	39,172	31,024	2,401	(5,747)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		CARE CANAVERAL AIR					(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	109,326	254,209	4,771	140 654	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Fioriua	All Foice	CAPE LISBURNE LONG	109,320	254,209	4,771	149,004	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	estimating methodology or model.
riasia	7111 1 0100	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG	0,201	3,310	110	700	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1.469	estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE ROMANZOF LONG	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	12,00		1,100	J
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	15,089	14,394	633	(62)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	5,377	4,368	94		No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	75,624	70,688	1,832	(3,104)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1 255	1 000	1 605	1 400	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Air Force Air Force	CHANUTE	1,355 44,423	1,083 22,073	1,695 1,699		No explanation required.
111111015	All FUICE	CHANUTE	44,423	22,073	1,099	(20,001)	nivo explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
		CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS					policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
North Carolina	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238		
	l						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	estimating methodology or model.
	l	CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL				(0.0=0)	
Wyoming	Air Force	AIRPORT	10,139	6,134	26	(3,979)	No explanation required.
							Duning t Cooper Added no military and to ather site level president
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	6,202	7,300	417	1 515	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
ridorid	7 (11 1 0100	COLD BAY LONG RANGE	0,202	7,000	717	1,010	i odos, sito resperios te addrese additional noti, additional editipiing/
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	4,278	2,697	143	(1,438)	No explanation required.
			,	,			
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost
							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope - Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
	l						greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,495	9,405	220		by changes in schedule.
0	A: F	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL		00	440		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Oregon	Air Force	GUARD STATION	28	90	119	181	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
<b>.</b>	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		COSTA MESA AIR GUARD					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Air Force	STATION	3,456	4,113	42		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Camorria	7 111 1 0100	on the transfer	0,100	1,110			Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	1,416	2,346	30		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
			.,				1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
		DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	BASE	2,917	7,631	356	5,070	estimating methodology or model.
lowa	Air Force	DES MOINES	518	0	30	(488)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3)
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Coordia	A:r	DODDING AID FORCE DAGE	7 440	0.400	4 450	2 220	needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1,152		Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.  Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	26	242	52		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabalila	All FUICE	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	20	242	52		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	70,725	128,265	1,409		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Dolawaro	7 (11 11 0100	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO	10,123	120,200	1,409	30,343	poncy of another that readmics the costs moladed in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	9,348	7,917	528	(903)	No explanation required.
	0.00		5,616	.,511	320	(550)	in a confirmation or a damage.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	_	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,333	4,884	2,358	5,909	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,382	8,098	435	6,151	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	8,488	11,344	171	3,027	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,143	6,325	705	887	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	78,295	98,565	2,033	22,303	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
							greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	444,018	607,907	12,027	175,916	by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7.595	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
				-,	, -	, = = =	, , ,
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	171,185	409,328	26,181	264,324	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	ELLINGTON	944	0	144		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE					policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
South Dakota	Air Force	BASE	23,196	31,199	1,936	9,939	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	13,023	14,968	1,611	3,556	New Site.
	•		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost
							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	57,964	67,664	4,305		3 , 3
. rasımığısı	7 (11 1 0100	.,	01,001	01,001	1,000	1 1,000	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	3,278	7,157	98	3,977	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	247	155	1	(91)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
		FRANCIS E WARREN AIR					change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Wyoming	Air Force	FORCE BASE	23,183	103,873	1,069	81,759	СТС.
							A) Project Coors. Added requirements due to other city level against
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		FRANCIS S. GABRESKI					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
New York	Air Force	(WEST HAMPTON)	666	1,109	940	1,383	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		,				•	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
A	A:-	ET CANTIL	070	074	245	707	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	279	671	315	707	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	145,709	224,975	22,249	101,515	New Site.
	•	ı					

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		_	(\$000)	Reason(s)
	1			. ,	. ,	, ,	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	7,085	,	473		
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	5,270	4,910	156	(204)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Air Force	GEORGE	63,194	65,031	1,778	3,615	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	7 1 0.00	0_0.10_	55,.5.	00,001	.,	0,0.0	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,532	1,764	45	277	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
_	l	00005511011		0.007	004	0.005	greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635	by changes in schedule.
							1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
		GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE					work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
North Dakota		BASE	5,248	6,750	386	1.888	caused by changes in schedule.
		GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO	5,2.0	2,. 00	300	.,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State			Inflation (\$000)			(\$000)	Reason(s)
Otato	Component	motunation Hame	imution (¢ooo)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	reacon(c)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		GREAT FALLS					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Montana	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960	Site.
		GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alahama	Λ: <sub>*</sub> Γο ***	CLINTED AID FORCE DAGE	0.404	2.547		4 004	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiaria	All I Olce	TAMMOND COMM STATION	U	13	99	114	leasibility study of Terriedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
						_,	,
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1,500	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	D.D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change	Baccan(a)
State	Component	Installation Name HAYWARD MUNICIPAL	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	AIRPORT	919	604	202	(113)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	4,492	3,615	26		No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual CTC.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7.047	440.000	for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	40,474			·	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	20,394	26,746	5,560	11,912	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	668				1 07
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,622	10,907	374	(341)	No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
		INDIAN MOUNTAIN	` '				
Alaska	Air Force	RESEARCH	32,280	26,222	406	(5,652)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	109	288	89	268	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	2,465	- ,			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	132,993	122,856	7,874	(2,263)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	102,376	141,353	7,268	46,245	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	31,878	46,710	2,454	17,286	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	75,952	53,034	1,973	(20,945)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	138,829	184,381	3,731	49,283	estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	47,572	41,681	3,501	(2,390)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	23,814	21,194	1,332	(1,288)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	16,014	18,521	828	3,335	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	31,196		2,014	(1,557)	No explanation required.
							A) Portrait Comment Additional and the contract of the contrac
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
							change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Now Jorgan	Λ:π <b>Γ</b> οποο	IDAADI LAKELILIDET	E7 20E	E7 400	E 004	6.040	CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305	57,463	5,891	6,049	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
							change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	116,818	214,844	6,527	104,553	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			,	,	-,-	,	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Coat Estimate Change Herslated to Change in Coase Actual contract
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Tayon	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,833	3,770	252	100	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	All Force	JBSA-CAIVIP BULLIS	3,033	3,770	252	109	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
							estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1 212	schedule.
Толао	711110100	OBERT CITT CRITICOGTOR	2,014	0,004	202	1,212	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	44,285	42,957	3,104	1.776	caused by changes in schedule.
	7 7 0.00		,=55	,	0,.0.	1,1.10	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	estimating methodology or model.
		JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR	,	,		,	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Missouri	Air Force	GUARD STATION	471	5,032	262	4,823	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE		·			Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	606	882	16	292	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
l	1	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	3,209	3,390	62	243	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							A) Desirat Cases Added as a vivan anta dua ta athan aita laval masia t
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1 510	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
ινιιοοιοοιμμι	All I OICE	INLLOLLIN	3,373	4,900	1/0	1,510	policy of uneclive that reachines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
							national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
							promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	44,583	77,836	1,494		Requirement).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Missississi	A:	KEY FIELD	150	0.004	60		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	150	2,281	68	2,199	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	57,023	83,364	1,240	27,581	New Site.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	47,353	54,412	5,737		estimating methodology or model.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
		IZIDTI AND		400.05	C		New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	105,002	108,390	24,857	28,245	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
		KLAMATH FALLS IAP					1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oregon	Air Force	(KINGSLEY FIELD) KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE	184	4,194	136	4,146	policy of directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	10,710	7,548	250	(2,912)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	5,085	6,413	182	1,510	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,160	17,255	843	14,938	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	LAPORTE AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	419	0	40	(379)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	14,800	35,292			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	296	7,626	73	7,403	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Arkansas	Air Force	BASE	20,315	25,890	236	5,811	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2.070	New Site.
ivialite	All Foice	LOKING	31,173	32,193	1,957	2,919	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5 435	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
rontaoky	7111 1 0100	LOGICVILLE IV	1,102	0,410	212	0,400	policy of directive that readmines the coole included in the circ.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Duanta Diaa	Δ:, Γ.,	LLUC MUNOZ MADIN	4.070	4.040	055	0.000	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	3,823	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9.641	estimating methodology or model.
7 11.120110	7 111 1 0100		10,100	2 1,00 1	333	0,011	osumaming memouslegy or measur
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
	1						change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	1,495	620	1,147	272	стс.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	21,124	24,658	1,499	5,033	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland California		MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	357 116,640			2,541	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  No explanation required.
Alabama		MAXWELL	33,317	31,644	1,333		No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	106,556		5,600	/	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		•	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,957	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	1,631	658	263	(710)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	MCENTIRE AIR GUARD BASE	5,418		6		No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	2,179	7,219	398		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	423	641	20		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	1,418				Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	239	2,585	104	2,450	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13,276	16,072	1,593	4,389	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  3) New Site.  4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama Georgia	Air Force Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	142 15,192		104 690		scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Idaho		MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	3,934	4,986	271	1,323	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	1,838	2,915	149	1,226	estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	10,860	11,290	1,661	2,091	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska		NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	829	974	13	158	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska		NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186	3,571	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246	2,888	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3,386	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
New Hampshire		NEW BOSTON	6,234	4,984	108		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		_	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,273	4,975	160	(138)	No explanation required.
New York New York	Air Force Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS NIAGARA FALLS IAP (ANG)	7,909 9				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
Alaska		NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	11,220	14,596	446	3,822	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY					·
Alaska	Air Force	STATION NORTON	7,725		1,061 519		No explanation required.
<u>California</u>		OFFUTT	17,342 16,844			, , , ,	No explanation required.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	D-D		FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	5,439	5,748	140	449	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska		OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	8,365	15.473	221	7 329	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
, iidolid		ORANGE AIR GUARD	0,000	10,110		7,020	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Connecticut	Air Force	STATION	72	205	346	479	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	19,372	48,501	2,540	31,669	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24,291	95,756	10,068	81,533	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).  3) New Site.
New Hampshire		PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	33	14	4,178	4,159	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

