Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for FY 2017



August 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 \$44,000 in Fiscal Years 2017 - 2018. This includes \$32,000 in expenses and \$11,000 in DoD labor.

Generated on 2018Jul16 RefID: 3-861D660

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
TABLES	ii
APPENDICES	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM	3
Environmental Restoration Goals	3
IRP Site Status and Funding	4
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	13
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, California	18
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California	18
Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California	18
VI. FY 2017 FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITAND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2016	

TABLES

Table 1:	Overall DoD Environmental Program Funding	2
Table 2:	RC 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	10
Table 10	: Natural and Cultural Resources Funding	12
Table 11	: Pollution Prevention Program Funding	13
Table 12	: Environmental Technology Program Funding	15

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

I. INTRODUCTION

This Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 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 (U.S.C.), 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 for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017, as well as reasons for increases in cleanup cost estimates since FY 2016, 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).

The Department's priorities for its environmental programs are: (1) protect the environment to ensure that DoD has the land, water, and airspace needed for military readiness; (2) protect the health of the military and civilian personnel and their families who live and work on DoD bases; (3) ensure DoD operations do not adversely affect the health or environment of surrounding communities; and (4) preserve resources for future generations. To achieve these objectives, DoD is committed to continuous improvement, greater efficiency, and the use of new technology where feasible. In FY 2017, DoD obligated approximately \$3.6 billion for its environmental programs. This includes \$1.4 billion for environmental restoration activities, \$2.0 billion for EQ activities, and \$183 million for environmental technology activities. In the President's FY 2019 budget, DoD is requesting about \$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 2013 through FY 2019.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested		
Environmental Restoration									
Active Installations and FUDS	\$1,352.6	\$1,286.5	\$1,221.0	\$1,161.1	\$1,082.3	\$1,221.9	\$1,050.8		
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Locations ⁺	\$472.9	\$697.5	\$609.6	\$415.5	\$347.0	\$274.4**	\$244.9 ⁺⁺		
Restoration Total	\$1,825.5	\$1,984.0	\$1,830.6	\$1,576.6	\$1,429.3	\$1,496.3	\$1,295.7		
EQ									
Compliance	\$1,347.3	\$1,379.5	\$1,306.0	\$1,271.8	\$1,511.8	\$1,442.0	\$1,475.5		
Natural and Cultural Resources	\$384.3	\$444.6	\$377.2	\$443.4	\$429.0	\$440.7	\$419.4		
Pollution Prevention	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$72.5	\$74.5		
EQ Total	\$1,797.1	\$1,921.3	\$1,777.5	\$1,802.3	\$2,008.0	\$1,995.2	\$1,969.4		
Environmental Technology	Environmental Technology								
Technology Total	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$231.8	\$172.2		
DoD Total***	\$3,817.7	\$4,108.5	\$3,792.6	\$3,568.3	\$3,620.3	\$3,683.3	\$3,437.3		

^{*} Includes all applicable congressional funding additions for FY 2013 through FY 2018.

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

⁺ BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. Omits Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) actuals.

^{**} Excludes \$113.9 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

⁺⁺ Excludes \$49.4 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

^{***} 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 known or suspected to contain unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents (i.e., closed military ranges). These sites are referred to as munitions response sites (MRSs). Through these programs, DoD complies with the federal cleanup law, 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 39,800 IRP sites and MRSs in the inventory, DoD has achieved the RC milestone at more than 33,200 sites (83 percent).

Environmental Restoration Goals

The Department uses environmental restoration goals to assist in driving 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.

Table 2 lists the RC goals and summarizes the Department's progress toward achieving these goals. 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 2017, the number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals in FY 2018 and FY 2019, and the total number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals from the beginning of the program through FY 2019.

Goals	Number of Sites Subject to the Goals	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites that Achieved the Goals through FY 2017	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2018	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2019	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals through FY 2019
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	37,275	32,063 (86%)	507 (1%)	953 (3%)	33,523 (90%)

Table 2: RC Goals and Progress*

Through FY 2017, the Department achieved RC at 86 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties. DoD is currently projecting that it will fall slightly short of the FY 2018 and FY 2021 RC goals; it anticipates achieving RC at 87 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties by the end of FY 2018, and at 93 percent of these sites 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 2017.

The Department's newest environmental restoration goal, established in FY 2014, focuses on reducing the potential risk to human health and the environment posed by FUDS MRSs. 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 that provide explosives safety education material to property owners and establishing a call center to answer questions.

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

^{*} Excludes FUDS MRSs; potentially responsible party sites, which are sites where DoD has identified that an individual or company is potentially responsible for contributing to the contamination; and sites where a DoD Component cannot obtain rights of entry to complete investigations.

number of sites at Remedy In Place (RIP)¹ and RC through FY 2016 and FY 2017, and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2016 to FY 2017.

Table 3: IRP Site Status

		RIP				RC	
	Total IRP Inventory (FY 2017)	Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2016	Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2017	Change in RIP Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2016	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2017	Change in RC Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017
Active Installations							
Army	11,271	10,525	10,569	44	10,250	10,267	17
Department of the Navy (DON)*	4,079	3,739	3,756	17	3,473	3,506	33
Air Force	7,264	5,995	6,135	140	5,453	5,607	154
DLA	215	195	195	0	186	185	-1
Active Total	22,829	20,454	20,655	201	19,362	19,565	203
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	3,097	2,548	2,596	48	2,512	2,554	42
BRAC Locations							
Army	2,108	1,999	2,019	20	1,960	1,970	10
DON*	1,116	1,068	1,062	-6	907	928	21
Air Force	5,137	4,906	4,966	60	4,768	4,805	37
DLA	48	48	48	0	47	47	0
BRAC Total	8,409	8,021	8,095	74	7,682	7,750	68
DoD Total	34,335	31,023	31,346	323	29,556	29,869	313

^{*} DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

¹ 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 2013 through FY 2019 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

FY 2014 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019 FY 2013 Active Installations Army \$212.8 \$201.9 \$216.8 \$200.5 \$139.6 \$155.8 \$143.6 DON+ \$240.9 \$243.5 \$238.5 \$231.8 \$280.3 \$239.0 \$262.1 \$398.2 \$333.1 Air Force \$431.2 \$403.4 \$352.9 \$264.9 \$245.6 Defense-wide** \$10.7 \$11.0 \$7.9 \$5.8 \$6.6 \$8.3 \$8.6 \$893.7 \$863.9 \$863.9 \$802.8 \$717.8 \$660.8 \$678.1 **Active Total FUDS Properties FUDS Total** \$195.2 \$172.3 \$143.8 \$156.5 \$149.4 \$132.9 \$152.7 **BRAC Locations**** Army \$86.5 \$207.2 \$106.1 \$66.7 \$43.9 \$60.4 \$28.3 DON⁺ \$164.9 \$119.2 \$181.1 \$149.9 \$148.9 \$112.9 \$133.9 Air Force \$118.9 \$154.3 \$94.1 \$79.0 \$81.9 \$56.3 \$49.1 Defense-wide** \$3.7 \$3.2 \$2.6 \$2.0 \$2.5 \$2.9 \$2.9 **BRAC Total** \$374.0 \$483.8 \$384.0 \$297.7 \$277.2 \$232.5 \$214.2 DoD Total*** \$1,462.9 \$1,534.4 \$1,391.6 \$1,256.9 \$1,144.5 \$1,045.0 \$1,026.1

Table 4: IRP Funding* (millions of dollars)

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. These substances are not uniquely attributable to DoD activities and are far more ubiquitous in consumer and industrial products. 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. As a result of AFFF use, PFOS and PFOA have been detected at a number of DoD installations.

On May 19, 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) 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 SDWA and is not a required or enforceable drinking water standard, DoD began taking actions to address impacted drinking water.

The Department followed a comprehensive approach to identify installations where DoD used AFFF containing PFOS or PFOA. As of August 2017, DoD has identified 401 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

^{*} This table includes funding for all program management requirements at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

⁺⁺ BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 appropriated and FY 2019 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

^{***} Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

^{****} The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to IRP funding.

suppression systems). Now that DoD has an initial list of known and suspected release areas, the DoD Components are following the CERCLA process to investigate these areas to confirm if a release occurred. The DoD Components will continue collecting 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. Throughout the CERCLA process, DoD will work in concert with regulatory agencies and communities and will share information in an open and transparent manner.

DoD expects that environmental cleanup costs will increase due to emerging contaminants, such as the investigation and cleanup of PFOS and PFOA. As additional information becomes available, DoD will include a best estimate of these costs in environmental cleanup costs.

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 2016 and FY 2017; and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2016 to FY 2017.

Table 5: MRS Status

			RIP			RC	
	Total MRS Inventory (FY 2017)	Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2016	Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2017	Change in RIP Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2016	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2017	Change in RC Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017
Active Installations							
Army	1,344	1,131	1,130	-1	1,129	1,129	0
DON*	419	176	182	6	171	179	8
Air Force	1,045	748	768	20	743	765	22
DLA	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Active Total	2,815	2,055	2,080	25	2,043	2,073	30
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	2,289	1,001	1,014	13	1,001	1,014	13
BRAC Locations							
Army	178	126	131	5	126	130	4
DON*	40	18	20	2	18	19	1
Air Force	140	124	126	2	121	123	2
DLA ⁺	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BRAC Total	358	268	277	9	265	272	7
DoD Total	5,462	3,324	3,371	47	3,309	3,359	50

^{*} DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

⁺ DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

Table 6 summarizes MMRP funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

Table 6: MMRP Funding (millions of dollars)*

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Estimated ⁺⁺⁺	FY 2019 Requested		
Active Installations									
Army	\$76.7	\$67.5	\$53.1	\$34.3	\$30.6	\$60.0	\$59.9		
DON ⁺	\$48.2	\$53.9	\$45.4	\$56.2	\$50.8	\$49.7	\$48.9		
Air Force	\$56.2	\$16.1	\$30.8	\$15.0	\$38.4	\$28.9	\$51.2		
Defense-wide**	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$2.6	\$1.6	\$0.6	\$0.3		
Active Total	\$181.5	\$137.6	\$129.3	\$108.2	\$121.3	\$139.1	\$160.3		
FUDS Properties									
FUDS Total	\$82.0	\$98.2	\$84.1	\$93.7	\$93.6	\$75.8	\$59.7		
BRAC Locations++									
Army	\$38.6	\$129.9	\$181.8	\$42.1	\$48.2	\$55.1	\$21.4		
DON ⁺	\$38.1	\$14.4	\$22.0	\$11.8	\$12.3	\$18.7	\$7.0		
Air Force	\$0.3	\$5.0	\$2.6	\$1.1	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.0		
Defense-wide**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
BRAC Total	\$77.1	\$149.3	\$206.4	\$55.0	\$60.9	\$73.8	\$28.4		
DoD Total***	\$340.6	\$385.2	\$419.8	\$256.9	\$275.9	\$288.8	\$248.4		

^{*} 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 2013 through FY 2019.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Estimated***	FY 2019 Requested
BRAC Locations							
Army	\$21.1	\$46.9	\$18.5	\$64.5	\$10.7	\$27.8	\$51.0
DON+	\$0.2	\$0.7	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.6
Air Force	\$0.6	\$16.7	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
Defense-wide**	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DoD Total**	\$21.9	\$64.3	\$19.2	\$64.9	\$11.2	\$27.8	\$51.6

^{*} Includes prior year funding and land sale revenue.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA. DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

⁺⁺ BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 appropriated and FY 2019 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

^{***} Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

⁺⁺⁺ The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to MMRP funding.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

⁺⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

^{***} The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to Planning or Compliance funding.

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 and its anticipated land sale revenue to supplement its annual appropriations and meet annual BRAC cleanup funding needs. Table 8 summarizes BRAC funding, including annual appropriations, prior year funds, and land sale revenue, from FY 2017 through FY 2019.

Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout (millions of dollars)

	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army			
Annual Appropriation	\$21.5	\$43.1	\$54.2
Prior Year Funds	\$29.0	\$68.7	\$46.4
Land Sale Revenue	\$52.4	\$31.5	\$0.0
Army Total Funding*	\$102.9	\$143.3	\$100.6
DON⁺			
Annual Appropriation	\$144.6	\$185.7	\$141.5
Prior Year Funds	\$6.6	\$0.0	\$0.0
Land Sale Revenue	\$10.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DON Total Funding*	\$161.2	\$185.7	\$141.5
Air Force			
Annual Appropriation	\$50.4	\$45.7	\$49.1
Prior Year Funds	\$32.3	\$10.7	\$0.1
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.1
Air Force Total Funding*	\$82.8	\$56.4	\$49.2
DLA**			
Annual Appropriation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Prior Year Funds	\$2.5	\$2.9	\$2.9
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DLA Total Funding*	\$2.5	\$2.9	\$2.9
DoD Total			
Annual Appropriation	\$216.5	\$274.4	\$244.9
Prior Year Funds	\$70.4	\$82.3	\$49.4
Land Sale Revenue	\$62.5	\$31.5	\$0.1
DoD Total Funding*, +++	\$347.0	\$388.2	\$291.3

 $[\]ensuremath{^{\star}}$ Due to rounding, subtotals and the DoD Total may not equal FY totals.

DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Funding is from a settlement DLA received from Sunoco to perform cleanup activities at the former Defense Supply Center Philadelphia.

⁺⁺⁺ Does not include DLA.

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 in budget reports, and provide additional detail and insight into funding allocations. Because of the change in budget-reporting format, the DoD Components have shifted funding between programs and re-defined some of the funding. Therefore, it is not possible to compare FY 2017 obligations to FY 2013 actual funding below the program level (i.e., compliance, conservation, pollution prevention).

Compliance

The Department provides resources through its Compliance Program to comply with applicable requirements, such as Federal, State, and local environmental laws, regulations, and ordinances, 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. 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. In FY 2017, the Department maintained a Clean Water Act permit compliance rate above 90 percent and a drinking water compliance rate almost equal to the 93 percent national average. In addition, DoD's non-hazardous solid waste diversion rate was 62 percent in calendar year 2017, exceeding the FY 2016 goal of 60 percent.

Table 9 summarizes Compliance Program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$389.6	\$380.2	\$347.6	\$368.6	\$397.5	\$417.8	\$422.6
Navy	\$358.1	\$374.3	\$354.9	\$359.8	\$351.1	\$367.7	\$376.9
Air Force	\$298.5	\$293.9	\$283.5	\$302.2	\$358.6	\$340.1	\$316.2
Marine Corps	\$113.2	\$115.6	\$148.1	\$103.4	\$119.1	\$108.5	\$106.8
Defense-wide*	\$187.7	\$215.5	\$171.9	\$137.8	\$285.5	\$207.9	\$253.0
DoD Total ⁺	\$1,347.1	\$1,379.5	\$1,306.0	\$1,271.8	\$1,511.8	\$1,442.0	\$1,475.5

Table 9: Compliance Program Funding (millions of dollars)

^{*} Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

Overall Trend Analysis

Overall DoD Compliance Program funding decreased from FY 2013 through FY 2016, in part because the Budget Control Act (BCA) led to a trend in reduced funding for overall compliance programs. For FY 2017, DoD total funding exceeded previous levels due to increased requests across most of the DoD Components to fund efforts that were delayed in previous FYs. For FY 2018, DoD appropriated funding decreases, partly due to completion of one-time military construction projects. For FY 2019, the total requested funding level remains relatively consistent with FY 2018.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Air Force funding increased 18.7 percent due to the increases in Manpower Cross Cutting Compliance Programs. 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. In addition, Defense-wide funding increased by 107.2 percent due to two DLA military construction projects to replace petroleum, oils, and lubricants (POL) storage facilities at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, and Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipated that Defense-wide funding would decrease (-27.2 percent) due to completion of one-time military construction projects and reductions in DLA's compliance related cleanup at POL sites.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, Defense-wide funding is expected to increase 21.7 percent due to military construction projects at Joint Base Langley-Eustis. In addition, there is compliance-related cleanup of POL facilities planned at three installations.

The Department is committed to ensuring safe drinking water for the people living and working on our installations. In response to an EPA LHA, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment directed in June 2016 that the Military Departments test for PFOS and PFOA worldwide where DoD supplies drinking water. Under this policy, DoD tested all of its 524 drinking water systems by the end of FY 2017. At the 24 systems where the test results were above the EPA LHA level, DoD followed the EPA advisory recommendations to bring the water below the EPA LHA level.

In addition, where DoD purchases drinking water, installations are encouraged to request that their suppliers test the drinking water. The Department identified 12 systems where DoD purchased water and where the results of these tests were above the EPA LHA level; the installation worked with the drinking water supplier to ensure the water consumed on base is now below the EPA LHA level.

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 and ensure the long-term sustainability of our

Nation's natural and cultural heritage. The Department manages approximately 25 million acres of land that contain high quality, unique habitats, and provide food and shelter for more than 550 species at-risk and almost 450 federally listed threatened or endangered species. Of these species, 63 listed species and 74 species at-risk are only found on DoD lands. The Department also manages and maintains cultural resources at 340 DoD installations that contain more than 132,000 archaeological sites.

Table 10 summarizes natural and cultural resources funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$182.0	\$174.6	\$182.2	\$187.3	\$209.2	\$187.2	\$183.9
Navy	\$59.3	\$75.0	\$57.2	\$65.6	\$60.5	\$69.5	\$72.0
Air Force	\$58.7	\$80.0	\$53.4	\$88.4	\$53.4	\$51.7	\$47.0
Marine Corps	\$34.8	\$46.1	\$27.3	\$26.8	\$36.8	\$37.4	\$37.1
Defense-wide*	\$49.5	\$68.9	\$57.1	\$75.3	\$69.1	\$94.9	\$79.4
DoD Total⁺	\$384.3	\$444.6	\$377.2	\$443.4	\$429.0	\$4440.7	\$419.4

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

Overall Trend Analysis

Funding for natural and cultural resources activities increased overall between FY 2013 and FY 2014. This increase was primarily due to congressional funding additions to support conservation on ranges and 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, despite BCA controls. The Department continued to meet legal requirements and fund any items with FY 2017 deadlines that it needed to maintain military readiness in the year of execution. For FY 2018, total appropriated funding remains relatively consistent with FY 2017 levels. The decrease in FY 2019 natural and cultural resources Defense-wide funding is a result of a congressional add in FY 2018 for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI).

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding increased by 11.7 percent as listed and at-risk species funding grew. Air Force funding decreased 39.6 percent in miscellaneous natural resources and miscellaneous cultural resources; Air Force diverted funds to different nonenvironmental programs. Marine Corps funding increased 37.3 percent due to increases in integrated natural resource planning as well as threatened and endangered species management.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Army funding decreased 10.5 percent due to reduced costs for threatened and endangered species management and to update and implement Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans. Navy funding increased by 14.9 percent because of project management needs and challenges associated with managing

^{*} Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

- agricultural lands. Defense-wide funding increased by 37.3 percent mostly due to increases in REPI Program funding.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, DoD does not anticipate significant changes in funding amounts, other than the decrease caused by the FY 2018 congressional add to the REPI Program.

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 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$23.9	\$31.6	\$36.2	\$27.4	\$21.2	\$22.1	\$20.8
Navy	\$6.6	\$7.4	\$4.1	\$8.3	\$4.2	\$4.3	\$4.3
Air Force	\$15.2	\$30.1	\$21.0	\$23.0	\$18.2	\$17.6	\$19.7
Marine Corps	\$15.8	\$21.2	\$20.7	\$13.4	\$12.9	\$15.5	\$16.2
Defense-wide*	\$4.0	\$6.9	\$12.3	\$15.0	\$10.7	\$13.0	\$13.5
DoD Total ⁺	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$72.5	\$74.5

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

Overall Trend Analysis

Overall funding for the Pollution Prevention Program increased from FY 2013 through FY 2015; the lower FY 2013 funding was driven mostly by reductions resulting from the BCA. Additionally, the DoD Components reduced pollution prevention funding to preserve funding for other programs in years when funding decreases because Pollution Prevention is not directly linked to legal requirements.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

• From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding decreased (-22.6 percent) mostly due to previous efforts to reduce hazardous material use. 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

^{*} Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

- hazardous material reduction efforts. Defense-wide funding also decreased 28.7 percent due to fewer pollution prevention projects to address clean air and hazardous waste issues.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Marine Corps funding is anticipated to increase 20.2 percent due to increases in manpower costs, while Defense-wide funding is expected to increase 21.5 percent, mostly due to anticipated increases in DLA's manpower costs and hazardous waste minimization efforts.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, DoD requested that Air Force funding will increase 11.9 percent mainly due to a focus on hazardous material/waste reduction and pollution prevention activities.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

The Office of the Secretary of Defense oversees the Military Departments' and Defense-wide environmental technology programs, and manages the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP). 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.

Table 12 summarizes environmental technology program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense-wide accounts.

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army*							
Army Total	\$45.5	\$47.5	\$44.9	\$54.7	\$60.3	\$55.6	\$29.5
DON⁺							
DON Total	\$39.8	\$37.3	\$28.8	\$35.5	\$33.4	\$36.5	\$36.3
Air Force							
Air Force Total	\$9.3	\$10.6	\$9.3	\$8.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Defense-wide	**						
SERDP**	\$58.6	\$62.3	\$56.4	\$54.3	\$65.1	\$71.8	\$76.5
ESTCP**	\$38.0	\$39.8	\$39.4	\$31.3	\$27.2	\$32.2	\$24.0
Deployed Warfighter Protection Program	\$3.9	\$5.6	\$5.7	\$5.3	\$4.9	\$5.1	\$5.9
Defense- wide Total	\$100.5	\$107.7	\$101.4	\$90.9	\$89.3	\$109.1	\$106.4
DoD Total***	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$201.2	\$172.2

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

Overall Trend Analysis

The Department's funding for environmental technology decreased from FY 2013 to FY 2015 due to congressional funding reductions to meet the BCA. Funding increased between FY 2015 and FY 2016, but 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

^{*} The National Defense Center for Energy and Environment is included in the Army Program line.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies.

⁺⁺ SERDP/ESTCP values are for environmental projects only and do not include energy projects.

^{***} Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

development to address replacing AFFF containing PFOS and PFOA. For FY 2019, DoD funding will decrease 14.4 percent, due to rephrasing of ESTCP funds into FY 2020 and FY 2021 based on execution delays in the program.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- 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 in FY 2017. There was a decrease in funding (-12.9 percent) for ESTCP and an increase of 19.9 percent for SERDP as a result of reductions and increases in Congressional funding, respectively.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipates that SERDP funding will increase 13.6 percent and ESTCP funding will increase 51.9 percent as a return to prior levels of funding. The Defense-wide total will increase 22.2 percent due to investment in Defense-wide environmental technology initiatives.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, Army funding will decrease (-46.9 percent) as funds were reprioritized to support Army modernization initiatives. The Deployed Warfighter Protection Program funding will increase 15.7 percent. Additionally, DoD anticipates that SERDP funding will increase 6.5 percent and ESTCP funding will decrease 25.5 percent due to DoD rephasing funds to FY 2020 and FY 2021.

Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals

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 and using groundwater cleanup technologies across the Department and throughout the private sector. DoD anticipates that it will achieve RC at 93 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties, by the end of FY 2021. Through its environmental technology programs, DoD is currently improving its fundamental understanding of these sites and developing new technologies to manage or remediate them.

Another example of the Department transitioning technologies to reduce costs and increase efficiencies happened 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. DoD accredited seven private firms in FY 2017, for a total of nine firms through calendar year 2017, through the DoD Advanced Geophysical Classification Accreditation Program (DAGCAP). The DAGCAP ensures that private-sector practitioners can collect high-quality data, and correctly analyze the data in support of DoD cleanup projects. These environmental technology program efforts benefit both the environment and the military mission.

Looking ahead, 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, targeted developing several approaches for treating groundwater containing PFOS and PFOA. In 2017, ESTCP began demonstrating these groundwater treatment options for PFOS and PFOA, with additional demonstrations to begin in

2018. Further, projects investigating new in-situ and ex-situ treatment methods for groundwater and soil will begin in 2018. SERDP will continue two projects initiated in 2017 aimed at developing fluorine-free fire-fighting foams to replace AFFF containing PFOS and PFOA, and will start five more projects in 2018. ESTCP has also requested proposals to demonstrate and validate more environmentally sustainable firefighting AFFFs in 2019.

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

In accordance with Section 2916(b) of the NDAA for FY 2014, the Department maintains "decontamination" programs to remove UXO resulting from Defense-related activities on withdrawn or reserved lands. Below are updates on DoD's "decontamination" activities during FY 2017 at ranges identified in the NDAA for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana

The Army conducted range clearance activities on approximately 7 acres of withdrawn land at the Limestone Hills Training Area.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

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, California

The Marine Corps did not conduct any decontamination activities on the withdrawn lands at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range.

Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California

The Marine Corps did not conduct any decontamination activities on the withdrawn lands at Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms.

Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California

The Navy conducted ongoing decontamination activities on 5,000 acres of withdrawn land at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, including surface clearance, trash removal, destroying UXO, venting operations, soil stabilization, and grading target sites.