					FY 2016	Cost	
	D-D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	mstanation Name	πιτατιστί (φοσο)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	40 420	90 606	1 602	EO 161	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
New TOIK	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE	40,138	88,606	1,693	50,161	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
California	Air Force	STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
			,	-,		,	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		POINT BARROW LONG					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			,	,-		,-	7 1 0/
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	423	14,004	20		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
riasita	711 1 0100	I GIVI EXT	420	14,004	20	10,001	rease, site reoperied to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
A11	A: E	DOINT LONGLY BOME	400	00	040	00	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213	83	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY					scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Orogon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	4.040	25	1 600	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Oregon	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR	358	1,942	25	1,009	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Puerto Rico	Air Force	SITE	76	209	31	164	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
	1	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Puerto Rico	Air Force	STATION	76	211	21	156	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Draiget Copps Added clooping phones on the project progresses (a.g.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
THOUG ISIAHU	AII I OICE	QUUNULIUIAIL	119	1,505	JZ	1,430	prodominity offucy of refinedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	lustallation Name	Adjusted for		_	Change	B(a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14,657	20,911	320	6,574	New Site.
		RENO TAHOE	ĺ	,			Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Nevada	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117	5,683			policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,948	1,959	2,225	1,236	New Site.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743	1,873	42	1.172	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
1g	7 1 0.00		7.10	1,070		.,	grades, one responds to additional risk, additional earlipting.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Ok.'s	A:- =	DIOKENDA OKED IA D	005	400	44.4	047	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	265	168	414	317	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost
							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost
	l	DODING					for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Georgia New York	Air Force Air Force	ROBINS ROME RESEARCH SITE	56,316 40,571	66,414 33,423			additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  No explanation required.
INCW TOIK	All FUICE	INDIVIE RESEARUR SHE	40,571	33,423	2,504	(4,044)	ino expianation required.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	D - D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	327	314			No explanation required.
Milocouri	7 11 1 0100	TOOLOT WITH MILIT	021	014	20		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,488	3,400	300		estimating methodology or model.
			5,100	0,100			Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	54	303	304	553	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
0-1161-	A : E	SAN DIEGO SPACE	4 000	4.450	044	(507)	No combined to a second to the
California	Air Force	SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,923	1,152	244	(527)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	89	1,810	52		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
- ŭ		SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL		,		,	,
Georgia	Air Force	AIRPORT	3,387	1,920	521	(946)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,697	1,110	89	(498)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	56,914	78,437	2,186	23,709	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD					
California	Air Force	STATION	4	10	10	16	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	10,659	13,604	607	3,552	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	55,064	74,103	1,294		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas		SHEPPARD	5,126		340		1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Iowa	Air Force	SIOUX CTY APT ANG	465		20		No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2	5	5		No explanation required.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	110	532	42		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	2,539	3,895	75	1,431	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	253	2,319	243		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
New York	Air Force	STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,128	3,889	36	(203)	No explanation required.

	D-D		FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	1,603	2,579	10	986	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	24,110	17,743	525	(5.842)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,205	4,493	156		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	46,793	55,556	8,896	17,659	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	135,210	122,622	9,566		No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,541	2,720	,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	3,841	11,579	61		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	165	568	31	434	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	102,968	189,129	17,914	104,075	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366				Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	5,865				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) New Site.  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	181,370				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	1,093	7,050	19	5,976	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	2200	000	4 504	4.250	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wake Island	Air Force Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	229 8,588	86 4,869			No explanation required.
wake Island	All Force	WARE ISLAND AIRFIELD	6,366	4,009	3,333	(104)	ino explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,020	19,074	200	8,254	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	3,729	2,852	620	(257)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	3,641	5,973	231	2,563	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site.
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	5,379	6,076	62	759	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288	6,260	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	4,656	5,620	315	1,279	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
				, west,	(4000)	(4000)	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893	in regulatory document review or approval).
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	73,018	102,815	2,888	32,685	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	186	789	63	666	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	2,927	1,592	2,618	1,283	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	DLA	FACILITY	9,050	9,716	606	1,272	estimating methodology or model.
		DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW					
Pennsylvania	DLA	CUMBERLAND FAC.	7,488	5,431	334	(1,723)	No explanation required.
							One to Father the Observed Handlete Ltd Observed in Occurrent Astronomy
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,484	3,559	122	107	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio		DSC COLUMBUS	2,377	1.515	20		No explanation required.
01110	DLA	DOG COLONIDOS	2,511	1,010	20	(042)	то охраналот годинов.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
	D. A	DOG DUW A DEL DUWA	40.040	40.440	4 000	0.070	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Pennsylvania		DSC PHILADELPHIA DSC RICHMOND	42,642				needed, technology was ineffective).
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHIVIOND	47,872	43,671	1,819	(2,382)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,628	6,662	424	458	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas		AF PLANT NO 13	20	0,002	1		No explanation required.
Florida		AF PLANT NO 74	3,889	96	48		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		. = 5 . 5 . 5 . 5 . 6 . (0) . 6					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		AF RADAR TRACKING					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maine New York	FUDS FUDS	STATION AEDIT NO 19	4,170		330 14		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 18 AFPLT NO 68	1,034 22	949			No explanation required.
INCAN LOLK		AIEA MILITARY		<u> </u>	3	(17)	ino explanation required.
Hawaii		RESERVATION	248	0	45	(203)	No explanation required.
Indiana		AIR FORCE PLANT #46	16				No explanation required.
California		AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	63		5		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	45	49	20	24	No explanation required.
	=	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Florida	FUDS	RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	1 000	ALMADEN AIR FORCE	339	330	20	011	in regulatory document review or approval).
California	FUDS	STATION	1,285	936	19	(330)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	12,428			(/	No explanation required.
			, -	- ,		( )- /	
Texas	FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	6,218	3,846	31	(2,341)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	39	3	2	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	681	643	57	19	No explanation required.
							Business Courses Additional investigation to other wife to other investigation
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211	5 603	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Chianoma	. 020	7 II COMOTILE 7 III COMOLE BAREL	2,001	0,000	2,211		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984	23,964	1,822		estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	59,873	27,409	1,222		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	10,373	97	270	(10,006)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	6,090	2,947	41	(3,102)	No explanation required.
_							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Drainet Conne. Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729	752	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		ATLAS MISSILE NO.7	.,.00	.,			,,
Texas	FUDS	(K06OK0407)	21,269	10,228	746	(10,295)	No explanation required.
	-		-	-	•		

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
	·			, ,	. ,	, ,	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,381	193,688	8,661	18,968	New Site.
American							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,178	2,278	52	152	contract or contract method.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
						_	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	NO. 8	132	153			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	83	41	24		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	403	413	10	20	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of	FUDC	DENEDICT FIELD	F 070	2.007	1 004	(0.050)	No evalenction required
the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	5,973	2,097	1,024	(2,852)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Cost Estimate Change Unvaleted to Change in Seens Astro-Lagrange
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3.337	310	222	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	DETREL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,066	1,456	125	515	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	13,635	9,436	221		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Nebraska	FUDS	DEPOT	254,962	246,395	8,681	114	estimating methodology or model.
					2,000		Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	4,214	4.050	174	040	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas		BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	5,182	4,253 52	33		No explanation required.
Τολασ	1 050	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE	0,102	- 02		(0,001)	The explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	RANGE	30,269	24,375	35	(5,859)	No explanation required.
							A) Desirat Conn. Added deserve the consist and the services
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	FUDS	BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	2 1/11	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	13,826		3		No explanation required.
			-,-	- , -	-		
California		BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,542		81		No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	31,888	18,923	62	(12,903)	No explanation required.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	FUDS	BROWNWOOD AAF	20	0	17	(3)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)				Reason(s)
State	Component	Illistaliation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Desired Common Addition to the state of the
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska		BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	36,732	20,226	882		No explanation required.
, macria	. 525		30,: 02		002	(10,021)	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	2,286	161	94	(2,031)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	6,425	6,780			estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	46,179	27,856	202	(18,121)	No explanation required.
							Businest Cooper Added as a vivo as a set of the set of the level and is at
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	155,782	158,915	871	4.004	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			.00,: 02	.00,0.0	0	.,00.	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
							technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
							remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate
							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	69,254	72,688			methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	30,075		31		No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	27,570		2,508		No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	5,350	126	83		No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	39,932	26,846	1,937	(11,149)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDC	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING	44.400	0.454		(0.050)	No symlematics required
Michigan Massachusetts	FUDS FUDS	RANGE CAMP EDWARDS	11,428 513	9,151 472	27 32		No explanation required.
iviassachusetts	LOD2	CAIVIP EDWAKDS	513	472	32	(9)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	25,511	27,076	116	1,681	estimating methodology or model.
		CAMP ELLIS MILITARY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	FUDS	RESERVATION	6,580	6,867	148		estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP FANNIN	64,387	61,390	59	(2,938)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	23,581	23,735			estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	17,381	199		\	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	146,529	88,478	5,152	(52,899)	No explanation required.
		CAMP HOWZE					
Texas	FUDS	(FELDERHOFF)	90,506	86,210			No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	27,479	23,740			No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP LOCKETT	17,228	12,176	168	(4,884)	No explanation required.
							1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877	92		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP MURPHY	599	0	49	(550)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	4,445	4,486	68	109	contract or contract method.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	99,114	90,978	236	(7,900)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
<b>.</b>							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2,474	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CAMP OUEL BY MANULYED					Besite to Comment of the Authority of th
N 41 1 1 1	FUDO	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER	40.707	44047		4.054	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1,254	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
01.	FUDO	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY		7.007		(40.4)	
Ohio	FUDS	RANGE	9,308	7,397	1,477	(434)	No explanation required.
T	FUDO	CAMP CIAUET	00.004			0.500	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	28,381	36,880			estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	22,276	6,843	128	(15,305)	No explanation required.
							Duning Comme. Added also many who are as the constant are set of
	FUDC	CANAD/ET NACCAUL			22.	100	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaalaa	FUDC	CANOL DIDELINE		44700			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,772	14,738	62	28	contract or contract method.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
_	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Magagahuaatta	FUDC	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK	4 600	4 444	200	10	No evaluation required
Massachusetts	FUDS	BOMB TARGET SITE	1,690	1,414	289	13	No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaaka	FUDS	CARE CARICHEE	2.040	2.004	50	101	
Alaska Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	2,940 7,800	2,994 7,802	50 4		estimating methodology or model.  No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE TARATAGA KKS	7,000	7,002	4	6	ino explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	3,396	3,265	60	(71)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	4,053	374	31	(3,648)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,503	560	214	(729)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567	62		New Site.
New Jersey	FUDS	CAVEN PT AR TER	1,457	78	10	( , ,	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	20	0	19	(1)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,616	3,915	38		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CHENNAULT AFB	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP					3)
Virginia	FUDS	TRAINING SITE	35,735	26,728	1,429	(7,578)	No explanation required.
J		CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY	,	,	,	, , ,	
Utah	FUDS	DEPOT	20	7	10	(3)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		CLINTON COUNTY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)			_	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	ililiation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,971	7,110	888	27	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaaka	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	38,347	44 705	2 557	9 005	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	FUD5	COLD BAY - FOR I RANDALL	38,347	44,785	2,557	8,995	inew Site.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213	210	38	35	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas		CONCORDIA POW CAMP	0	149	298		New Site.
Oregon	FUDS	CONDON AFS	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	21,802	12,480	208		No explanation required.
North Carolina		COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	575	568	13	6	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	700	020	20	00	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina		CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	780 15.832	830 12,354	38 55		No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,376	22,922	31		No explanation required.
New York		CP HERO	21,338	13,222	659		No explanation required.
New Jersey		CP KILMER	499	53	2		No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	32,200	29,620			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,514	1,640	469		No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,390	263	373	(754)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
T	FUDO	OLIDBUIN FIFL C	4 0=0	4 4	46.1		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484	587	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Buorto Bico	ELIDO	CHI ERRA DHERTO RICO	400 500	105.057	4 504	1 0 4 5	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico Florida	FUDS FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO  DALE MABRY AAF	108,533 3,218	105,857 3,001	4,521 37		No explanation required.
New Jersey		DEAL TEST SITE	1,359	78			No explanation required.
INCM JEISEY	טטט ון	DEAL TEST SITE	1,339	70	99	(1,102)	pro explanation requiled.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Classista.	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING	004	254		(470)	No symbol of the security of
Florida		CENTER	604	351	77		No explanation required.
New Mexico		DEMING AAF PBR #24	2,372	1,450	113	(809)	No explanation required.
T		DENTON NIKE (DFW NIKE				(40)	No suplemention required
Texas	FUDS	BAT 1)	20	0	8	(12)	No explanation required.
Duanta Diaa	FUDO	DECECUEO ICI AND	F 70F	0.440	4 040	4.004	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,705	8,416	1,610	4,321	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Caush Canalina	FUDO	DONAL DOON AED	44400	45.070		4 000	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	74	1,930	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
l							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718	9,293	1,374	3,949	New Site.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California		D-Q UNIVERSITY	92		99		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida		DREW FIELD	10,040	5,466	21	(4,553)	No explanation required.
		DRY CANYON ARTILLERY					
California	FUDS	RANGE	9,961	7,135	86	(2,740)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
North Carolina		DUCK TARGET FACILITY	719	1,056	67	404	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		DULUTH INTERNATIONAL					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Minnesota		AIRPORT	4,508	4,541	25		estimating methodology or model.
Texas		DYESS AFB-NIKE DY10	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
		EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA					
Alaska	FUDS	SITE	625	589	55	19	No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	_	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,978	5,895	281	198	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB AF FAC S-1	1	0	3	2	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB AF FAC S2	1	0	2	1	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-01	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-20	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-40 ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	BATTERY E-70	1	0	1		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	410	170	42	(198)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	408	335	28	(45)	No explanation required.
	FILIDO		005	000	440	477	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	605	669	413	477	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	3,166	285	3,021	140	in regulatory document review or approval).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	20,253	20,792	6		Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Dunicat Conna Added a suive secure due to other site level assistat
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	1,721	285	1,970	534	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorada	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	3,071	2.474	40	(E 10)	No explanation required
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	3,071	2,474	49	(346)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13	2,403	820	266	(1,317)	No explanation required.
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
	FUDO	EE WARREN AER EAG OITE O	55.070	50.444	70	000	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	55,876	56,411	73	608	in regulatory document review or approval).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	58,573	63,796	182	5,405	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	0	0	14	14	No explanation required.
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Nahraalsa	FUDC	FE WARREN AFR FAC SITE O	2.025	200	0.070	104	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	3,035	289	2,870	124	in regulatory document review or approval).  Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	19,175	19,155	747	727	in regulatory document review or approval).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,252	3,233	388	369	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		FIVE POINTS					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Texas	FUDS	OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	781	813	26	50	New Site.
Texas	FUDS	FLAMINGO PROPERTIES CO	761	613	20	56	inew Site.
Texas	FUDS	(REV.)	20	0	11	(9)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	1,862	175			No explanation required.
			.,002			(1,000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1,338	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,468	5,679	57	268	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Drainet Conna Added cleanus shapes on the president programme (a.g.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,437	5,671	49	283	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nalisas	FUD3	FORBES AFB ATLAS 5-02	5,437	5,671	49	203	leasibility study of refriedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	103	73	82	52	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	4,116	1,476	307	(2,333)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,814	1,775	148	109	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Kanasa	FUDC	FORRES AFR ATLAS S OS	007	04.4	00		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Businest Course. Added also are also as the president are assessed to
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,267	1,177	121	31	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Italisas	1 000	FOREST PARK RECREATION	1,207	1,177	121	- 51	leasibility study of remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	FUDS	CAMP	1,117	657	41	(419)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of	EU 10.0						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	535	799			feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	FORT A.P. HILL	0	0	214	214	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,778	2,716	151	89	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	FORT BAKER	113	2,073	8	1,968	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,377	1,030			No explanation required.
		FORT CUSTER					
Michigan	FUDS	REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	23,525	19,973			No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	4,134	3,580	115	(439)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,474	5,946	3,357	1 829	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	436,157	337,343			No explanation required.
				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		(==, ==,	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	102	104	631	633	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Desirat Conn. Added donous phonon of the project one of
Phodo Jolond	TUDE	FORT CREBI E DI ITCH ISI		40		00	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Rhode Island	FUDS FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL FORT HANCOCK	51 31,062	40 19,509			feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  No explanation required.
New Jersey	L0D2	FOR I HANGOGK	31,062	19,509	1/3	(11,380)	no explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40	62		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada		FORT MCDERMITT	53	41	2		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	5,731	4,609	157		No explanation required.
						,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	7,843	19,851	2,263		estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	New Site.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,084	17,132	67		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	FORT SAN JACINTO	15		8		No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT	20	0	6		No explanation required.
_	FUE	500TED AID 50D05 DA05	4.500	4.044			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas		FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,529	4,611	34		estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania		FRANKFORD ARSENAL	16,925	7,060	377		No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	8,510	6,113	33		No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
North Carolina	FUDS	ET ODEEN	0.000	9.065	201		estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina		FT GREEN FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH	8,800	9,065	201		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida		BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665		estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	GEIGER AIRFIELD	15,575	0.030	2,003		No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	GETTYSBURG WASTE AX	1	0	1		No explanation required.
South Dakota	1 003	GETTTOBONG WASTE AX	<u> </u>	U	ı ı	(0)	ivo explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964	5,830	919		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	137	86	37		No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		OOL DENI CATE NATIONAL					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Galilottila	1 000	GOPHER ORD PLT	30	343	342	037	rease, site resperied to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	FUDS	ROSEMOUNT	146	81	62	(3)	No explanation required.
		GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH					
Delaware	FUDS	CENTER GREAT BEND A-GRND GNRY	48	48	1	1	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	R	18,544	6.959	28	(11 557)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	116,177	109,652			No explanation required.
			,	,		, , ,	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	6,549	8,343	870	2,664	
		GUNTER AIR FORCE					
Alabama	FUDS	STATION	192	187	4	(1)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	2,214	2,226	62	7/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
i iawaii	1 003	HAIRO RADIO STATION	2,214	2,220	02	74	estimating methodology of model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE					estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	HALEIWA LANDING FIELD	42	0	24	(18)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	EUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	000	E 070	404	1 514	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	MANULTON ARWIT AIRFIELD	886	5,276	121	4,511	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California		HAMMER FIELD	133	<b>(</b> ()			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	7,339	1,880	50		No explanation required.
Mississippi California	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	607 1,564	544 401	208 142	145	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  No explanation required.
California	F0D3	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING	1,304	401	142		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	FUDS	CAMP	35,521	35,666	132		estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	598	296	11		No explanation required.
Kansas		HERINGTON AAF	647	561	134	48	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts		HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	19,322	17,012	150		No explanation required.
Georgia		HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	26,788	12,936	17		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	31	32	3	4	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas		HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386	3,372	891		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Guam		IBANEZ/GUERRERO PROPERTIES	185	123	78	16	No explanation required.
Illinois		IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466		1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

		FY 2015 Cost Estimate				
DoD						
Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158	339	182	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
						No explanation required.
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				No explanation required.
	JEFFERSONVILLE				( - /	
FUDS	QUARTERMASTER DEPOT	13	0	1	(12)	No explanation required.
						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
						dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
FUDS		740	825	18	103	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
						No explanation required.
FUDS	KILAUEA RADAR STATION	608	504	41	(63)	No explanation required.
ELIDO	KINGUELOE AID FORCE DACE	04.404	40.000	4 040	(7.405)	No suplementing required
FUDS		21,461	12,823	1,213	(7,425)	No explanation required.
TUDE		4 450	2 000	105	0.705	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
						estimating methodology or model.
FUDS		120	21	l l	(98)	No explanation required.
FLIDS		12 227	7 030	2	(5.286)	No explanation required.
						No explanation required.
1 000		1,021	0,717	332		i vo explanation required.
FUDS		2 174	1 255	140	(779)	No explanation required.
						No explanation required.
. 020		,	3,00:	<u> </u>	(=,000)	
						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
						dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
FUDS	CENTER	11,824	12,607	100	883	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	FUDS FUDS FUDS	FUDS INDEPENDENCE AAF FUDS JAMES CONNALLY AFB FUDS JEFFERSON BARRACKS JEFFERSONVILLE FUDS QUARTERMASTER DEPOT  FUDS KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10 KENTUCKY ORDNANCE FUDS WORKS FUDS KILAUEA RADAR STATION  FUDS KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY FUDS KINGSLEY FIELD KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE FUDS ANNEX FUDS KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64 KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB FUDS RGE FUDS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3  KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY	DOD Component         Installation Name         Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)           FUDS         INDEPENDENCE AAF         315           FUDS         JAMES CONNALLY AFB         1,548           FUDS         JEFFERSON BARRACKS         883           JEFFERSONVILLE QUARTERMASTER DEPOT         13           FUDS         KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10         740           KENTUCKY ORDNANCE FUDS         1,480           FUDS         KILAUEA RADAR STATION         608           FUDS         KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY         21,461           FUDS         RANGE FUDS         1,459           FUDS         KINGSLEY FIELD         120           KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE FUDS         1,459           FUDS         KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64         7,027           KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB FUDS         2,174           FUDS         KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3         11,758	DOD   Installation Name	Dod	Estimate Adjusted for Installation Name