VI. FY 2017 FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES AND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2016

The House Report (House Report 113-113) accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014, requests that the Secretary of Defense provide information regarding funds invested in the DERP 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 funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2016 to FY 2017; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2017 (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 562 DoD installations and 461 FUDS properties where DoD obligated funds for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017. It also compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2016 and FY 2017 to determine how much the Department reduced its liability at each location.² At 202 DoD installations and 237 FUDS properties, the cost estimates either decreased by the amount invested or decreased to zero, and therefore no explanation is needed. At the remaining 360 DoD installations and 224 FUDS properties, the cost estimates did not decrease by at least the amount invested for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017. Appendix A includes an explanation of why the liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested at each of these locations.³

Appendix B lists the 232 DoD installations and 189 FUDS properties where the FY 2017 cost estimates increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2016 estimates. It compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2016 and FY 2017 to determine the dollar amount and percentage increases at each location.² Appendix B also includes the reason(s) the cost estimates increased between FY 2016 and FY 2017 at each location.⁴

² The FY 2016 cost estimates are adjusted for inflation and work completed in FY 2017 to compare the estimates more accurately.

³ If a location's liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested for environmental activities in FY 2017, 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.

⁴ If a location's FY 2017 cost estimate increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2016 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 2017 DEP ARC

Appendix A

Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2017 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2016.

This Appendix provides the amount of funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2016 to FY 2017; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2017.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	
State	Component		Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
l	A	1LT CHARLES L. WAPLES				_	No contraction as wifeed
Indiana	Army	USARC	0	0	4	4	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate
		ABERDEEN PROVING					Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract
Maryland	Army	GROUND	109,091	107,337	3,586	1,832	method.
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59	0	19	(40)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	0	0	40	40	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Alahama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	13,088	13,964	176	1.052	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	ALABAIVIA AAP	13,000	13,964	176	1,032	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	18,419	21,427	405	3,413	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
		ARMY RESEARCH					project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		LABORATORY-					requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Massachusetts	Army	WATERTOWN	560	984	245	669	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
		ARMY RESEARCH					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		LABORATORY-					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Virginia	Army	WOODBRIDGE	1,442	1,420	89	67	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
<u> </u>	<u> </u>		,	, -			
		AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY,					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Florida		49-A	0	197	8	205	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		BADGER ARMY				(1)	
Wisconsin	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	43,227	16,727	709	(25,791)	No explanation required.
Manuland		BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	2 006	4,015	39	E0	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Maryland	Army	RESEARCH FACILITY	3,996	4,013	39	36	contract or contract method.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,072	1,169	176	273	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
ĺ			,	,			
		BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-					
Kentucky	Army	LEXINGTON FACILITY	1,174				No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,236	1,150	15	(71)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
_		OAMB BABKELEV		0.050	4.5		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	0	2,856	15	2,871	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	12,445	12,259	7,980	7.794	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
	,		,	,	1,000	.,	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	3,340				additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	277	202	34	(41)	No explanation required.
		CHARLES MELVIN PRICE	0.544	0.504		400	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Illinois	Army	SUPPORT CENTER	2,544	2,594	88	138	contract or contract method.
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	35	317	62	344	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.
							, , ,
		COLD REGIONS RESEARCH					
l		AND ENGINEERING					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New Hampshire	Army	LABORATORY	6,635	13,047	1,634	8,046	estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX	0	480	1,474	1 05/	New Site.
Alabama	Airriy	CORNHUSKER ARMY		400	1,474	1,554	I VOW OILC.
Nebraska	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	54,264	33,309	933	(20,022)	No explanation required.
			·	,			
		DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Tennessee	Army	TENNESSEE	8,211	7,496	1,801	1,086	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	9,734	10,049	564	879	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	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	45,597	48,666	2,076	5,145	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	610	334			No explanation required.
						. ,/	<u> </u>

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				_	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
							sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
		DEVENS RESERVE					Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Massachusetts	Army	TRAINING FACILITY	44,234	46,444	1,541		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
wassachuseus	Army	TRAINING FACILITY	44,234	46,444	1,341	3,751	scriedule.
		DUGWAY PROVING					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Utah	Army	GROUND	39,380	41,853	192		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
	,y		33,000	11,000		,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	145,549	148,824	6	3,281	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	23,762	23,337	228		No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	16,825	13,829	1,980	(1,016)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	40,771	28,124	953	(11,694)	No explanation required.
_		FORT RUISO		07.000			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	35,088	37,002	1,691	3,605	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							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) 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
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	6,195	9,947	104		in schedule.
	•		·				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,355	11,354	211	5,210	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	9,792	9,571	273	52	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
			(+ /	(4)	(+ /	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	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
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	11,389				schedule.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,534	1,019	69	(446)	No explanation required.
							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
	.	FORT RETRICK		5 004	4 074	000	work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	6,609	5,921	1,074	386	caused by changes in schedule.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	4,308	5,585	2,173	3.450	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
TOW TOTA	7 tilliy	TOTAL BROWN	4,000	0,000	2,170	0,400	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 – 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
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	29,926	30,276	1,043	1,393	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 –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
	1.						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	5,566		187		schedule.
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,851	2,107	679	(65)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	landallation None	Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	B(-)
State		Installation Name FORT HUACHUCA	Inflation (\$000) 1,921	(\$000) 1,516	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s) No explanation required.
Arizona California	Army Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	2,079				No explanation required.
California	Ailily	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	2,019	1,908	120	(31)	ino explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	279	1,154	37	912	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	6 1 4 9	12.476	2 242	0.671	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.
	Army	FORT KNOX	6,148				
Kentucky	Army	FORTKNOX	4,924	4,004	897	(23)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,188	2,086	395	1,293	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	438	403	1,297	1,262	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	26,701	26,544	209	52	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 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 schedule.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	9,740	9,656	2,010	1 926	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 – 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 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
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,035	4,551	119	3,635	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			ì				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
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,400	1,410			schedule.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	5	0	00		No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	15,577	13,682	104	(1,791)	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
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	9,564	11,899	1,471	3,806	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
California	Δ	FORT ORD	047.044	000 070	40,000	0.000	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	217,641	206,979		,	schedule. No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT FICKETT ARING WITC	1 0	0	716	/ 16	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
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	6,365	6,889	400	924	CTC.
Louisiaria	, willy	I OKI I OLK	0,505	0,009	+00	JZ-T	1010.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,973	26,062	2,664		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) 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).
		FORT RITCHIE			66		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Maryland Alabama Hawaii	Army Army Army	FORT RUCKER FORT SHAFTER	3,231 10,105 3,491	3,285 11,697 2,186	321	1,913	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). No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	7,038	7,432	22	, , ,	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	Army	FORT STEWART	11,823	9,540	867	(1,416)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	58,795	40,815	7,248	(10,732)	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	10	7,059	9		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	66,019	75,685	7,511		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.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,867	1,857	492		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	91,558	29,537	1,315	(60,706)	No explanation required.
		HOLSTON ARMY					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Tennessee	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	10,415	12,502	81	2 168	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	9,235		154		No explanation required.
			,	,		, , ,	
		IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Iowa	Army	PLANT	46,742	64,146	1,161	18,565	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							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
		JEFFERSON PROVING					change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Indiana	Army	GROUND	3,669	14,275	1,572	12,178	
	7		3,000	,	.,	,	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	14	3,293	3	3,282	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,342	1,190	32	(120)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	3,359	3,361	6,720	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	0	6	94	100	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
11111013	Allily	JI TIQ IL AINIO	0	0	34	100	leasibility study of remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	0	3	94	97	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	19,092	9	61		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
North Dakota	Army	JFHQ ND ARNG	0		138		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nebraska	Army	JFHQ NE ARNG	0				No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	0	0	188	188	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New York	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	0	49	188	237	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	124	68			No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	JFHQ RQ ARNG	0	00			No explanation required.
. 30110 11100	1, 11117					200	onposition rogalion

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	_	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Utah	Army	JFHQ UT ARNG	0	0	94		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	93	1,402	49	1,358	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	0	6	159	165	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							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
		LOWER BASE LEWIS					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
M/a alaka arta a	Δ	JOINT BASE LEWIS-	44.744	50.050	4 000	45 400	sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Washington	Army	MCCHORD	44,714	58,050	1,826	15,162	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Δ	JOINT BASE MYER- HENDERSON HALL		0	4.5	40	No evalenction required
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	2	0	15	13	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
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	21,115	24,582	1,285	4 752	sampling).
	<i>r</i> y	KANSAS ARMY	2.,		.,_55	.,. 02	
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	10,382	1,085	1,528	(7,769)	No explanation required.
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	275	,			No explanation required.
						Ì	
		KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Army	SITE	0	524	122	646	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	KUNIA FIELD STATION	633	546	46	(41)	No explanation required.
		LAKE CITY ARMY					
Missouri	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	111,288	109,637	1,654	3	No explanation required.
		LETTERKENNY ARMY					
Pennsylvania	Army	DEPOT	5,849				No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	1,608	113	246	(1,249)	No explanation required.
		LOMPOC BRANCH					
California	Army	DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS	1,050	1,039	1	(10)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	LONGHORN ARMY	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	54,455	47,995	3,219	(3 241)	No explanation required.
		LOUISIANA 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 site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,387	2,449	475	537	sampling).
		MAKUA MILITARY					1) New Site. 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
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	760	641	3,539	3,420	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		MCALESTER ARMY					L
Oklahoma	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	6,025	4,553	132	(1,340)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	31,972	31,891	1,174	1,093	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	34,180	35,013	1,244	2,077	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,507	2,638	19	150	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.
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	3,479	239	3,718	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,623	7,261	301	3,939	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	287	296	117	126	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	landalladan Nama	Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	D(-)
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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Florida	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2,811	2,901	30		sampling).
Tionua	Allily	WITC CAMIF BLANDING	2,011	2,901	30		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,915	7,816	770		contract or contract method.
Camorna	Ailiy	WITO-IT CANNI ROBERTO	2,910	7,010	770	3,071	contract or contract method.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		NATIONAL TRAINING					scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	Army	CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	13,750	14,327	1,015		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	15,660	2,406			No explanation required.
	1	PAPAGO MILITARY	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		, , ,	
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION	1,363	620	401	(342)	No explanation required.
		PARKS RESERVE FORCES					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
California	Army	TRAINING AREA	285	6,620	90	6,425	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		PHOENIX MILITARY					
Maryland	Army	RESERVATION	1,115	1,046	58	(11)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mann Inna and	A	DIGATINALY ADOENIAL	04.045	77.005	004		scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	24,015	77,935	601	54,521	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,684	30,145	3,104		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Aikaiisas	Ailly	I INC DEGIT ANGLINAL	30,004	30,143	3,10 4	2,505	pleasibility study of refriedial action operation added to project scope).
		POHAKULOA TRAINING					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Army	AREA	98,546	101,292	5		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
			23,010	101,202	l	2,701	podensini, etady et formadiai dedicti operation added to project deepo).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,501	1,450	744		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
	,		.,	,			, , ,

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	-	FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	-		Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	installation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	(4000)	Incasul(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 – 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
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	208,340	201,132	30,532	23 324	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
00.0.00	7		200,010	201,102	00,002	20,021	inay also so sauced by ellaliges in collection
		RADFORD ARMY					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Virginia	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	13,786	13,728	205	147	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project 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, additional
							sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
							Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate
		RAVENNA ARMY					Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract
Ohio	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	18,149		4,636		method.
Texas		RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	31,030				No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	876,557	572,961	16,384	(287,212)	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
		RIVERBANK ARMY					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	7,572	19,869	88	12,385	sampling).
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	8,531	7,215	407	(909)	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
		DOCKY MOUNTAIN					Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	204 404	207,378	0 650	11 524	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Army	ANGENAL	204,494	201,378	8,650	11,534	Scriedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,256	2,251	279		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.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	62,002	46,360	5,747		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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS SENECA ARMY DEPOT	18,414	30,323	550		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Army	ACTIVITY	5,491	4,141	191	(1,159)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	30,230	23,996			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	18,831	7,204	270		No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,054	4,386	53	3,385	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	985	1,209	15		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	36,637	30,312	6,375		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.
		TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE					
North Carolina	Army	PLANT	1,067	98	49	(920)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,539	15,888	108		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
				Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State C	Component	Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
olulo o	oomponon.		(4000)	(4555)	(4555)	(4000)	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
Utah A	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	35,043	48,258	3,327	16,542	schedule.
		TOOELE ARMY DEPOT					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Utah A	Army	SOUTH	2,354	64,769	2,636		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Otan		TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL	2,334	04,709	2,030	03,031	pleasibility study of Terriedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii A		CENTER	1,077	774	272	(31)	No explanation required.
		TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	13,898	9,382	1,248		No explanation required.
7.	y	TWIN CITIES ARMY	. 5,555	0,002	.,	(0,200)	in to onplication required.
Minnesota A	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	42,019	29,700	915	(11,404)	No explanation required.
	Í	UMATILLA CHEMICAL	,				·
Oregon A	Army	DEPOT	40,718	37,440	2,166		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
.		USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
	-	59)	142	4,253			sampling).
New Jersey A	Army	USARC LODI	48	0	23	(25)	No explanation required.
Naw Yard	Λ	USARC NIAGARA FALLS	400	400	40	(25)	No symbologotica associaca
New York A	Army	(AMSA 5) VIETNAM VET MEM USARC	163	109	19	(35)	No explanation required.
Illinois A	Army	(SOUTH)	0	0	14	1/	No explanation required.
		VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,535	1,062	56		No explanation required.
		VOLKSTONE	0	1,002			No explanation required.
7 J. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.		VOLUNTEER ARMY					1
Tennessee A	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	20,360	19,471	574	(315)	No explanation required.
		WAIAWA GULCH	445	0			No explanation required.
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO				` /	
Hawaii A	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	1,803	756	74	(973)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Navy Vasla		WATERWIET AROENAL	0.000	0.000		000	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL WELDON SPRING TRAINING	3,662	3,928	96	362	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Missouri	Army	AREA	1,941	1,959	40	58	contract or contract method.
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	58,488	52,877	814	(4,797)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	2,273	1,068	209	(996)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	3,629	3,407	175	(47)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,222	2,235	28	41	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Osst Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	11,092	9,389	2,095	392	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 ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	78,801	100,986			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.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	5,482	6,045	319	882	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component		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) 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 additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	46,071	58,566	15,275	27,770	schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,939	12,670	1,790	1,521	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ü			,	,	,	,	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
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	38,651	37,323	2,451	1,123	Requirement).
l							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	43,478	45,631	626	2,779	estimating methodology or model.
							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
District of							Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	2,672	3,913	271	1,512	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
L							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	17,915	18,196	1,286	1,567	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
		AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Navy	DAM FACILITY	617	672	305	360	sampling).
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	79,171	99,648			New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

					FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$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) 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
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	7,785	6,985	1,013	213	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
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	116	2,044	129	2,057	sampling).
Tawaii	Navy	DARKING GANDOT WIKI	110	2,044	123	2,007	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
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	51,601	49,246	8,761	6,406	Requirement).
							Coat Fatiguate Change Haveleted to Change in Coans. 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
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	33,051	30,564	3,286	799	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oddii Carolliia	INAVY	DETICION MONO	30,001	30,304	0,200	700	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	15,114	19,628	989	5,503	needed, technology was ineffective).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	351,761	341,857	12,588	2 684	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
INGW I UIK	INAVy	DETTIL AGE INVIINT	331,701	J 4 1,057	12,300	2,004	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	Navy	BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	17,609	17,736	161	288	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 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
Marina	N	DDI INIONI IOK NA O	00.000	00.050	000	000	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Maine New York		BRUNSWICK NAS CALVERTON NWIRP	30,636				methodology or model.
North Carolina		CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	19,172 158,797				No explanation required. No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	158,797	136,344	13,845	(8,608)	ino expianation 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 – 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 – 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
		OAMB BENDLETON MOS	04.040	40.500	45.404	0.450	contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	61,912				This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS CHARLESTON FISC	11,612		743		No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLES I ON FISC	2,703	2,305	226	(172)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
	DeD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD Component		Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
J.C.	Component	motanian ranio	mation (¢ooo)	(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
		0.145.55501.110	4 004				property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
South Carolina N	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	4,991	4,917	304	230	sampling).
							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
North Carolina N	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	77,040	75,590	5,166	3,716	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
Maryland N	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,592	4,042	419	1 860	sampling). 2) New Site.
iviai yiai ia	ivavy	OTILONI ENICE BAT BET WILL	2,002	7,072	713	1,003	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Virginia N	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	120	120	118	118	sampling).
							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) 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.
California N	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	108,245	108,145	2,857	2,757	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Arizona N	Navy	AGR	9,804	9,147	2,053	1,396	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,133	40,761	792	420	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	60,736	60,578	2,940	2,782	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.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	5,097	4,856	439	198	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.
Toyas	Nava	CODDIIS CUDISTI NAS	20.754	20.202	2.056	11 507	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
Texas Indiana	Navy Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS CRANE NSWC	20,751 38,260	30,202 33,525	2,056 2,850		directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. No explanation required.
mulana	IIvavy	OTATIVE INOVVO	30,200	33,323	2,030	(1,000)	ino orbianation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
DoE	D		Adjusted for			Change	
			•	(\$000)			Reason(s)
	•			,		. ,	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
Virginia Nav		CRANEY ISLAND FISC	5,676	5,889	315		or model.
California Nav		CROWS LANDING NALF	3,434	2,908	290		No explanation required.
Maine Nav	ivy	CUTLER NCTS	20,897	14,757	509	(5,631)	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 – Actual contract cost for prior or
		D. 4.1.11. O.D.E.11. 11.01.11.0	00.444	00.450	4 000	4 000	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
Virginia Nav	ivy	DAHLGREN NSWC	20,411	20,459	1,320	1,368	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
T		DALLAGNAG	47.054	47.407	500	444	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Texas Nav	ivy	DALLAS NAS	17,951	17,497	598	144	contract or contract method.
Tavas Na		DALLACANAIDD	0.000	0.405	00	205	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Texas Nav Rhode Island Nav		DALLAS NWIRP DAVISVILLE NCBC	2,229 32,703	2,435 27,866	99 1,078		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. No explanation required.
	,	DIXON NRTF		27,866 860		_	No explanation required.
California Nav Virginia Nav		DRIVER NAVRADSTA	1,417 535	464	256 46		No explanation required.
virginia ivav	ivy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	555	404	40	(23)	ino explanation required.
							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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope
California Nav	avv	EL CENTRO NAF	23,661	25,212	510	2.061	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
							sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California Nav	avy	EL TORO MCAS	46,623	52,118	1,511	7,006	Change in contract or contract method.
				•			Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV					requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
California Nav	avy	DET	23,269	22,940	1,209	880	delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$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) 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
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	27,558	29,804	1,305	3,551	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	32,131	37,292	1,400		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	7,578			1,927	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 broadscale 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) New Site. 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.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	178,876		5,109		No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	154	161	2	9	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
		0.11444141410	57.705	70.004	4 007		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
Guam Guam	Navy Navy	GUAM NAVACTS GUAM NSRF	57,785 154	70,694 161	1,897		may also be caused by changes in schedule. No explanation required.
Guain	ivavy	GUAINI NSKF	104	101			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,456	1,472	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
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,352	3,606	326	1,580	sampling).
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	19,027	19,223	3,990		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) 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	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,907	13,487	1,895		schedule.
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	183,485	173,647	6,518		No explanation required.
maryiana	itavy		100,400	170,047	0,010	(0,020)	110 Oxpianation required.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	37,967	36,256	1.933		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 – 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.
Florida	INAVY	JACKSONVILLE NAS	37,907	30,230	1,933	222	Scriedule.
							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
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	10,168	11,446	1,770		in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							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
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	78,909		738		in schedule.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	20,338		1,928		No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	4,165				No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,373	2,976	11	(386)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	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
							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
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	25,925	25,850	1,620	1 5/15	in schedule.
Camorna	INAVY	LEMOCKE WAS	25,925	23,030	1,020	1,040	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
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	304,448	311,799			schedule.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,301	1,249	1,033	(19)	No explanation required.
		LONG BEACH NS SAN					
California	Navy	PEDRO	11,312	10,566	183	(563)	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
0 - 116 1 -	N	LONG BEAGLINGY		0.40	00	0.40	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	693	942	93	342	sampling).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	1,831	2,546	84	700	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Neritucky	inavy	LOUISVILLE NOVVO	1,031	2,340	04	199	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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
l	l	l					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	67,574	66,040	3,061	1,527	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 – 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 – Change in
							contract or contract method. 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
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,241	65,413	8,954	10 126	by changes in schedule.
Camorna	INAVy	MARE ISLAND NOT	04,241	00,410	0,334		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
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	14,557				directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,489	3,106	323	(60)	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) 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,
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	16,918	17,801	286	1,169	delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		•	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) Technology –
							Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored
L							natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed,
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,867	8,755	1,962	3,850	technology was ineffective). 3) 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
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	583	584	400	401	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	46,106	41,716			No explanation required.
California	Navy	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	50,004	26,609	1,287	(22,108)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	46,942	39,979	7,816		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 – 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.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	19,657	17,945	2,050		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) 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 Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	116	764	11	650	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.
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	66,945				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 schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	19,476	27,799	938	9,261	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.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	10,010	11,991	517		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California		NORTH ISLAND NAS					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) 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.
Calliornia	Navy	NOVATO DOD HOUSING	79,375	80,596			, , , ,
California	Navy	FACILITY	716	667	25	(24)	No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	44,994	45,026	2,849	2,881	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
							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 broadscale 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 – 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) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	77,731	89,113	2,654	14,036	or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$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
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	15,321	15,786	987	1,452	Requirement).
							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) New Site. 3) Cost
Florida	Novar	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,588	16,864	737	12.012	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
rioliua	Navy	PANAMA CITT CSS	4,000	10,004	131	13,013	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	76,155	81,170	458	5,473	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
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	34,205	34,733	2,295	2,823	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
Howeii	Nova	DEADL LIADDOD FISC	17.000	15 115	2 247	202	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii Hawaii	Navy Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC PEARL HARBOR NS	17,060 129,914				No explanation required.
ı iawaii	inavy	I LANL HANDOK NO	129,914	110,243	0,120	(5,545)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	333	320	550	537	sampling).
	/			. 320	, 300		1-1 J/

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
				ζ. /		. ,	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
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	6,179	6,580	917	1 318	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR PWC	42,708	41,958			No explanation required.
Hawaii	itavy	T EXILETIMA BOTT WO	12,700	11,000	200	(101)	Tro 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) 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 cost estimating methodology or model.
							5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	62,421	56,955	5,674	208	contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Tionua	INAVY	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY	02,421	30,933	3,074	200	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	STATION	6,139	4,500	867	(772)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,294	1,049			No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	335	213	97	(25)	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 –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Alacka	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	29,778	31,507	3,081	4 940	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	ivavy	I OINT BARROW NARL	23,110	31,307	3,001	4,010	Journal Control of the Control of th

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	installation Name	illilation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$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
			40.000	44.500		400	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	16,880	14,503	2,785	408	sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC					requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Washington	Navy	DIV DET	2,977				delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	9,741	8,959	617	(165)	No explanation required.
							1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,439	4,856	1,527	944	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		PUGET SOUND FISC					
Washington	Navy	BREMERTON	3,399	3,352	28	(19)	No explanation required.
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
							national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
		PUGET SOUND FISC					promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
Washington	Navy	MANCHESTER	1,455	1,953	31	529	Requirement).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Washington	Navy	BREMERTON	1,646				additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS	20,754	19,374	46	(1,334)	
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	98,803	97,932	3,328	2,457	schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS PUGET SOUND NSY	20,754 98,803			, , ,	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-le project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased phydimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 pricestimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$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) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
							in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
Vinciale.	NI	OLIANTICO MOD	400,000	405.074	7.540	5.440	the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP	108,268	105,871	7,540	5,143	in schedule.
Puerto Rico	Navy	GARCIA	18,906	11,863	148	(6,895)	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 – 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
0 117	.	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND	4 000	4 000	0.10	0.40	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
California	Navy	NALF	1,268	1,990	218	940	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 contract or contract
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	6,618	6,894	616	892	method.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 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
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,503	2,783	1,536	2,816	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							A) Project Comment Added also are also as a the project and are
							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) 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or
							ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	314,106	314,862	1,179	1,935	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
0 117	l	OAN DIFOONTO	0.507	4 0 4 4	4 500	0.47	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	2,527	1,344	1,530	347	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) Standards or
							Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	8,282				directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	40,946	39,434	1,062	(450)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Massachusatta	Nova	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	42,129	45,776	1,655	E 202	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Inavy	SOUTH WETWOUTH NAS	42,129	45,776	1,055	5,302	Jauditional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State			Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	8,967	9,042			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).
							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 –
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	26,204	27,995	16,815	18 606	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Camorria	Itavy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	20,201	21,000	10,010	10,000	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	HUNTERS PT ANNEX	222,331	196,857	49,281	23,807	estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,092	22,110	1,280	3,298	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	TUSTIN MCAS	17,296	17,385	508	597	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 contract or contract method.
	l	TWENTYNINE PALMS	00.:	00.65-	-	(0.005)	
California	Navy	MCAGCC	23,179	20,885	226	(2,068)	No explanation required. 1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	Novy	VIEQUES EAST	240 707	250 926	15 FG2	16 692	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.
Fuerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	249,707	250,826	15,563	10,082	judused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
O 1 1	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,873	7,419	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 site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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).
Fuerto Nico	inavy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS	5,673	7,419	200	1,740	delay in regulatory document review of approval).
Hawaii	Navy	EASTPAC	6,877	5,699	924	(254)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	43,055	46,361	2,356		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.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	245	214	49	18	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	25,471	22,140	836	(2,495)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	71,307		12,422	20,096	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.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	3,303	2,909	155	(239)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	20,906	21,626	1,376	2 096	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		WILLIAMSBURG FISC				·	
Virginia	Navy	CHEATHAM ANNEX	40,759	35,357	5,186	(216)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,143	57,753	12,078	19,688	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	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	16,602	26,562	869	10,829	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	YORKTOWN NWS	53,347	52,442		167	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.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	31,107	26,463	3,875	(769)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	2,979	3,011	184	216	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		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
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	36,065	40,959	2,803	7,697	sampling).
<u> </u>	7 1 0.00	,	30,000	10,000	_,000	.,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,160	3,184	105	129	estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	35,379		1,052		No explanation required.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	50,186	47,859	3,433	1,106	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
N V 1	l	ALD FORCE DI ANT SO	004	000	740	707	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	891	888	710	707	sampling).
							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
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	126,543	131,534	2,880	7,871	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 –
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	11,971	12,984	142	1.155	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	22,078				No explanation required.
			,			(),== 1)	