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914	56,389			in regulatory document review or approval).
Arizona	FUDS	KOFA NWR	33,563	32,598	84		No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	KOKEE STATE PARK	450	350	50	(50)	No explanation required.
Et add a	FUDO	LAKE BRYANT BOMB &	00.077	0.050	0.4	(50.740)	Nie word was financia and a standard
Florida	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE  LAKE CHABOT MACHINE GUN	63,677	6,853	81	(56,743)	No explanation required.
California	EUDO			45		(404)	No combination required
California	FUDS	RANGE	147 252	15 96	8 79		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	252	96	79	(77)	No explanation required.
							Draingt Scope Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	WORKS	9,946	9,883	225	162	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	9,946 461	261	17		No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	5,098		66		No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	LARSON AIR FORCE BASE	3,090	4,027	1		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	10,227	7,709	338		No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	LIBERAL AAF	1,821	579	87		No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	218		45		No explanation required.
TTCDIASKA	1000	EINGGEN AIR DAIL TAGGET	210	113	40	(00)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,500	3.073	726	299	estimating methodology or model.
riobraona	1 000	2.11002.1711.2711.1710.0.10	0,000	0,070	720	200	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	24,879	23,362	1,642	125	
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	13,642		32		No explanation required.
. 102.40.14				. 0,000		(000)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	5,920	6,023	145	248	
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	3,218		64		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	lu ataliatia u Nama	Adjusted for			Change	December 1
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	3,835	3,902	60	127	contract or contract method.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	309		9		
. 100.00.10	1.020					(==5)	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
OL:	ELIDO.	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE	00.05	0.4.500	4.070	0.545	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Ohio New York	FUDS FUDS	BASE LOCKPORT AFS	33,857 7.368	34,526 7.100			New Site.
New York	FUD5	LOCKPORT AFS	7,308	7,100	135	(133)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1,407	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	52	52	24	24	No explanation required.
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX					
Colorado	FUDS	1B)	179	141	33	(5)	No explanation required.
Colorada	FUDC	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX	074	007		(00)	No evalenction required
Colorado	FUDS	1C) LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX	974	897	51	(26)	No explanation required.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Colorado	FUDS	2C)	3,916	3,980	204	268	contract or contract method.
Colorado	. 020	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE	0,010	0,000	201	200	Some of Some of House
Vermont	FUDS	STA	522	84	358	(80)	No explanation required.
						, ,	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
	1						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Coorgie	EUDS	MACON ORDNIANCE DI ANT	- 4	7-	4.0	07	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	3/	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			(4,222)	( )	(+ /	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
		MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER					
Hawaii	FUDS	NAVY SALVAGE YARD	0	5,447	1,054	6,501	New Site.
		MAKANALUA BOMBING					
Hawaii	FUDS	RANGE	9,324	8,423	61	(840)	No explanation required.
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE					(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	3,578	4,508	55		needed, technology was ineffective).
Washington		MANCHESTER AAA SITE	1	0	1		No explanation required.
Washington		MANCHESTER ANNEX	7,010		371		No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	284	279	4	(1)	No explanation required.
		MARIETTA AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	FUDS	STATION	2,795	2,854	117	176	estimating methodology or model.
							Draiget Seens Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	656	643	65	52	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Offic	F0D3	WARION ENGINEER DEFOT	000	043	00	32	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Northern							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			,,,	3,100			3,
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777	115	3,325	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico		MAYAGUEZ MISSILE ANNEX	62	0	<b>U</b> .		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	4,566	3,780	54	(732)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	195				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	73,709	45,772	51	(27,886)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	_	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Toyoo	FUDS	MOORE AIRFORCE BASE (USDA SITE	20	0	10	(10)	No evaluation required
Texas West Virginia		MORGANTOWN OW	20 97	0 12			No explanation required.  No explanation required.
Tennessee		MOTLOW RANGE	14,190	0		\ /	No explanation required.
1611165566	1 003	MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE	14,190	U	131	(14,009)	ino explanation required.
California	FUDS	RANGE	587	31	13	(543)	No explanation required.
Gamorria	1 000	10.1102	307	- 01	13	(040)	no explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	2,748	2,206	111	(431)	No explanation required.
	. 525					(.0.)	- Constantiation required
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	841	696	131	(14)	No explanation required.
			-			\	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	New Site.
		MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN					
Florida	FUDS	RANGE	729	0	36	(693)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Northern	E1100		10.510	45.400	000	(0.040)	
Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	19,512	15,433	236	(3,843)	No explanation required.
Northern	FUDO	NAFTAN ORDNANCE	0.004	40.504	400	000	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mariana Islands	FUDS	DISPOSAL NANSEMOND ORDNANCE	9,891	10,594	163	866	estimating methodology or model.
Virginio	FUDS	DEPOT	45.250	34,153	622	(40 502)	No explanation required
Virginia Massachusetts		NANTUCKET BCH	45,359 497	34,153			No explanation required.  No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	1,334	137			No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,334	1,596			No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	1,889	354		/	No explanation required.
vvasinigion	1 003	INAU-QUILLATUTL	497	304	01	(36)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	10,500	10.105	892	497	contract or contract method.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	584	10,103			No explanation required.
INGW JEISEY	1 000	INTO OTHE DEDG CORE	304		<u>ı</u> 3	(319)	ino explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	_	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	initiation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AIR STATION					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	OAKLAND	117	95			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	12,934	7,561	2,026		No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	7,336	6,837	26	(473)	No explanation required.
O-1:f:-	FUDO	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR	7,000	4.007	070	(0.400)	No suplemention required
California	FUDS	STATION	7,960	4,987	873	(2,100)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California		STATION ARCATA	44	5,645	55	5,656	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
				3,010	- 55	0,000	,
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251	755	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					
California	FUDS	STATION VERNALIS	22	0	1	(21)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30	262	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	3,298	0			No explanation required.
T delle Mee	1 000	TV/V/LE GT/(TIGIN G/IIV GG/IIV	5,230		70	(3,220)	TVO CAPITATION TEQUITED.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		NAVAL WEAPONS					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		INDUSTRIAL RESERVE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Illinois	FUDS	PLANT	73	455	11	393	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	ELID O	NAVOVELIEL ANIXA DIDELINE		000	050	4.070	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	ELIDO	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE	0.005	E E04	005	(00)	No evelopetica acquired
Alaska	FUDS	ISLAND) NEBRASKA ORDNANCE	6,365	5,531	805	(29)	No explanation required.
Nahraaka	ELIDO	PLANT	040.007	000 774	5 040	(0.004)	No evalenction required
Nebraska	FUDS	PLANT	248,987	239,771	5,312	(3,904)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	39,823	29,473	4,066	(6 20A)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,992	1,299	195		No explanation required.
INTIQUE ISIATIU	1 003	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE	1,332	1,299	193	(490)	INO explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	PLANT	126	87	54	15	No explanation required.
viigiilia	1 000	1 27 (141)	120	07	J-	10	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,344	1,347	29	32	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	2,985	0	106		No explanation required.
			_,,,,,			(=,0:0)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	590	2,058	120	1,588	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BAT NY 15 LAUNCH	52	20	25		No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE BAT NY 80	109	0	7	(102)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	5,900	4,409	10		No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-46 - MUNSTER	0	0	5	5	No explanation required.
							Drainet Conne. Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,014	2,232	344	562	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	302	153	8		No explanation required.
Illinois		NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	0		71		New Site.
11111013	. 000	THILL O GOLDT AINLINGTON	ı	۷,500	/ 1	5,059	140W Oilo.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$000)			Reason(s)
			,				
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND					requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215			in regulatory document review or approval).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	52	52	17		No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 88	52	0			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 93/94	465	0			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY-73	0	0			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 32	202	0	10	(192)	No explanation required.
							Desirat Conso. Added desarra whose of the president processor (a.e.
Name Inches	ELIDO	NUKE DI LEO	504		004	400	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74	70	
1 omojivana	. 020	THILE I II TO, TO (MEDILI)		107	, .	, ,	iouso, one response to address additional non, additional campling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,530	1,515	43	28	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							<u></u>
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Alaska	FUDC	NUKE CITE LOVE	000	404	500	074	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523	371	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	In a fall of an Name	Adjusted for		_	Change	B (-)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,533	2,496	172	135	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland		NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,240	1,192			No explanation required.
California		NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	94				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	3,815			/	No explanation required.
Alaska	1 003	NORTHEASTERN	3,013	3,110	209	(410)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,447	2,488	94	(865)	No explanation required.
Alaska		NORTHWAY ACS	1,837	697	36		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,402				No explanation required.
Alaska	1 000	NORTHWAT STAGING LED	2,402	073	33	(1,430)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	658	622	6,429	6 303	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
riasita	1 000	INOVINO/II /IICT I BEW(B/IIC//	030	022	0,423	0,555	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7 310	New Site.
- iawan	1 000	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL	2,140	0,077	02	7,010	Trow Gree.
California	FUDS	AIRPORT	2,421	63	119	(2.239)	No explanation required.
Alaska		OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	4,494	797	242		No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	190	126			No explanation required.
	. 050	0.101.11.27.11.11.002	100	120	<u> </u>	(00)	in o supramation roquinos.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
lowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2.302	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			10,100	-,	_,,,,,	,	37
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
			1				dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	7,383	8,306	133	1,056	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE	,	,		,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Oklahoma	FUDS	WORKS	5,246	0	45	(5,201)	No explanation required.
Alaska Oklahoma	FUDS FUDS	OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE	ĺ	,			

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							A) Project Occurs. Added to be a sense of the sense of th
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	280	607	604	931	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
ransas	1 000	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET	200	007	004	331	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	FUDS	ANNEX)	1,613	1,631	18	36	estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	73	36	35		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	7,703	2,306	94		No explanation required.
		ORANGE PORT OF NAV SHIP	1,100	_,		(0,000)	
Texas	FUDS	STOR	187	48	2	(137)	No explanation required.
		ORLANDO RANGE AND					
Florida	FUDS	CHEMICAL YARD	648	0	42	(606)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		OROVILLE PRECISION					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		OYSTER POINT STORAGE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Virginia	FUDS	AREA	932	942	60	70	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	8,149	7,831	111		No explanation required.
				,			
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	468	895	104		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii		PALI TRAINING CAMP	35,994	34,914	96		No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PALMYRA ISLAND	5	0	3	(2)	No explanation required.
Toyoo	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	200	0.5	4	(470)	No explanation required
Texas California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	269 4,949	95 1,115	490	(1/3)	No explanation required.  No explanation required.
Calliottila	FUDO	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-	4,949	1,115	490	(3,344)	ino explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	GROUND GUN	1,055	711	48	(206)	No explanation required.
i ioriua	טטט ון	CITODIAD COM	1,055	111	40	(230)	110 ολριαπατίοπ Γεγαπεα.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alaska		PEDRO DOME	39	64	12		in regulatory document review or approval).
Oregon	FUDS	PENDLETON FIELD	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
		PETALUMA BOMBING					
California	FUDS	TARGET	12,250	5,533	136		No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	PHILOMATH GAP FILLER	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
		PINE RIDGE GUNNERY					
South Dakota		RANGE	14,529	4,220			No explanation required.
Florida		PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	9,156	8,830	28		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-1	135	20	20	(95)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-4	187	45			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-8	147	45	10	(92)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Ohio		PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	22,965	13,717	11,195	1,947	New Site.
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	42,614	28,891	59	(13,664)	No explanation required.
		POCATELLO BOMBING					
Idaho	FUDS	RANGE #3	5,508	1,349	113	(4,046)	No explanation required.
		POINT CABRILLO RADAR					
California	FUDS	SIMULATOR ANNEX	81	0	3	(78)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	30,669	27,056	153	(3,460)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	249	1,374	43	1,168	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		PORT ANGELES COMBAT					
Washington	FUDS	RANGE	8,817	3,720	46	(5,051)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	19,870	17,236	86		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	1,097	107	81	(909)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)				Reason(s)
Olulo	Component	motanation Numb	manon (¢000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	incuson(o)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		PORTERVILLE ARMY					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	AIRFIELD	201	110	265	174	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Disanta Diaa	FUDC	DUEDTO DICO DOMP DANCE	4 407	0.400	500	0.500	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico Rhode Island	FUDS FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	4,137 299	6,138 219	532 39		estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,519	20,341	131		No explanation required.  No explanation required.
Kiloue Islanu	FUDS	QUONSET FOINT NAS	20,519	20,341	131	(47)	INO explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916		159		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	9,516	7,379	43	(2,094)	No explanation required.
							A) Project Coope Added cleaning above as the resident assessment
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,329	10,816	939	426	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		RED BLUFF AIR FORCE					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION	99	79	168	1.10	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	57	0			No explanation required.
Jamorria	. 555	RIALTO AMMUNITION	57	0	21	(50)	110 Orphanation roguitous
California	FUDS	STORAGE POIT	33	5	15	(13)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	724	432	72		No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ROSSFORD AD	23	9			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	655	78	95	(482)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	25,893	26,488	21	616	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
L		SAN FRANCISCO DEFENSE		_	_		
California	FUDS	AREA SITE 61-R	22	0	6	(16)	No explanation required.
							Drainet Coope Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444	
Camorria	1 000	BATTERT 00 00	021	+00	300	777	rease, site respense to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	15	67	14	66	
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE					7 1 9/
California	FUDS	BATTERY 93	606	0	20	(586)	No explanation required.
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60	
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,063	5,297	57	291	in regulatory document review or approval).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2,416	20	727	
riorida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2,410	20	121	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,827	4,108	99	2.380	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	3,595	1,358	72		
				,		1	·
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	449	344	142	37	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
			( tree )	(4000)	(+===)	(4000)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,688	2,637	130	79	estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	5,845	5,163			No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,665	5,693	100	128	estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	3,849	3,163	98	(588)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	259	80	59	(120)	No explanation required.
		SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Washington	FUDS	DEPOT	4,044	6,933	64	2.953	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	4,954	3,114	34		No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	6,481	4,490	66		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	171	62		\ ' '	No explanation required.
		SHUMAKER NAVAL AMMO				( /	2.1.2.2.1.2.2.1.2.2.1.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2
Arkansas	FUDS	DEPOT	133	10	1	(122)	No explanation required.
Nebraska Iowa	FUDS FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT SIOUX CITY MUNI AIRPORT	27,481 9	28,066 0			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	97,172	97,708	608	1,144	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	25,915	15,100	47	(10,768)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	16,346	33,106	7,467	24,227	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	559	2,764	34	2,239	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
	· ·		\	· ,	. ,	ζ. /	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518	898	20	400	needed, technology was ineffective).
		STOCKTON ORDNANCE					
California	FUDS	DEPOT	10	0	11	1	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	3,633	2,051	32	(1,550)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,987	6,209	112		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	96,183	23,999	1	(72,183)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AAF	15	0	3	(12)	No explanation required.
American		TAFUNA MILITARY					
Samoa	FUDS	RESERVATION	255	262	9		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	81,949	25,135	5,575	(51,239)	No explanation required.
Northern							
Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	10,161	568	247	(9,346)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	6,738	1,274	8,185		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY		4= 004		(0=4)	
Pennsylvania	FUDS	RANGE	18,305	17,261	393	(651)	No explanation required.
0 117	ELID O	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY	0.400	470	404	(4.440)	
California	FUDS	10	2,103	476	184		No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	508	511	10	13	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRINIDAD BOMBING TARGET	48	0	4		No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	58	60	18		No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,849	13,475	219	(155)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TWO ROCK RANCH STATION	112	0	77	(35)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	17,619	18,220	284	885	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,681	17,699	3,980		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)				Reason(s)
State	Component	instanation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	ineason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213,385	233,408	809	20,832	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	ELID O		0.007	0.000		04.4	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA UNIV OF CAL, SANTA	8,687	9,209	92	614	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BARBARA	28	0	30	2	No explanation required.
West Virginia		US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	107	106	9		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	USAF AVON PARK RANGE	21,505	2,635	65		No explanation required.
Tionua	1 000	USCG RESERVE TRAINING	21,303	2,000	00	(10,000)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	CENTER	0	0	51	51	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	16				No explanation required.
American						\ /	
Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	904	262	319	(323)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP	61,786	64,561	347	3.122	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	VAN VLECK GAP FILLER	0	0	9		No explanation required.
							1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
							the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	13,478	14,138	61	721	in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
		VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR					
Florida	FUDS	STATION	313	52	18	(243)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	100	255	73	228	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
			•	,		, ,	
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS		29	18		No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	21,225	4,896	528	(15,801)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	815,060	843,761	5,985	34,686	estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico		WALKER AFB	7,867	7,728	57		No explanation required.
Virginia		WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	31,066	25,720	1,112		No explanation required.
			,		.,	(1,=01)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,879	3,894	45	60	estimating methodology or model.
		WAUGOSHANCE POINT	,	,			3/
Michigan	FUDS	TARGET	5,679	2,319	946	(2,414)	No explanation required.
lowa		WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	158	0	51		No explanation required.
Texas		WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,835	3,644	25		No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	2,138	1,130	46	(962)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WELLSBACH PLT NOBS 258	482	20	212	(250)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER AIR FORCE AUXILIARY FIELD	2,617	0	44	(2,573)	No explanation required.
		WENDOVER BOMBING					
Utah	FUDS	RANGE	5,368	0	22	(5,346)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER SPECIAL WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	500	0	19	(481)	No explanation required.
West Virginia		WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	86,040	68,006	3,089	(14,945)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	WESTERN REMOUNT AREA & RECEPTION CENTER	674	25	71	(578)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts		WESTOVER AFB	1,496	1,461	92	<u>5</u> 7	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri		WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	2,256	1,491	528	(237)	No explanation required.
Alaska		WILDWOOD AFS	4.181	2,565	55		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Designat Cooper Added as a vivo as costs about the other site level as size to
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		WILKINS AIR FORCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio		STATION	757	1,132	1	370	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
OTIIO	1 000	WILLIAMS FIELD BOMB TAR	131	1,132		313	lease, site respected to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	FUDS	RGE #6	838	568	21	(249)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WILLOW RUN AIRPORT	137	0	11	\ /	No explanation required.
						Ì	
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	6,221	643	141	(5,437)	No explanation required.
		WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY					
West Virginia	FUDS	SODS	82,203		116		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	49,591	7,379	•		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	36	5	33	2	No explanation required.
							Duringt Coope Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	FUDS	PLANT	434	421	154	141	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	. 323		101		101		3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	1,767	2,462	72	767	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

## FY 2016 DEP ARC

# Appendix B

## **Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates**

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2016 Environmental Restoration Funding and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2015.