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT	3,989	4,028	311	350	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.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	71,755	72,161	937	1,343	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.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	83,973	112,631	3,750		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.
1 6111162266	All Folce	JANNOLD	03,973	112,031	3,750	32,408	Jauditional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

ne project progresses
on added to project
s due to other site-level
nants, increased physical way such as vapor
change in future
onal risk, additional
I to Change in Scope –
lel.
nroiget progresses (o. g
project progresses (e.g., ded to project scope).
ded to project scope).
Scope – Change in cost
Caana Channa in aast
Scope – Change in cost
Scope – Actual contract
e prior estimate. This
in schedule.
ner site-level project
ncreased physical
vay such as vapor
change in future
onal risk, additional
Scope - Change in cost
1 3-
ti/, 011

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	Page 201/2)
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
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	1,940	4,125	39	2,224	sampling).
		BLUE ASH AIR GUARD	·	·		,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Ohio	Air Force	STATION	6,407	8,190	155	1,938	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	494	565	12	83	estimating methodology or model.
		BRADLEY IAP (EAST					
Connecticut	Air Force	GRANBY)	7,206				No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	9,131	7,281	338	(1,512)	No explanation required.
							1) New Site. 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
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	51,277	58,964	4,269	11 056	schedule.
Colorado	All I olde	BOCKEL I AI B	31,277	30,904	4,209	11,930	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	BUCKLEY ANNEX	231	1,998	443	2,210	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
A11	A : E	DULL EN DOINT	000	40.400		0.700	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	862	10,496	69	9,703	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
		BURLINGTON					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Vermont	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	10,535	21,587	629	11,681	sampling).
N 4: 1 :	 	CALUMET AIR FORCE	,				Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Michigan	Air Force	STATION	473	5,800			feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	11	0	15	4	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	_	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		CAMP BLANDING MIL					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	741	2,049	93	1,401	estimating methodology or model.
		CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Washington	Air Force	STATION	1,068	1,812	30	774	estimating methodology or model.
	l	CAMP PENDLETON MIL	_				
Virginia	Air Force	RESERVATION	0	0	1,252	1,252	No explanation required.
		CAMPION AIR FORCE			4=0	0 = 4.4	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	14,750	21,316	178	6,744	estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	31,551	38,384	2,111	8,944	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.
		CAPE CANAVERAL AIR					
Florida	Air Force	FORCE STATION	258,531	214,017	3,810	(40,704)	No explanation required.
		CAPE LISBURNE LONG					
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	6,017	3,748	130	(2,139)	No explanation required.
	l =	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG	40.000	40.00-	0.45	(0.004)	
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	12,903	10,607	215	(2,081)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	14,639	33,420	539	19,320	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) 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).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas		CARSWELL	4,442				feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Air Force	CASTLE	71,890	63,572	1,327	(6,991)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

					FY 2017	Cost	
	D-D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	•	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Otate	Component	matanation rame	πιατιοπ (ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,101	1,162	348	400	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Calliornia	All Folce	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,101	1,102	340	409	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) 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
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	22,448	22,645	1,444		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
N 4 0 1	l –	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS	40.070	04.400	400		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
North Carolina Alaska	Air Force Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT CHENA RIVER	16,376 340	21,190 339	102 9		estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
Alaska	All Folce	CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL	340	339	9	0	INO explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	AIRPORT	6,238	5,643	38	(557)	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	7,424	9,375	351		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
		COLD BAY LONG RANGE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	2,743	3,608	62		sampling).
		COLUMBUS AIR FORCE		,			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mississippi	Air Force	BASE	9,565	9,192	691	318	estimating methodology or model.
		COOCLIEAD AID MATIONAL					
Oregon	Air Force	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	92	15	46	(24)	No explanation required
Oregon	All FUICE	MOLINIC DANDO	92	15	46	(31)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost			Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
		COSTA MESA AIR GUARD					
California	Air Force	STATION	4,183	2,582	62	(1,539)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,386	2,448	45	107	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	7,761	11,455	418	4,112	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 cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	8,643	8,558	160	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	246				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	130,446	107,503	2,639	(20,304)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	8,052	9,666	392	2,006	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	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,967	11,089	258	6,380	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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 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
		DUNCAN CANAL RADIO					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION (RRS)	8,236	2,168	6,606	538	sampling).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	11,537	11,200			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
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,433	7,355	113	1.035	sampling).
		EARECKSON AIR FORCE		,,,,,,		1,000	,
Alaska	Air Force	BASE	100,241	96,687	1,257	(2,297)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	618,241	585,963	18,545	(13.733)	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 – 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) New Site. 7) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	44,021	42,640	1,681	300	or model.
			,52 1	,510	.,551		1

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Farra	EIELCON AID FORCE DAGE	440.007	044 500	47.705	240.007	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
Alaska Texas	Air Force Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE ELLINGTON	416,287 0	614,589 0			in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
Texas		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE					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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
South Dakota	Air Force	BASE	31,729	33,171	1,996	3,438	schedule.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	15,222	15,911	340	1,029	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).
Washington Kansas		FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE FORBES	68,814 7,279		3,765 101		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 ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule. No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	158	200	5	47	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	105,639	57,196	303	(48,140)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
		FRANCIS S. GABRESKI					, ,
New York	Air Force	(WEST HAMPTON)	1,128	733	176	(219)	No explanation required.
	1						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	682	1,101	108	527	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
							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
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
							estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	228,800	258,341	1,324	30,865	schedule.
							A) Project Occur. Added decrees the project and project
							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 –
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	9,947	12,317	296	2,666	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 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
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	4,993	6,369	113	1.489	schedule.
		1	.,000	2,300		.,	

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		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 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
California	Air Force	GEORGE	66,137	66,935	3,997	4,795	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,794	3,078	4,043	5,327	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	8,540	9,048	122	630	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE					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). 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
North Dakota	Air Force	BASE GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO	6,865	6,856	326	317	caused by changes in schedule. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	6,590	7,020	81	511	estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	20,588	9,629	276	(10,683)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	4,068	1,942	15	(2,111)	No explanation required.
Indiana		GRISSOM ARB	24,358		374		No explanation required.
		GULFPORT BILOXI					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mississippi Alabama	Air Force Air Force	REGIONAL AIRPORT GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	3,607		131		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.
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	15		24		No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
0.0.00			The state of the s	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	
							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 –
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	2,092	3,051	240	1,199	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
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	25,693	35,429	2,229	11 065	sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
	Air Force	HARRISBURG	1,559				No explanation required.
	7 1 0.00	HAYWARD MUNICIPAL	.,000		<u> </u>	(0)	
California	Air Force	AIRPORT	614	146	146	(322)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	3,676	6,482	38	2,844	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) 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 – 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
I. Ir - I-	A:- =	LIII AID EODOE DAGE	000 700	005.050	45.004	0.040	the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	308,723	295,350	15,991	2,618	in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	36,489		9,100		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.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	27,201	38,067	1,924		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.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	6,257	9,088	124	2,955	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. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,092	10,962	1,404	1,274	(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.

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Passan/a)
State	Component	Installation Name INDIAN MOUNTAIN	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	RESEARCH	26,668	23,240	385	(2.042)	No explanation required.
Alaska	All I Olce	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C	20,000	23,240	303	(3,043)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mississippi	Air Force	THOMPSON)	293	2,461	132	2 300	estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	All I olde	THOWN CON	293	2,401	102	2,300	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	10,112	15,988	332	6 208	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	124,945	135,952	3,362		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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	143,756	102,408	10,232	(31,116)	No explanation required.
South Carolina		JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	47,504		2,701		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.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	53,936	49,367	2,562	(2,007)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•	(\$000)		_	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	187,515	256,419	5,073	73,977	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 broadscale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	42,390	67,345	4,366		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 broadscale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	21,554		1,130		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.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	18,836	16,418	415	(2,003)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
.	۱	IDMDL DIV	00.005	00.400	0.000	0.040	sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
New Jersey	Air Force Air Force	JBMDL-DIX JBMDL-LAKEHURST	28,095				in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	58,440 218,496	,			No explanation required. No explanation required.
ivew Jersey	All Foice	JBMDE-MCGOINE	210,490	144,104	11,070	(02,322)	ino explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,834	5,282	335	1.783	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
			2,001	5,=5=		1,1.00	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	3,411	4,977	89	1,655	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Tayon	A:= F====	JBSA-LACKLAND	40.007	44.004	007	4.704	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	43,687	44,624	827	1,764	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
							sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	6,029	10,346	124	4,441	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Missouri	Air Force	GUARD STATION	5,118	5,992	62	936	estimating methodology or model.
Missississis	Ain Face	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE	007	047		0.5	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	897	917	15	35	estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,258	13,879	280	4,901	estimating methodology or model.
JUIIISIUII AIUII	All FUICE	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,230	13,079	200	4,501	jesumating methodology of model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	-		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
	l				.=-		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO	6,095	9,095	278	3,278	sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	3,448	2,112	18	(1.318)	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
L	l						sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	4,988	6,453	270	1,735	Change in 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
							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 –
Texas Mississippi		KELLY KEY FIELD	79,159 2.320				Change in cost estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
Michigan		KI SAWYER	2,320 84,781	57,122	1,790		No explanation required.
Alaska		KING SALMON	55,337	49,545			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
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	110,233	137,306	7,794	34,867	sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
I ACM INICYICO	All I UICE	MINITAND	110,233	137,300	1,194	34,007	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
		KLAMATH FALLS IAP	((()	(c	(4000)	(4000)	
Oregon	Air Force	(KINGSLEY FIELD)	4,265	3,732	161	(372)	No explanation required.
		KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE				, , ,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	7,676	7,889	111	324	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	6,522	6,334	278	90	estimating methodology or model.
		LAMBERT ST. LOUIS					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Missouri	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	17,548	20,027	217		estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	35,892	27,585	320	(7,987)	No explanation required.
		LINCOLN MUNICIPAL					
Nebraska	Air Force	AIRPORT	7,756	5,400	138		No explanation required.
		LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Arkansas	Air Force	BASE	26,330				policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	32,742	18,540			No explanation required.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	6,524	5,284			No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	8,115		116		No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	4,928	2,735	317	(1,876)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	25,002	24,712			estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	86,552	77,953	1,600	(6,999)	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	631	3,887	210		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) New Site. 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
		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE					ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
Montana	Air Force	BASE	25,077	31,815	1,851	8,589	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
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	993	2,124	154	1,285	sampling).
California	Air Force	MARCH	166,740	123,296	8,425	(35,019)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	mination (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	neason(s)
							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 –
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	2,853	5,353	93		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	Air Force	MATHER	105,464	120,988	3,411		sampling).
Alabama	Air Force	MAXWELL	32,182	30,578	902		No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	99,761	88,426	10,032	(1,303)	No explanation required.
	1	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE					
Kansas	Air Force	BASE	62,293	42,263	8,697	(11,333)	No explanation required.
		MCCONNELL AID FORCE					Draiget Coope Added clooning phones as the project progresses (c.g.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	669	727	163		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Narisas	All I olde	MCENTIRE AIR GUARD	009	121	103	221	leasibility study of remedial action operation added to project scope).
South Carolina	Air Force	BASE	3,430	2,665	16	(749)	No explanation required.
			-,	,		(- /	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	7,342	7,415	110	183	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 in Scope –
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	652	1,520	32		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
				,,,,,	-		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,134	2,182	28		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
		MININEADOLIS OF DALL					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Minnocoto	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	2,629	2,707	139		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota North Dakota	Air Force Air Force	MINOT	16,345		795		No explanation required.
1401til Dakota	/ III I OICE	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	10,343	13,037	1 93		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	3.303	5.632	124		
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	3,303	5,632	124		estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	14,312	12,499	3,941	2,128	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.
Idaho		MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	5,071	44,101	2,029	41,059	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) 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.
	A	MUDDINADOME	0.005		074	0.000	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska		MURPHY DOME	2,965		974		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) 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
South Carolina		MYRTLE BEACH NAKNEK RECREATIONAL	11,482	12,127	311	956	method. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	CAMP I	991	1,129	11	149	estimating methodology or model.
		NAKNEK RECREATIONAL					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Alaska	, 0.00	CAMP II	12,091	13,380			estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	2,695	1,416	62	(1,217)	No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
				(\$000)		_	Reason(s)
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	19,166	18,622	598	5.4	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.
							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 –
New Hampshire Delaware		NEW BOSTON NEW CASTLE COUNTY	5,069				Change in contract or contract method. 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.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,060				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.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
		NIAGARA FALLS NIAGARA FALLS IAP (ANG)	9,611 18				sampling). No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	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
		NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	14,844	15,842	425	1,423	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
		NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	6,019	8,819	1,813	4,613	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
California	Air Force	NORTON	8,965	10,371	382	1,788	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 –
							Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
							estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	36,104	38,364	577	2,838	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
Illinois		OHARE	5,846	6,215	108	477	sampling).
l		OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY	, <u> </u>	40 ===	0.5	(0.76.1)	l.,
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	15,736	10,702	2,250	(2,784)	No explanation required.
		ORANGE AIR GUARD				45.00	
Connecticut		STATION	208		122		No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	PAINE FIELD	1,753	1,274	436		No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	49,326	46,939	1,220	(1,167)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
			Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
	•		· · · · · ·	ζ. /	, ,	ζ. /	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	97,384	113,475	26,042	42,133	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
		DEAGE AND NEW					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Hampshire		PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	3,540	4,889	99	1 110	sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire		PETERSON AIR FORCE	3,340	4,009	99	1,440	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Colorado		BASE	14	36	36	58	estimating methodology or model.
New York		PLATTSBURGH	90,112		1,297		No explanation required.
		POINT ARENA AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California		STATION	3,310	3,630	30	350	estimating methodology or model.
Alaska		POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	11 712	2,329	8,057	(4.257)	No explanation required.
	Air Force	POINT LAY	11,743 14,242	4,037	18		No explanation required.
		POINT LONELY DOME	40				No explanation required.
7.11.01.10	7 1 0.00						- to orpinalism regained.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
		PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY					technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	15,278	33,816	6,032	24,570	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	1,975	6,512	40	4,577	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
- rogon		PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR	1,973	0,012	+0	7,511	osamaang modiodology of modol.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	SITE	213	56	31	(126)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	215	59	31	(125)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State			Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	_	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	1,531	2,200	62	731	estimating methodology or model.
			1,001				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
Texas	Air Force	REESE	21,266	22,452	718	1,904	schedule.
		RENO TAHOE					
Nevada	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	5,780	4,493	116	(1,171)	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
	l	DIOLIADDO OFDALID		0.074	400	4 0 4 =	sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	1,992	2,871	166	1,045	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
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	1,905	3,750	663	2 500	sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	1,842	1,714	119		No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	171	54	61	· /	No explanation required.
Offic	7111 1 0100	THOREIND TOREIT IN	17.1	J-	01	(50)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	Air Force	ROBINS	67,543	86,203	1,065	19.725	sampling).
 	1 0100		0.,010	00,200	.,500	10,720	1L