This Appendix explains an increase of 10 percent or more in an installation's or property's projected cost estimate over the prior year estimate.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change	-
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	0	234	72	306		dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alahama			44.000	40.000	440	4.040		1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alabama  Massachusetts	Army	ALABAMA AAP  ARMY RESEARCH  LABORATORY- WATERTOWN	11,330	,	98	,		delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY- WOODBRIDGE	1,273					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1,197		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT- LEXINGTON FACILITY						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kentucky	Army	LEANING TON FACILITY	320	1,154	6	840		sampling).  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491		schedule.  Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,350	3,284	286	1,220		the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

State Comp Oregon Army New Hampshire Army Massachusetts Army	my		Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)  69	Estimate (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	, ,	Reason(s)  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon Army  New Hampshire Army	my	Installation Name CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	Inflation (\$000)	( <b>\$000</b> )	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Oregon Army  New Hampshire Army	my	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	69	34	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, ,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
New Hampshire Army	my	WITHYCOMBE  COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING			986	951	1376%	
New Hampshire Army		COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING			986	951	1376%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		AND ENGINEERING	6,455	6,524				
	, in y		0,400	0,027	5,736	5,805		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusells Anny		DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	39,934					1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Virginia Army		FORT BELVOIR	15,959	,	,			approval).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia Army								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
_	DoD		Adjusted for		_	_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
IZ to alin -		FORT CAMPRELL	0.440	0.000	000	4.054		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	8,140	9,628	363	1,851	23%	schedule.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019	1,508	108	597		sampling).
Airansas	Allily	I OKT OTALTEE	1,019	1,500	100	331		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236	698	2,173		model.
	,			.,_55	333	,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6,587	5,473	5,171	4,057	62%	additional sampling).
								1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054	69%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	37%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
IZ	A	FORT LEAVENIMORTH	050	4.400	05	440		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1,168	95	413	49%	sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.     Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793		method.
virginia	глину	II OKT LLL	423	431	100	193	100%	moutou.

							Cost Estimate	
	DoD						Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570	26,255	667	20,352		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	2,171	1.377	8.039	7.245		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ţ.	,			,				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
California	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003	15,071	23,303	11%	approval).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost			Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•		(\$000)	(\$000)	•	Reason(s)
Kansas		FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	2,232	3,177	19	964	43%	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,478	,	528			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

					FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	In at all attack Name	Adjusted for			_	Change	D/-)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
								costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	3,998	11,625	466	8,093	202%	greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Aiiiiy	I OKT STEWAKT	3,330	11,023	400	0,093	20276	caused by changes in schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	40,127	57,812	4,378	22,063	55%	contract or contract method.
			,	01,01=	1,010	,	2272	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,433	9,081	203	7,851		costs included in the CTC.
Ocorgia	Aiiiy	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION	1,433	3,001	203	7,001	34070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Iowa	Army	PLANT	46,669	45,961	7,179	6,471	14%	cost estimating methodology or model.
	ĺ		,	,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		IEEEEDOON BOOK WIG						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING	E 404	2 600	2.007	1 101	200/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Indiana	Army	GROUND JOINT BASE MYER-	5,494	3,608	2,987	1,101	20%	sampling).  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1.002	1617%	contract or contract method.
virgina	/\liliy	I I LIADEROOM LIALE	02		1,002	1,002	1017%	CONTRACT OF CONTRACT METHOU.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	_	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	_		Reason(s)
	1			. ,		, ,	, ,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		KANSAS ARMY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	5,072	10,208	590	5,726	113%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	2189%	scope).
		LOUISIANA ARMY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	719	32%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		MAKUA MILITARY						scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	0	747	124	871	N/A	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		MCALESTER ARMY						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Oklahoma	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825	1,944	40%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
		MEA CAMP EDIMARDO	0.504	0.500	4 745	4.740		Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,561	3,562	1,715	1,716	48%	method.
1.14-1-		MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS	470	000	4.704	4.500	0570/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Utah	Army	WEST FED	473	282	4,721	4,530	957%	cost estimating methodology or model.
A rimana	A	PAPAGO MILITARY	4.500	4 0 4 0	004	450	000/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION PHOENIX MILITARY	1,563	1,340	681	458	29%	cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland	A rmov	RESERVATION	767	1 000	100	435	F70/	cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Maryland	Army	RESERVATION	/6/	1,096	106	435	5/%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	F60/	schedule.
CaillUllila	Army	FILSIDIO OF MONTERET	1,079	1,476	202	599	30%	Scriedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Colorado		PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857			81%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	20,663	30,511	814	10,662	52%	contract or contract method.
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777	8,388	323	1,934		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		SIEVERS-SANDBERG						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	Army	USARC	0	1,784	165	1,949		sampling).
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,066	1,036	209	179	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
M	A	CURRURY TRAINING ANNEY	000	000		00		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	93	10%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		SUNFLOWER ARMY						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	14%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina		PLANT	170	1.049	335	1,214		sampling).
	,			1,010		.,		
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
								approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4.039	4,463	97	521		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
. omoyivama	Alliy	TODAY WATER OF THE STATE OF THE	4,039	7,703	31	JZ 1	1376	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change
								in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
								requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
								delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate
		TWIN CITIES ARMY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Minnesota	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4,806	13%	methodology or model.
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		UMATILLA CHEMICAL						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Oregon	Army	DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228	33,730	71%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD						Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		USARC NIAGARA FALLS						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Army	(AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	120%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509	5	244		approval).
g	7		.,	.,000			1070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453		scope).
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Hawaii	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1,351	279%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	61%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,233	2,185	350	302		in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
vasimigton	Airiy	TARRING SEITTER	2,200	2,100	330	302	1470	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	13%	schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
		ANACHUTIKA						DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	News	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	27 722	40.754	0.000	7.050		2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Navy	FLISURSPIDETI	37,722	42,751	2,030	7,059	19%	cost estimating methodology or model.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2,214	12%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		ANNAPOLIS US NAVAL			_			property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maryland	Navy	ACADEMY	9,675	11,015	7	1,347	14%	sampling).
California	News	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS	4 220	607	4 044	440	220/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	Navy	DAM FACILITY	1,239	607	1,044	412	33%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater
								than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	52%	changes in schedule.
								1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	29,445	32,499	3,707	6,761	23%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
		DETUEODA NAVAREDOCA						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Mamdand	Na	BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM	245	504	607	400	4540/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Maryland	Navy	NATCAPREG	315	504	297	486	154%	schedule.

	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	297,943	345.881	8,178	56,116	19%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	16,545	,	,	,		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina N	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	121,437	156,143	10,592	45,298		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	- Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	54,073	60.877	8,382	15,186		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	,	CECIL FIELD NAS	10,482		,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	792	2,658	22	1,888	238%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	3,195	,				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	105,400	106,436	9,699	10,735		model.  1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	2,852	5,012	1,044	3,204	112%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	18,418	20,404	2,387	4,373	24%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		OD ANE NOW		67.000		4.200		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620	2,979	4,628	13%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract
								method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	11%	schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		EDIDLEY NIDOD	00.400	04.504		4 000	100/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	18%	schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	6,005	7,451	415	1,861	31%	contract or contract method.
TOXAG	11417	THE WORLD THE STATE OF THE	0,000	7,101	110	1,001	0170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	85%	cost estimating methodology or model.
	ĺ							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500	6,184	11%	schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90	151	18	79	87%	contract or contract method.
		CHANG COMMANDA DI COMMA		0.5:-				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	13%	cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		Estimate	Cost		Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_			_	_	Reason(s)
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	10,607	13,675	4,255	7,323		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425	37,332	2,944	6,851		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,934	4,095	417	578		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
0-116	<b>.</b>	LEMOODE NAC	40.000	05.400		0.500	0.40/	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	34%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.  1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	16%	schedule.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3,093	399/	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	INAVY	FEDRO	6,033	11,123	23	3,093	30%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
								(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	2,794	3,431	88	725	26%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	,				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746	1,682	36%	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328	849	8,383	71%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD						Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	60,510	65,826	17,956			1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) New Site.  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	44,855	76,432	6,523	38,100		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
			,	,	,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	11,763	15,065	775	4,077	35%	schedule.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,218	4,511	116	409		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

						Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for			Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•		(\$000)	•		Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	18,925	74,882	1,102	57,059		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	13,259	16,775	3,657	7,173		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	5,817	6,036	533	752		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	585	1,431	115	961		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP		,				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Puerto Rico	Navy		14,310	18,590		4,679 6.146		Schedule.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	4,133	6,507	3,772	0,146	149%	schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	964	1,478	171	685	71%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,918	8,144	533	759	10%	sampling).
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926	41,425	2,408	25,907	145%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	67%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	17,767	22,792	875	5,900	33%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,210	5,775	10	575	11%	cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	4,008	6,762	290	3,044	76%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate				Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component		•				_	Reason(s)
	· ·		· ,	,	. ,	,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6,429	15%	sampling).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
District of		WASHINGTON DC						(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Columbia	Navy	NAVOBSY	54	241	44	231	429%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
District of				0= 0.4=		40.00=		cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18,267	230%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
District of								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
	Nova	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289	217		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Columbia	Navy	WASHING I ON INKL	830	763	289	217	26%	schedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Washington	Navy	  WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66.950	70,115	3.526	6.691	10%	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia		WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	22,284	40,078	4,202	21,996		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	19,025	30,587	1,348	12,910	68%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	la stallation None	Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	Barran(a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)  1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
		ABRAHAM LINCOLN						DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Illinois	Air Force	CAPITAL AP	91	2,929	78	2,916	3188%	2) New Site.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171	35,462	373	30,664	593%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,540	3,107	76	643	25%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	23,762	34,788	2,748	13,774	58%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	75,769	124,428	8,215	56,874	75%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio		AID EODOE DI ANT OF	7.440	44 774	F07	E 205		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	7,113	11,771	567	5,225	73%	costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
								the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	45,453	70,556	1,201	26,304	58%	schedule.
								<ol> <li>Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.</li> <li>Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in</li> </ol>
								cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	73,817	82,569	5,859	14,611	20%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	3,266	6,565	2,144	5,443	167%	Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	3,356	4,061	95	800	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	54	105	5	56	104%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
accaciiacono	7 1 0.00	, G. (	<u> </u>				10170	policy of another man roughless and cools moraded in the circ
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased)
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY	11,789	19,138	165	7,514	64%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	764	991	10	237	31%	cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	10,032	23,461	180	13,609		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,194	11,703	255	1,764	17%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	627	1,908	36	1,317	210%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	209	6,300	135	6,226	2975%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295	7,086	246	7,037		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	8,229			,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	28,193	50,420	2,660	24,887	88%	caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	741	848	674	781	105%	sampling).
riadika	All Toloc	BOLLETT GILLT	7-11	040	074	701	10070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		CALUMET AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	Air Force	STATION	0	465	1,680	2,145	N/A	sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	491%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Louisiana	7 11 1 0100	CHINI BEHONESHIE			40	10	40170	bob policy of allocate that readilities the costs indicated in the orie.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
								the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved
								cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4)
		CAMP BLANDING MIL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	558%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								, , ,
		CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Washington	Air Force	STATION	515	1,050	84	619	120%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		CAPE CANAVERAL AIR						scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	FORCE STATION	109,326	254,209	4,771	149,654		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE LISBURNE LONG	,	, , , , , , ,	,	-,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	15%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE NEWENHAM LONG						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1,469	13%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,355	1,083	1,695	1,423	105%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ottale	Component		illianon (4000)	(wood)	(ψουσ)	(wood)		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238	14,293		Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	50%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION  COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,202 6,495	7,300 9,405		1,515 3,130	24%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
0.000	Λ: <sub>2</sub> Γουοο	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL	20	00	110	404	6250/	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Oregon  California	Air Force	GUARD STATION  COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	3,456					DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	1,416	2,346	30	960	68%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	2,917	7,631	356	5,070	174%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1,152	2,239	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	26		52	268	1013%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Delaware		DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	70,725					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,333	4,884	2,358	5,909	443%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
		DUNCAN CANAL RADIO						vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,382	8,098	435	6,151	258%	additional sampling).
		,						. 3
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	8,488	11,344	171	3.027	36%	the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Тохао	7 1 0.00	B1200	0,100	11,011		0,021	0070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,143	6,325	705	887	14%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	78.295	98.565	2.033	22.303	28%	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
/ Haoka	All 1 GIGG	Broce	70,233	30,303	2,000	22,000	2070	Change in cost commaning moundatings of moust.
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	444.018	607,907	12,027	175,916	40%	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		-	,0.0	221,301	1_,3_1	,	1070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7,595	20%	schedule.
		l .			, ,,	, ,		