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
	D - D		Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(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) 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
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	33,991	44,609	1,551	12,169	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
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	319	1,225	78	084	sampling).
MISSOUT	All I Olce	INOSECINANS MEM	319	1,225	70	304	Sampling).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,458	3,462	52	56	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	308		114	(8)	No explanation required.
		SAN DIEGO SPACE					
		SURVEILLANCE FIELD					
California	Air Force	STATN	1,172		228		No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	1,841	1,440	62	(339)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,953	1,504	38	(411)	No explanation required.
Georgia	All Folce	AIRFORT	1,900	1,504	30	(411)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,129	1,907	131	909	estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	79,770		2,433		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
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	21,130	24,949	1,204	5.022	sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
wiichigan	All FUICE	SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD	21,130	24,949	1,204	5,023	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.
California	Air Force	STATION	10	0	16	6	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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
		SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina	Air Force	FORCE BASE	13,835	14,281	576	1,022	sampling).
							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
Courth Corolina	Air Force	CLIAW AID FORCE DACE	75.060	72.050	4 204	074	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	75,363	72,050	4,284	9/1	sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	7,597	8,478	81	062	estimating methodology or model.
Texas	All I OICE	SKY HARBOR	1,591	0,470	01	302	lestimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	5	4	8	7	No explanation required.
, unzona	7 11 1 0100	111121111111111111111111111111111111111			J	,	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	541	620	92	171	estimating methodology or model.
		SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	3,961	4,257	90	386	estimating methodology or model.
			·				ŭ,
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
		SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY					sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Ohio	Air Force	MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,358	2,864	255	761	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
l	l	STEWART INTERNATIONAL					l
New York	Air Force	AIRPORT	3,955	2,751	54	(1,150)	No explanation required.
M/s complies as	A :- = -	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE	0.000	0.070	_	050	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Wyoming	Air Force	STATION STATE OF THE STATE OF T	2,623	2,870	9	256	estimating methodology or model.
Alaaka	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE	10.045	14.054	250	(2.420)	No explanation required
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	18,045	14,251	356	(3,438)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	_	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)			(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
							national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
1	1	TED STEVENS					promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
Alaska	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,569	19,303	116	14,850	Requirement).
							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 – 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	56,500	66,542	1,728	11,770	schedule.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	124,707	95,472	4,857	(24,378)	No explanation required.
		TUCSON INTERNATIONAL					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	AIRPORT	2,766	3,416	304	954	estimating methodology or model.
	1	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR				(=)	
California	Air Force	SITE	11,776	162	9,042	(2,572)	No explanation required.
Oklohoma	Δ:	TULSA	570	600	24	00	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	578	629	31	82	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
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	192,344	191,857	13,388	12,901	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	11,834	10,788			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 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
	1						CTC. 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
	1						Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
	1						the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	8,256	9,339	1,799	2,882	in schedule.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	272,745	223,320	29,879	(19,546)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name				_	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
		VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wisconsin	Air Force	BASE	7,170	9,618	106	2,554	sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	87	0	43	(44)	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
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	4,952	5,648			sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	19,398	11,270	150	(7,978)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,900	2,543	284	(72)	No explanation required.
Massacriusells	All Force	WESTOVER	2,900	2,543	204	(13)	ino explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		WHITEMAN AIR FORCE					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Missouri	Air Force	BASE	6,075	5,313	1,394		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	6,179				No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	21,520	,	878		No explanation required.
		WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE	,				
Pennsylvania	Air Force	RESERVE	5,716	3,967	124	(1,625)	No explanation required.
							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
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	5,485	40,434	7,971	42,920	Requirement). 2) New Site.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	124,053	120,277	1,635	(2,141)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			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 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
Michigan	Air Force	 WURTSMITH	104.563	133,923	8,617	37,977	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	All Folce	WORTSWITT	104,303	133,923	0,017	31,911	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	802	1,848	93	1,139	estimating methodology or model.
9				,		,	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,
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,619	1,849	2,125	2,355	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
		DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	DLA	FACILITY	9,881	11,236	1,268	2,623	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
		DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	DLA	CUMBERLAND FAC.	5,523	5,479	69	25	sampling).
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,620		84		No explanation required.
		DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	- /		(2-2)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	DLA	SURPLUS	1,951	1,911	70		estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	1,541	760	25	(756)	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
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	44,156	43,974	2,492	2,310	sampling).
rennsylvania	DLA	DOC PHILADELPHIA	44,156	43,974	2,492	2,310	jsampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 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
		500 5101 IN 401 IS	44.440	40.040			property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	44,413	43,010	2,192	789	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
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,775	9,776	338	3 330	sampling).
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	98				No explanation required.
Tionaa	1.020	7.11 1 27.11 110 7 1			0,	(11)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		AF RADAR TRACKING					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maine	FUDS	STATION	4,232	5,144	2,196	3,108	sampling).
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 18	965	0	40	(925)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	42	64			estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	50	41	29	20	No explanation required.
Et a situla	FUDO	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	000	004	00	(5.40)	No sombo of conserving d
Florida	FUDS	RANGE PINELLAS ALMADEN AIR FORCE	802	221	39	(542)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	STATION	050	100	30	(046)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	952 11,138		135		No explanation required.
Alaska	F0D3	AWARNAR	11,130	10,307	133	(030)	ino explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	3,911	3,075	5	(831)	No explanation required.
TOAGO	1.020	AMCHITKA AF AUXILIARY	0,011	0,010	J	(001)	i to explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FIELD	80,005	75,722	1,209	(3,074)	No explanation required.
			,	- ,	,	(= / = /	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	231	2	193	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
		ANTIGO AIR FORCE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wisconsin	FUDS	STATION	654	1,260	70	676	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	5,491	2,641	191	(2,659)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	24,371	14,395	113	(9,863)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	27,875	35,250	382	7.757	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	99				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
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	2,997	3,638	38	679	sampling). 2) New Site.
	ELIDO		4.400	4.450	4.5	50	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas Oklahoma	FUDS FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8 ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,106 1,239				estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	10,402			, , ,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	196,981	180,123			No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,317				No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AVON PARK ARMY AIRFIELD	2,680	1,946	220	(514)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	63	20	1	(42)	No explanation required.
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	NO. 8	156	199	677	720	sampling).
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	661	2,448			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	42	97	41	96	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
							sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
0 114	ELIBO		400	570		404	technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
California Virgin Islands of	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	420	573	38	191	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	2,133	3,479	51	1,397	estimating methodology or model.
trie 0.3.	1 003	BENEDICTTIELD	2,133	3,473	31	1,597	New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	876	10,808	853	10.785	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			9.5	10,000			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
1							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,394	3,674	38	318	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
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,481	3,828	47	2,394	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) 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
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	9,596	12,226	83	2,713	methodology or model.
		BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION	,				
Nebraska		DEPOT	250,584	231,780			No explanation required.
		BLUE BEACH	4,325				No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	53	0	19	(34)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

					FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
							A) Preiost Come. Added requirements due to other site level preiost
							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
		BOARDMAN AIR FORCE					sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Oregon	FUDS	RANGE	24,789	30,363	103	5,677	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	9,806	13,194	20	3,408	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	2,480	4,155	49	1,724	estimating methodology or model.
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
Eta adala	FUDO	DOOTMICK DOMB TABOUT	44.000	40.040	4 404	4 000	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	11,962	12,246	1,104	1,388	needed, technology was ineffective).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	19,245	20,477	47	1.279	sampling).
			-, -	- ,		, -	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	8,029	7,554	535	60	or model.
		BROOKSVILLE TURRET					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	587	878			estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	BROWNWOOD AAF	0	0			No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	21,885	6,984	775	(14,126)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	719	737	20	20	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,624	1,467	149		No explanation required.
INEW JEISEY	1-003	DONLING FOR AAP	1,024	1,407	149	(0)	ino explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,432	2,075	40		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
	1. 020		1, 102	2,070	+0		