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
	-		(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i diddiiiago)	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	171,185	409,328	26,181	264,324	154%	additional sampling).
riidoka	7111 1 0100	EIEEGGIVAIIVI GROE BAGE	171,100	400,020	20,101	204,024	10470	additional dampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
South Dakota	Air Force	BASE	23,196	31,199	1,936	9,939	43%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	13,023	14,968	1,611	3,556	27%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
								costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
	1	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Washington	Air Force	BASE	57,964	67,664	4,305	14,005	24%	model.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	3,278	7,157	98	3,977	121%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
		FRANCIS E WARREN AIR						change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
Wyoming	Air Force	FORCE BASE	23,183	103,873	1,069	81,759	353%	the CTC.
,	1 0.00	1. 2	20,700	. 50,070	1,000	5 / , , 50	00070	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			,			, ,	,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		FRANCIS S. GABRESKI						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
New York	Air Force	(WEST HAMPTON)	666	1,109	940	1,383	207%	costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	279	671	315	707	253%	costs included in the CTC.
rindriodo	7 11 1 0100	1 0	270	07.	010	707	20070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	145,709	224,975	22,249	101,515	70%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	7,085	9,781	473	3,169	45%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
. 11000113111	7.11 1 0100	CLIT D WILL OF ILLE	7,000	5,701	7/3	3,103	7570	The state of the s
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,532	1,764	45	277	18%	cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate		Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635		1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	5,248	6,750	386	1,888		1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	60%	cost estimating methodology or model.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266		project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	97%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  3) New Site.
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	90%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	51%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate				Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	N/A	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Na Vasla	A: =	LIANGOOK AND		0.057	00	0.005		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035		sampling).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater
								than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614		changes in schedule
			10,000		0.10	-,	33.10	
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1,500	2343%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
j				,		,		
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
								costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
	1	l						greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7,317	112,980	57%	caused by changes in schedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	Change (\$000)	_	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	20,394	26,746	5,560	11,912	58%	model.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	668	6,152	420	5,904	885%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	109	288	89	268	247%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	2,465	9,943	484	7,962	323%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	102,376	141,353	7,268	46,245	45%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	31,878	46,710	2,454	17,286	54%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	138,829	184,381	3,731	49,283	35%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	16,014		828			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305	57,463	5,891	6,049	11%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Society Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	116,818	214,844	6,527	104,553	90%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
_			0.074	0.054	000	4.040	540/	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1,212	51%	schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	249/	<ol> <li>Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.</li> <li>Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.</li> </ol>
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	471	5,032				Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Mississippi		JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	606		16			Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	103%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1,510	42%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)		•	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified
Texas		KELLY	44,583					Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	150	2,281	68	2,199	1462%	costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	57,023	83,364	1,240	27,581	48%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	47,353	54,412	5,737	12,796	27%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	105,002	108,390	24,857	28,245	27%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

ents due to other site-level
red contaminants, increased
, additional risk pathway such as linitiated by DoD), change in
d to address additional risk,
or Regulations – DoD Policy or
or directive that redefines the
ts due to other site-level project
taminants, increased physical al risk pathway such as vapor
ed by DoD), change in future
dress additional risk, additional
,
ents due to other site-level
red contaminants, increased
, additional risk pathway such as linitiated by DoD), change in
d to address additional risk,
or Regulations – DoD Policy or
or directive that redefines the
phases as the project progresses ction operation added to project
requirements due to other site-
scovered contaminants, increased
, additional risk pathway such as
l initiated by DoD), change in
d to address additional risk,
or Regulations – DoD Policy or or directive that redefines the
Estimate Change Unrelated to
estimating methodology or
ases as the project progresses
ction operation added to project
olicy or Directive – A change in
es the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate				Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	,	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Maina	A:= Fa==	LORING	24.472	22.405	4.057	0.070		future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Maine	Air Force	LURING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2,979	10%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5,435	456%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Romaoky	7 (11 1 0100	EGGIGVIEEE I/ (I	1,102	0,410	212	0,400	40070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	27%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Duarta Dian	A: <b>-</b>	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	4.070	4.040	055	0.000		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	3,823	299%	sampling).
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9,641		cost estimating methodology or model.
			,					
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
<u>_</u>	1							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	117%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		MAKAH AIR FORCE						scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
Washington	Air Force	ISTATION	1,495	620	1.147	272		the CTC.
vasimigion	IVII I OICE	1017(11014	1,490	020	1,147	212	10%	uno 010.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)			(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
								the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
								model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Montana	Air Force	BASE	21,124	24,658	1,499	5,033		schedule.
			,	,	,	-,		
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
								approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive –
								A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included
								in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459		model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	357	2,805	93	2,541		costs included in the CTC.
ar yiaria	7 1 0100		007	2,500	- 50	2,011	7.070	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		MCCONNELL AIR FORCE						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Kansas	Air Force	BASE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,957	32%	schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	2,179	7,219	398	5,438	250%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
101110000	7411 1 0100	INICOLIZE, I LOCIT	2,110	7,210	000	0,400	20070	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	423	641	20	238	56%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	1,418	2,098	64	744	52%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	239	2,585	104	2,450	1026%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13.276	16,072	1,593	4,389	229/	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     New Site.     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
NOTH DAKOTA	All Force	IVIINO I	13,276	16,072	1,593	4,309	33%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
Alabama	Air Force Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS  MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	3,934					the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	1,838	2,915	149	1,226	67%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

DoD State Compo				FY 2016				
			Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State Compo			Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
	ponent In		Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	•		Reason(s)
			` '			,	, ,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
South Carolina Air Ford		IYRTLE BEACH	10,860	11,290	1,661	2,091		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
		IAKNEK RECREATIONAL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska Air Ford		CAMP I	829	974	13	158		cost estimating methodology or model.
l l		IAKNEK RECREATIONAL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska Air Ford	orce C	CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186	3,571		cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		IA OLIN III LE METRO		0.050	0.40	0.000		(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Tennessee Air Fore	orce N	IASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246	2,888	35530%	scope).
Nevada Air Fore	orce N	IELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3,386	21%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).  2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  4) New Site.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Delaware Air Fore	orce N	IEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	63%	project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York Air Ford	orce N	IIAGARA FALLS	7,909	9,450	927	2,468	31%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	11,220	14.596	446	3,822		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	16,844		1,187			1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	8,365	15,473	221	7,329		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Connecticut	Air Force	ORANGE AIR GUARD STATION	72	205	346	479		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	19,372	48,501	2,540	31,669		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

						Cost	Cost	
	D. D		Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name			Obligated (\$000)	_	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Otate	Component	mstanation Hame	Ιπιατίστι (ψοσσ)	(4000)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(i crecitage)	neason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation
								Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that
								impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24,291	95,756	10,068	81,533	336%	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		DE A CE ANIC NIEW						scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	2575%	change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
ivew mampanine	All I olce	TIAWI STIIRE	134	3,401	107	3,434	237370	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		PETERSON AIR FORCE						(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Colorado	Air Force	BASE	33	14	4,178	4,159	12794%	
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	40,138	88,606	1,693	50,161		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
0 114		POINT ARENA AIR FORCE				4 004	000/	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
California	Air Force	STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	68%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Alaaka		POINT BARROW LONG	4 047	11 5 47	0.47	7 577		future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247	7,577	180%	additional sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
l								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	423	14,004	20	13,601	3218%	sampling).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213	83	49%	sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	46%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	1,942	25	1,609	450%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	76	209	31	164	215%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	76	211	21	156	204%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52	1,438	1210%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14,657	20,911	320	6,574	45%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	Air Force	RENO TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117	5,683	98	5,664		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,948					New Site.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811		1,221		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Fercentage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	265	160	44.4	247	1100/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Offic	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	265	168	414	317	119%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	56,316	66,414	10,733	20,831	37%	caused by changes in schedule.
	7 0.00		00,010	33,	. 0,. 00	20,001	0.70	and the second s
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	54	303	304	553	1027%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
	l	0.43/44/14/14/19/74						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	89	1,810	52	1,773	1983%	costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	56,914	78,437	2,186	23,709	42%	ineffective).
								costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was
Illinois	Air Force	SCOT FAIR FORCE BASE	56,914	78,437	2,186	23,709	42%	ineffective).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575	8,971		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	10,659	13,604	607	3,552		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	55,064	74,103	1,294	20,333		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	5,126	7,470	340	2,684		Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE	110	532	42	464	423%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	2,539	3,895	75	1,431	56%	cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio		SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	253					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	1,603	2,579	10	986		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,205	4,493	156	3,444		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	46,793	55,556	8,896	17,659		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,541	2,720		,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	3,841	11,579		7,799		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	165	568	31	434	264%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	102,968	189,129	17,914	104,075		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

					FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366	11,636	143	5,413	85%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	5,865	8,118	2,247	4,500		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) New Site.  3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Onanoma	741 1 0100	V/1110L	0,000	0,110	2,241	4,000		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	181,370	268,186	28,472	115,288		(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
		VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD						project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Wisconsin	Air Force	BASE	1,093	7,050	19	5,976	547%	costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	229	86	1,501	1,358	594%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	lustelletien Neue				_	Change	D(-)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,020	19,074	200	8,254		scope).
Hasita	7 11 1 0100	WEST NOME THAT THAT	11,020	10,014	200	0,201	1070	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator
								(e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases
		WHITEMAN AIR FORCE						project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3)
Missouri	Air Force	BASE	3,641	5,973	231	2,563	70%	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	5,379	6,076	62	759		sampling).
- Cittarionia	7 111 1 0100		0,010	0,010	02	100		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288	6,260	39%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		WILLOW GROVE AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania		FORCE RESERVE	4.656	5,620	315	1,279		sampling).
			1,000			1,=: 0		
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893		approval).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893		

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	73,018	102,815	2,888	32,685		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
	–	VE. 1055 1110	400	700			0.500/	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
West Virginia  Maryland	Air Force  DLA	YEAGER ANG CURTIS BAY	2,927	789 1,592				DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	9,050	9,716	606	1,272		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	83%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
	EUD0	100					4000/	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	199%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		ARDMORE AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Oklahoma	FUDS	BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211	5,603	279%	sampling).
			,	,	,	-,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984	23,964	1,822	11,802	84%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	85%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729	752		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Okianoma	1 003	ATEAS MISSIEE NO. 5	1,193	1,210	129	132		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,381	193,688	8,661	18,968	10%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Na	ELIDO	DANIGOD CAD EIL AV				0.4		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61	111%	sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	NO. 8	132	153	58	79		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	EUD C	DENIGH ADDE::::						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	29%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
	EUD O	DETUEL ADDT						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	10%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1.066	1,456	125	515	18%	sampling).
Alaska	1 000	DETTILE BIATIDQING	1,000	1,430	123	313	4070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	3,141		additional sampling).
			, -	-,		-,		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	88%	scope). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	1307%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
	FUE				400	400		(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103	14%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967		sampling).
INGW JOISEY	1 003	DONLING FOR AAF	1,090	1,597	1,000	907	31%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	31%	sampling).
	1. 350	1=	1,007	1,100		010	3170	1t3/-

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
	_							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	12%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
E	EU D 0	OAAR OORRON IOUNOTON	27.700	04 700		4 000	4=0/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	15%	cost estimating methodology or model.
Tayon	FUDS	CAMBMAYEY	14.054	40.977	92	26.745	1070/	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877	92	26,715	187%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2,474		sampling).
	1 323	0,	. 0,0 .0	. 5,555			1070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		CAMP SHELBY MANUVER						(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1,254	10%	scope).
			·					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	28,381	36,880	89	8,588	30%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	33%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Illinoio	FUDC	CARMIAIR FORCE STATION	37	100	60	400		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100	63	126	346%	sampling).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567	62	7,348		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
, naona	1. 555		201	7,007	32	7,040	2011/0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	1502%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		CLINTON COUNTY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	38,347	44,785	2.557	8.995		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
	. 525		35,5	,. 55	2,001	0,000	2070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213	210	38	35		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	0					New Site.
7.00.0		CORRY ST USN TECH	-					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	TRAINING	780	830	38	88	11%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484	587		sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,705	8,416	1,610	4,321	76%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	74	1,930	14%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718	9,293	1,374	3,949	59%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD		Adjusted for		_		Change	B(-)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	92	157	99	164	177%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	719	1,056	67	404	56%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Na Varil	FUDO	ENGINEED COLL	0.47	440	4.504	4.000	4050/	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119	1,594	1,066	165%	scope).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	605	669	413	477	79%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	FUDS	11	1,721	285	1,970	534	31%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wyoming	FUDS	4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3.252	3,233	388	369		sampling).
	1. 320	1	5,202	0,200	, 300		1 7170	

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Estimate Change	Change	
	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
0.0.0			manon (voce)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i crecinage)	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1,338	15%	additional sampling).
ranous	1000	TORBEOTHE	0,000	0,712	021	1,000	1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	103	73	82	52		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Virgin Islands of								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	535	799	147	411	77%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses     (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	FORT BAKER	113	2,073	8	1,968	1745%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wyoming	FUDS	TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,474	5,946	3,357	1,829	24%	sampling).
			·	,	·			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	102	104	631	633		scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	51	40	77	66	1200/	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
INTOUE ISIAITU	1 000	TONT GREDLE DUTCH ISE	51	40	11	00	130%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	65%	cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
	•					, ,	,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40	62	25	32%	sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida		FORT PICKENS	7,843		2,263			cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	24290%	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,084	17,132	67	8,115	89%	sampling).
		FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665	4,322	28%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	E	0 0.0 0.1 5.5					400/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964	5,830	919	785	13%	sampling).
0 117	EUDO	COFFO CAMPOITE	0.550	0.774	470	000	440/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	11%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
California	FUDC		50	245	240	607	40000/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	1280%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
					1			dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	51	6,549	8,343	870	2,664	440/	1
Michigan	ורטטט	J I	0,349	0,343	670	2,004	41%	sampling).

			Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska		HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	11,255	13,516	3,015	5,276	47%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	EUDO	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	0000	5.070	404	4544	500%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California		HAMMER FIELD	886	3,210		4,511		sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi		HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	607	544				Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43	1,104	92%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386		891	877	26%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466	5,365	125%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158	339	182	58%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	740	825	18	103		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
IVIISSOUTI	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G	740	825	18	103	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	1,459	3,999	165	2,705	195%	cost estimate Change officiated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alizona	1 003	GONNERT RANGE	1,439	3,999	103	2,703	103 /6	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
								with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914	56,389	1,503	14,978	35%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	153%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1,407		additional sampling).
OHIO	ויטטט	DLFOI	3,071	4,369	109	1,407	40%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	37	69%	sampling).
<del> </del>	- 020						3070	I

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
		MAKALAPA CRATER	` '	. ,	,	, ,	, ,	,
l		FORMER NAVY SALVAGE	_					
Hawaii	FUDS	YARD	0	5,447	1,054	6,501	N/A	New Site.
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE						Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	3,578	4,508	55	985	28%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
vg	. 020		0,070	1,000		000		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Northern	ELIDO	MARRI POINT FIELD	4.040	4 400	004	470		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	11%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777	115	3,325	25%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	195	310	37	152		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
		MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA						vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	1204%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	1 000	INOB	103	1,422		1,521		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
<b></b>								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	259%	sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785		DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
orar Garonna	. 555	I W U TO EDELITION	2,000	5,102	10	100	UT /0	post postery of directive that redefines the costs included in the CTO.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AIR STATION						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	OAKLAND	117	95	383	361		sampling).
- Camorna	1 000	0711(271172)	117	30	000	001	00070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION ARCATA	44	5,645	55	5,656	12947%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251	755	106%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30	262		sampling).
Camornia	. 020	OTATION WATERWILE	10	200	- 55	202	0.1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL WEAPONS						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		INDUSTRIAL RESERVE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Illinois	FUDS	PLANT	73	455	11	393	537%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Magaaahuaa	ELIDO	NAVA ELIEL ANVADIDELINE	500		050	4.070		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	189%	sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NIKE BA-30/31						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maryland	FUDS	(TOLCHESTER)	590	2,058	120	1,588		sampling).
	1. 550	11.010.1201	330	2,000	120	1,000	20070	J-2043/.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219	766	30%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
la diana	FUDO	NUCE C 47 LIODADT	0.044	0.000	0.44	500		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Indiana	FUDS FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	2,014	2,232 2,988		562 3,059		sampling).  New Site.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-60/61 - ARLINGTON	0	2,900	/ 1	3,059	IN/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	21%	sampling).
			.,	,,,,,,		-		Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215	83	129	77%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	18%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Daniel de la contra	FUDO	NUCE DI 175/70 (MEDIA)		407	7.4	70		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74	70	49%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741		sampling).
TTIOGE ISIAITU	1 000	I IV-13	3,761	0,212	310	741	1376	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523	371	59%	sampling).
	1				, 020			1 I J/

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		N. N. / A C A D A / C DT D E   A / D A D						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	ELID O	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR			0.400		07404	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	A	658	622	6,429	6,393	9/1%	sampling).  1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7,310		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
i iawan	1.000	C. I. C. IOL/III I/III CE I	2,149	5,311	02	7,510	20070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2,302	22%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
1								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	7,383	8,306	133	1,056	14%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		OLATHE NAVAL AIR						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	STATION	280	607	604	931		additional sampling).
			100		1		22270	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		OROVILLE PRECISION						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	162%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Now Jersey	ELIDE	DALERMO COMMULEAC	468	905	104	E24	1100/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	468	895	104	531	113%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
								requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	39	64	12	37	97%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	249	1,374	43	1,168	469%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		PORTERVILLE ARMY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	AIRFIELD	201	110	265	174	86%	sampling).
D . D:	EUDO	PUERTO RICO BOMB	4.407	0.400	500	0.500	040/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RANGE	4,137	6,138	532	2,533	61%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916	2,309	159	552	200/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,910	2,309	159	552	29%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		RED BLUFF AIR FORCE						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	STATION	99	79	168	148		additional sampling).
	1.020				100	110	10170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444		sampling).
							2370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	15	67	14	66	431%	sampling).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60		Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	,				Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan  Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	1,827			2,380		sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	16.346	33,106	7,467	24,227	148%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other sitelevel project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	559	,				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518			,		Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	6,738	1,274	8,185	2,721		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,681	17,699	3,980	1,998	10%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213,385	233,408	809	20,832	10%	additional sampling).
Alaska	1 003	OWIAT ATS	213,303	233,400	009	20,032	10 /0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	100	255	73	228	229%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		WILKINS AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	STATION	757	1,132	4	379	50%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	FUDS	PLANT	434	421	154	141	330/	sampling).
rennsylvania	FUDS	FLANT	434	421	154	141	33%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	1,767	2,462	72	767	43%	sampling).
			,,,,,,,	, , , , , , , ,				1 9/