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	20,570	23,635	749	3 814	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina		BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	245				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
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	164	165	30	31	methodology or model.
0-1161-	ELIDO		2 225	5 740	4 007	04.4	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California		CAMARILLO AIRPRT CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	6,895				estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP BARKELEY (FORT	28,330	14,650	1/2	(13,508)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	BARKLEY)	16,258	15,284	1	(973)	No explanation required.
Толао	. 000	Drittle 1)	10,200	10,201		(010)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	161,617	170,010	1,024	9,417	estimating methodology or model.
			·		·		y y
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Flavida	ELIDO	CAMP DI ANDING	70.004	07.000	4 070	45 447	sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	73,924	87,363	1,978	15,417	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	15,180	17,370	4,740	6 930	needed, technology was ineffective).
10/100	1. 000	O DOTTIE	10,100	17,570	- -,,, - -0	0,000	modes, toomology was monocurej.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$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 –
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	15,128	19,467	505	4,844	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	128	176	135	183	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana		CAMP CLAIBORNE	27,302		285		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.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING RANGE	9,307	6,140	1	(3.166)	No explanation required.
California		CAMP ELLIOT	27,536				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	6,984	16,624	3,949	13,589	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).
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	32,329	18,186	670	(13,473)	No explanation required.
Illinois		CAMP GRANT RIFLE RANGE	1,811	2,646			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) 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).
Oklahoma		CAMP GRUBER	24,138	2,457	26		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	202	32	125	(45)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Otato		motanation rame	manon (¢000)	(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
		0.1.5		440 40=		0==04	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	89,982	112,485	3,001	25,504	sampling).
							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
		CAMP HOWZE					Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Texas	FUDS	(FELDERHOFF)	87,676	95,141	128	7,593	methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	660	1,849	245	1,434	estimating methodology or model.
							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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	24,144	25,014	370	1 240	or model.
California		CAMP LOCKETT	12,383	11,871	84		No explanation required.
	. 525		,000	,	<u> </u>	(:= 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
		CAMP LUCAS					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	MAINTENANCE FACILITY	63	1,102			sampling).
Texas Puerto Rico	FUDS FUDS	CAMP MAXEY CAMP O'REILLY	41,572 4,562	40,672 2,503	52 83		No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUD5	CAIVIP OREILLY	4,502	2,503	63	(1,976)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP					scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Arkansas	FUDS	PIKE	92,525	124,737	238	32,450	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	18,668	21,035	62	2,429	estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Otato	Component	motunation Name	mination (4000)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		CAMP SHELBY MANUVER					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	14,255	16,869	135	2 749	sampling).
Mississippi	1000	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY	14,200	10,003	100	2,743	Sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	RANGE	7,523	4,367	424	(2 732)	No explanation required.
01110	1 0 0 0	101102	7,020	1,007	12.	(2,702)	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
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	37,507	107,727	25	70,245	sampling). 2) New Site.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	6,959	6,220			No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	554	454	15		No explanation required.
1.						, ,	
							1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,989	16,906	434	2,351	needed, technology was ineffective). 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
		CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Massachusetts	FUDS	BOMB TARGET SITE	1,438				sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE PROMINENCE AWS	2,149	2,025	136		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	3,045		77		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKAK RADIO STA	15,303	13,338			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	7,935	148	1	(7,786)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMIAIR FORCE STATION	400	45	00	(24)	No explanation required
Illinois Wyoming	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION CASPER AFB	102 3,321	45 2,028			No explanation required. No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	3,321	319			No explanation required.
10/40	1.000	C. C. HALIK IV. HAOL	360	319	30	(3)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS 7-80	570	1.383	17	830	
	FUDS						
Maine Alaska	FUDS FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80 CATON ISLAND	570 7,696	1,383 6,256			property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	_	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ciuio			(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	, '
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	10,742	20,578	2	9,838	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,982	3,812	276	106	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).
Alaska	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	27,562	35,517	944	8,899	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	509	277	532	301	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
\/inginia	ELIDO	CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP	07.400	40.547	454	(7.54.4)	No evelopation varying d
Virginia	FUDS	TRAINING SITE CLEARFIELD NAVAL	27,182	19,517	151	(7,514)	No explanation required. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Utah	FUDS	SUPPLY DEPOT	7	101	8	102	estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	1,518		1		No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,231	9,962	209	2,940	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	45,546				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	214	88	91	(35)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost 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
		COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR			_		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	STATION	298	2,926	2	2,630	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/	ELIDO		450	440		0.4	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	152	112	71	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
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
							sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	12,692	15,121	34	2 463	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			,00_		<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
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	578	1,133	4	559	sampling).
		CORRY ST USN TECH					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	TRAINING	844	1,201	39	396	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	12,564				estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,312	8,851	82	(14,379)	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
Name Val	ELIDO.			00.00:	0.465	00.000	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	13,447	36,324	3,126	26,003	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	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
Now Jorgov	FUDS	CP KILMER	54	38	106		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILIVIER	54	36	106	90	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	30,124	52,806	57		or model.
7 1100001110	. 020	0.0.0.0	00,:=:	02,000	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
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	1,668	2,027	92	451	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 –
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	267	711	26		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,193	1,680	44	531	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 in regulatory document review or approval). 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
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	107,657	105,153	10,704		Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,052	3,336	37	321	estimating methodology or model.
1							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	97,687	112,525	89	14,927	estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	79	1,309	27	1,257	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		DELAND NAVAL TRAINING					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Florida	FUDS	CENTER	357	1,563			sampling).
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	1,475	63	23	(1,389)	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
Duanta Dias	FUDO	DECECUEO ICI AND	0.550	0.050		440	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Puerto Rico South Carolina	FUDS FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND DONALDSON AFB	8,559	8,950 9,046	51 550		sampling). No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	16,251 9,451	8,046 8,026	165		No explanation required.
Mairie	FUDS	BOW WILL AT	9,431	6,020	103	(1,200)	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	160	2,133	47	2 020	needed, technology was ineffective).
Galifornia	1 000	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY	100	2,100		2,020	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	RANGE	7,256	9,638	334	2 716	estimating methodology or model.
	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	1,074	711	82		No explanation required.
Ttorur Garonna		EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA	1,071	,	02	(201)	i to explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SITE	599	510	50	(39)	No explanation required.
						(00)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,995	5,261	1,145	411	estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	173	54			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ELMIRA SUB DEPOT	191	13	47		No explanation required.
New York		ENGINEER SCH	121	17	86	(18)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	341	324	7		No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	680	609	46	(25)	No explanation required.
_							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	290	313	60	83	estimating methodology or model.
	_						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	21,145	24,304	1,194	4,353	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

		FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			_	_		
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
	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
FUDS	11	290	2,048	1,897	3,655	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
ELIDO		0.540	202	0.070	450	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
		2,516	393	2,273	150	sampling).
		834	313	254	(267)	No explanation required.
1000	10	004	313	204	(201)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
						dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	57,370	70,450	34	13,114	sampling).
					(-)	L
FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	64,881	53,646	3,709	(7,526)	No explanation required.
FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	164 081	136 721	8 121	(19 239)	No explanation required.
		,	.00,.2.	5,121	(10,200)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	294	313	55	74	estimating methodology or model.
						ŭ,
FUDS		19,481				No explanation required.
FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,288	1,341	14	(1,933)	No explanation required.
EU 10.0					0.5 :	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
						feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	1/8	0	218	40	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
FUDS	FORBES AFB	9,877	10,276	480	879	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	FUDS FUDS FUDS FUDS FUDS FUDS FUDS FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8 FUDS FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX FUDS FINLAND AFS Z-69 FIVE POINTS OLF (TWINPARKSESTATES) FUDS FLOYD BENNETT FLD	Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) FUDS 11 290 FUDS 11 290 FUDS 12 2,516 FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2,516 FUDS 13 834 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3 64,881 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4 164,081 FUDS FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8 294 FUDS FEDERAL CENTER 19,481 FUDS 19,481 FUDS FINLAND AFS Z-69 3,288 FUDS FIVE POINTS 0LF(TWINPARKSESTATES) 827 FUDS FLOYD BENNETT FLD 178	Dod Installation Name	DOD Component Installation Name Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) (Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) Estimate Change (\$000)

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	_		Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Otato	Component	motunation Name	milation (¢000)	(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
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,776	7,191	69	1,484	sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,767	1,169	287	(4,311)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	74	0	49	(25)	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
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,501	1,647			sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,805	1,561	63		No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	930	670	42	(218)	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
Kanaga	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,197	1,231	107	1.11	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION		1,231	107	141	Sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	CAMP	668	521	32	(115)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORMER CAMP FANNIN	62,434	41,691	10,986		No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of		T GTANIETA GTANIET TTANIA	02, 10 1	11,001	10,000	(0,101)	i to explanation required.
the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	813	142	34	(637)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	FORT A.P. HILL	0	0			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
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,762	4,160	107	1,505	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 –
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,048	33,520	18	32,490	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
.		FORT CUSTER				(0.05.)	<u>l. </u>
Michigan	FUDS	REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	20,313	14,591	2,891	(2,831)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	In at all attack Name	Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	B/-\
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	3,641	1,217	25		No explanation required. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Litob	FUDS	FORT DOUGLAS	10.455	12,095	26		lestimating methodology or model.
Utah	FUD5	FORT DOUGLAS	10,455	12,095	20	1,000	estimating methodology of model.
		FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN					
Wyoming	FUDS	TAR & MANEUVER RGE	6,047	1,732	56	(4.250)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	343,078		1,699		No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	106		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		No explanation required.
IVIAIIIE	1 000	TOKT GORGES	100		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
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	41	36	40		sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	19,841	13,622	632		No explanation required.
110W GOLGGY	1 000	T GILL TWILL GOOD	10,011	10,022	002	(0,001)	i to 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
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	11,858	16,457	185		Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	. 525		, 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
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	3,942	5,334	1,172		sampling).
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	41	0	36	(5)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	FORT MCDERMITT	42	5	24	(13)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	4,687	8,175	55	3,543	estimating methodology or model.
		FORT MILES MILITARY					
Delaware	FUDS	RESERVATION	18,581	17,626	8	(947)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	20,188	24,085	39		estimating methodology or model.
			1				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
			1				change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
			1				dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
			1				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	17,423	14,347	4,150	1,074	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State DoD Installation Name Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) (\$000				FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
State Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$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). Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technole (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remed needed, technology was ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) 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				Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level projechange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapority as ampling). Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup te				•	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor	State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		
dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in tuture property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in tuture property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in tuture property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in tuture property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion intrusion required and re								
intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk additional risk additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk additional risk additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is reopened to address additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (the sample of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (the sample of the cleanup additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (the sample of the cleanup additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (the sample of the cleanup additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion								
New York FUDS FORT SLOCUM 3,474 25,210 1 21,737 sampling). Florida FUDS FORT TAYLOR 14,193 13,413 2,924 2,144 reeded, technology as ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physica dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
New York FUDS FORT SLOCUM 3,474 25,210 1 21,737 sampling). Technology - Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediate needed, technology was ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope - Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
Florida FUDS FORT TAYLOR 14,193 13,413 2,924 2,144 reded, technology was ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
Florida FUDS FORT TAYLOR 14,193 13,413 2,924 2,144 needed, technology was ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor	New York	FUDS	FORT SLOCUM	3,474	25,210	1	21,737	
Florida FUDS FORT TAYLOR 14,193 13,413 2,924 2,144 needed, technology was ineffective). Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
Texas FUDS FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT 0 0 8 8 No explanation required. Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor	Florida	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	14,193	13,413	2,924	2,144	needed, technology was ineffective).
Texas FUDS FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE 4,689 2,174 239 (2,276) No explanation required. Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor	Toyas	ELIDS	EODT WODTH ADMV DEDOT		_	۰	۰	No explanation required
Pennsylvania FUDS FRANKFORD ARSENAL 7,180 1,329 1,434 (4,417) No explanation required. Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor				-	_			
Puerto Rico FUDS FT BROOKE 12,999 11,093 28 (1,878) No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level prochange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor	r derio rrico	1 000	I I BROOKE	12,333	11,033	20	(1,070)	ino explanation required.
change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								
interest (and to require a and interest of Dep // charige in retails								
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
								sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri FUDS FT CROWDER 6,217 6,540 16 339 Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	6.217	6.540	16		
		1		5,= ::	5,515			Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
								(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
North Carolina FUDS FT GREEN 9,219 10,716 39 1,536 needed, technology was ineffective).	North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	9,219	10,716	39	1,536	
			FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida FUDS BASE 17,320 26,496 118 9,294 estimating methodology or model.	Florida	FUDS	BASE	17,320	26,496	118	9,294	
Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level proje								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physica								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Montana FUDS GLASGOW AFB 5,929 7,054 844 1,969 sampling).	Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,929	7,054	844	1,969	sampling).
Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Georgia FUDS GLYNCO NAS 87 201 38 152 estimating methodology or model.								
California FUDS GOFFS CAMPSITE 3,835 2,832 114 (889) No explanation required.	California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,835	2,832	114	(889)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component		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,
		COLDENI CATE MATIONAL					delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	351	395	115	150	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California		GOPHER ORD PLT	331	395	115	159	Internodology of model.
Minnesota	FUDS	ROSEMOUNT	82	62	21	1	No explanation required.
Militiesota	1 000	TOOL MOOI VI	02	02	21	'	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,822	1,757	886	821	needed, technology was ineffective).
		GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH	,-	, -		_	, 3,
Delaware	FUDS	CENTER	49	25	4	(20)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GRAND RAPIDS NGTR	268	6	8	(254)	No explanation required.
		GREAT BEND A-GRND GNRY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	FUDS	R	7,077		18		estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	111,516	101,831	15	(9,670)	No explanation required.
		GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-				()	
Michigan	FUDS	51	8,485	4,680	326	(3,479)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	GUNTER AIR FORCE STATION	100			(404)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	190 2,264	0 1,814	6 71		No explanation required.
i iawaii	FUDS	TIAIRO RADIO STATION	2,204	1,014	7 1	(379)	ino 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
		HAINES FAIRBANKS					sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Alaska	FUDS	PIPELINE	13,746				in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	5,366	3,163	604	(1,599)	No explanation required.
California	LIDE	HAMMED EIELD	440	070	15	475	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	110	270	15	1/5	estimating methodology or model.
		HAMMOND BOMBING					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Louisiana	FUDS	RANGE	1,912	3,913	123	2 124	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiaria	. 555	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING &	1,012	0,010	120	2,127	is a substitution of the substitution and the project substitution and the
Mississippi	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	553	446	67	(40)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Otato	Component	motunation runio		(\$000)	(\$555)	(\$555)	i cason(o)
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	408	134	87	(187)	No explanation required.
		HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING					
Hawaii	FUDS	CAMP	36,272	31,007	255	(5,010)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	301	61	45	(195)	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
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	571	939	49	417	sampling).
Magaaahuaatta	FUDS	LUNCHAM NAD (ANNEV)	47.004	44400	200	(0.040)	No evalenation required
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	17,301	14,189	296		No explanation required. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	13,156	16,260	26		estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	1 003	TIONERVILLE BINBAGINET	13,130	10,200	20	3,130	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	33	75	2	44	estimating methodology or model.
riadita	. 020	110010.111110			_		community moundainegy of moudin
Northern							
Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	2,299	1,284	352	(663)	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
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,429	3,432	113	116	sampling).
III:i	FUDO	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB	0.004	4.440	050	(4.000)	No avalenction required
Illinois	FUDS	ORCHARD)	9,361	4,142	256		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
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	161	111	75		sampling).
	1 5 5 5		.01		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
		IONA ISLAND NAVAL					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	AMMUNITION DEPOT	14,834	15,628			sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	771	650	68	(53)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
				Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate		Change	
State	-		•	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	839				No explanation required.
Miccourt	. 020	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE			·	(110)	i to explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	WORKS	1,467	1,312	29	(126)	No explanation required.
rtoritabily	. 020	Tronuc	1,101	1,012		(120)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
		KINCHELOE AIR FORCE					Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Michigan	FUDS	BASE	13,041	14,880	282	2,121	methodology or model.
····g····	. 020	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY	,	,000			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS	RANGE	4,067	1,523	4,057	1.513	estimating methodology or model.
		KINGSBURY ORDNANCE	1,001	1,000	1,001	,,,,,,	January Manager Manager
Indiana	FUDS	PLANT	18,314	159	3	(18,152)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIELD	21	0	7	(14)	No explanation required.
		KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE					
Oregon	FUDS	ANNEX	7,159	3,695	1	(3,463)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	6,831	6,608	157	(66)	No explanation required.
		KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB					
New Mexico	FUDS	RGE	1,276	530	92	(654)	No explanation required.
							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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3	9,211	11,958	213	2,960	or model.
NI		KODI ED MANAL OURRING					
Northern	FUDO	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY	40.004	44 700		(4.000)	No contraction as well-ad
Mariana Islands		CENTER CODIAL NAVA/A DAV	12,821				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	57,348	53,542	1,641	(2,165)	No explanation required.
Florido	LIDE	LAKE BRYANT BOMB &	0.070	4.500	400	(F 200)	No evalenation required
Florida	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	6,970	1,500	168	(5,302)	No explanation required.
California	LIDE	LAKE CHABOT MACHINE	4-	_		_	No explanation required
California	FUDS	GUN RANGE	15	0	20	5	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

				FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Otato	Сотронон	motanation rame	macion (¢ooo)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	in case in (G)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANOE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	10,051	12,510	1,142		sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	265	77	28		No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	4,909	4,840			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	7,840				No explanation required.
	1 0 0		.,0.0		333		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	115	155	28	68	sampling).
Nobrooko	ELIDO	LINCOLNI AED AE EAC S 40	2.425	5.040	400		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,125	5,842	460		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
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	23,759	31,364	53		sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	13,226	12,526	37		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
NI - Is us - Is -	EUDO		0.405	0.040	400		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Nebraska Nebraska	FUDS FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7 LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	6,125 3,210		186 96		sampling). No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	3,968	1,929			No explanation required.
Nobiaska	1 000	ENTOCENTAL DAL LAGG-9	3,900	1,329	05		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	78	352	2		sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	35,113	35,329	1,202	1 //18	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 York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	7,221	3,712			No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	53				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	4,443				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	51100	1 0 D N 0 A F D 0 0 1 1 1 0 A V 1 1 0				(4-)	
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	53	17	19	(17)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	143	67	99	23	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	912	68	664	(180)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	4,048	5,136	80	1,168	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	85	62	353	330	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
		MAKALAPA CRATER					
		FORMER NAVY SALVAGE					
Hawaii	FUDS	YARD	5,540	4,471	219	(850)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE	8,566	5,150	56	(2.260)	No explanation required.
i iawaii	FUD3	IVANGE	8,500	5,150	30		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	4,585	5,038	178		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
M/a alain at an	ELIDO	MANIOLIEGTED ANNEY	0.500	0.047	050		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Washington North Carolina	FUDS FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	6,526 284	6,647 160			sampling). No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	WANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	204	160	47		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		MARIETTA AIR FORCE					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	FUDS	STATION	2,903	4,949	142		sampling).
01.	ELIDO.	MADION ENGINEED DEDOT	054	47.	40	(404)	
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	654	474	19	(161)	No explanation required.
Northern							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,574	46,644	213	42.283	estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	17,062	6,430			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	3,844				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
0 117	5,100	 MILL VALLEY 1 = 5					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	315	154	390	229	sampling).
Tannassaa	FUDS	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	88	154	352	/110	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	ניטט ון	INITELINGTON OND WORKS	00	154	332	410	esumating methodology of model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		•	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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	46,550	62,786	142		sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AF STATION	0	160	424	584	New Site.
New York	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AUX FLD #1	191	0	3	(199)	No explanation required.
INEW TOIK	1 003	MOORE AIRFORCE BASE	191	0	3	(100)	ino explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	(USDA SITE	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	12	12			No explanation required.
							1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
T	ELIDO	MOTI OW DANCE	0	0.704	4 005		(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE	0	2,791	4,695	7,486	needed, technology was ineffective). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	RANGE	32	15	17	0	No explanation required.
Camorna	. 020	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE					The explanation required.
California	FUDS	RANGE	2,244	309	929	(1,006)	No explanation required.
	_						
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	708	366	15	(327)	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	1,446	316	3,100		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	807	443			No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	3,155	1,808	44	(1,303)	No explanation required.
Northern							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,695	34,188	119	18 612	estimating methodology or model.
Waliana Islands	. 555	17.17.17.17.15.01.15.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.	10,090	J-1, 100	113	10,012	osamaang modiodology of modol.
Northern		NAFTAN ORDNANCE					
Mariana Islands	FUDS	DISPOSAL	10,774	4,359	134	(6,281)	No explanation required.
	ELIDO	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE	A . == .	00.0==		(F. FOC)	<u> </u>
Virginia	FUDS	DEPOT	34,734	28,373	771	(5,590)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	399	295	20	(84)	No explanation required.
เพลงงินงาเนอยเเอ	. 000	I W WALLOOKE I DOLL	399	233		(0+)	то охранацон годинов.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	139	0	34	(105)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,623				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	5,967	5,344	141	(482)	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
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	360	167	326	133	sampling).
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	10,277	7,251	388		No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	0	0	2	2	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	97	415	48	366	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	7,690	10,146	214	2,670	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	6,953	8,094	135	1,276	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) New Site.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	5,072	4,073	131	(868)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	5,741	2,386			No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	1,236		1,190		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).
O - life maile		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					-
California Massachusetts	FUDS FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	1,010	1,075	270		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).
		NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE					
Alaska Nebraska	FUDS	ISLAND) NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	5,625 243,847	<u>5,416</u> 253,419	4,282		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.
				253,419	, -		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
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC) NEW CUMBERLAND ARMY	1,321	2,730	53	1,462	sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	DEPOT	787	719	77	9	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	88	19	31	(38)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NEW YORK ORDNANCE WORKS	16,101	11,763	82	(4,256)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,370	969		(353)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	0	0	41	41	No explanation required.
		NIKE BA-30/31					
Maryland	FUDS	(TOLCHESTER)	2,093	125	75	(1,893)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,129	147	630	(1,352)	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
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	2,603	3,254	69	720	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
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,484	5,691	50	1,257	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
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,270	2,458	120	308	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
Illinois		NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	156		82	290	sampling).
Illinois		NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	3,039		56	193	New Site.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,964	1,298	247	(419)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	0	139	8	147	New Site.
		NIKE D-86 - WAYNE STATE					
Michigan	FUDS	UNIVERSITY	20	0	10	(10)	No explanation required.
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND					
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	219	27	50	(142)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			(4000)	(4000)	(+cc)	(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
Maine		NIKE LO-13	53				sampling).
New York		NIKE NF 03	159				No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE NY 09	190	0	4	(186)	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
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	63	29	104	70	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
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	139	635	237	733	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
D	FUDO	NIIVE DD 70	0.040	0.000	440	704	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	6,318	6,660	419	761	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
Alaska	FUDC	NUCE CITE DAY	4.544	0.040	200	4 204	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska		NIKE SITE LOVE	1,541	2,642			sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	489	129	211	(83)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	0.500	0.605	0.5	400	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois Maryland		NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	2,538 1,212				No explanation required.
iviai yiai lu	ניטט ון	ININE VV-44 (VVALDORF)	1,212	000	54	(296)	ino expianation required.

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	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
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	54	97			sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	3,163	1,306	291		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
		NODTHEACTERN					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Now Vork	LIDO	NORTHEASTERN	0.500	4.000	0.45		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,530	4,088	245		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,
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	709	1,405	7		delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAT ACS	709	1,405	'		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	888	1,623	8		estimating methodology or model.
riadita	1 000	NORTHWAT CHACING LED	000	1,023		740	estimating methodology of model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	633	104	168	(361)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	10,147	6,347	1,657		No explanation required.
		OAKLAND MUNICIPAL	,	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	AIRPORT	64	36	55		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
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	811	3,958	72		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
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	128	237	32	141	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	In at all attack Name	Adjusted for	Estimate	_	Change	B(-)
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
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	9,882	12,508	1,566	4 102	sampling).
iowa	1 003	OITOTTALBALTAC 3-3	9,002	12,500	1,500	4,132	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk 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	OGLIUGA ISL	8,447	8,540	18	111	sampling).
			- ,	-,-	_		1 0/
							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
		OLATHE NAVAL AIR					sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Kansas	FUDS	STATION	617	976	157	516	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Daniel de la contra	ELIDO	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET	4.050	4 000	00	(04.4)	No soules of a service d
Pennsylvania	FUDS FUDS	ANNEX) ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	1,659 37				No explanation required.
California	FUD5	ONTARIO ARMT AIRFIELD	31	0	21	(10)	No explanation required. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,345	2,748	109	512	estimating methodology or model.
Tiorida	1 000	OROVILLE PRECISION	2,040	2,740	103	312	lestimating methodology of model.
California	FUDS	BOMBING RANGE	76	0	39	(37)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	OWOSSO NGTR	20				No explanation required.
<u> </u>	1			Ť		(0)	· '
		OYSTER POINT STORAGE					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Virginia	FUDS	AREA	958	3,532			feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	7,964	4,099	83	(3,782)	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
Niana Ianaan	FUDO	DALEDNA COMMULEAC	242	4 000	_	700	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	FUDS FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC PALI TRAINING CAMP	910 35,508				sampling).
Hawaii	LOD2	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT	35,508	11,988	58	(23,462)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	(TX TECH)	97	80	4	(13)	No explanation required.
ισλαδ	טטט ון	(IA ILOII)	91	00	1 4	(13)	ino explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	ineason(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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	1,134	16,124	322	15 312	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Camornia	1 0 0 0	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-	1,104	10,124	022	10,012	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	GROUND GUN	723	1,468	23	768	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	65	75	23	33	estimating methodology or model.
		PETALUMA BOMBING				(= 400)	
California	FUDS	TARGET PINE RIDGE GUNNERY	5,627	46	143	(5,438)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	RANGE	4,292	2,844	71	(1 377)	No explanation required.
New York		PLATTSBURG OTR MK AUX	96		100		No explanation required.
rion ron							- Companient Toganion
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-10	886	13	45	(828)	No explanation required.
Na Vaul	ELIDO	DI ATTODIDOLI ATI AC C 44	2.002	4.4	40	(0.000)	No combraction required
New York New York		PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-11 PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-4	3,093 46		46 20		No explanation required. No explanation required.
New York		PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-5	187	13	46		No explanation required.
New York		PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-6	210		2		No explanation required.
New York		PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-8	46				No explanation required.
New York		PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-9	2,846	14	45		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
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	13,950	6,937	7,062	49	sampling).
			,	2,23.	.,:32	. 3	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered 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 Varie	LIDE	PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL	44.570	47744		2.007	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	RESEARCH CENTER	14,576	17,741	62	3,227	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		Estimate	FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	29,382	19,785	71	(9,526)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	1,372	2,380	27	1,035	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	27,516	29,409	40	1,933	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.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	1,397	2,277	257		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORCUPINE RIVER DEW STAGING CAMP	5,782	5,745			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	3,783	3,004	67	(712)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	17,529	8,835			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	109	303			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	112	72			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	6,242	6,191	72		No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	223		55		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property 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
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,687	53,330	681	33,324	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component		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
NA: - la :	FUDO		0.040	4.070	000	0.500	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan Puerto Rico		RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	2,348 7,504	4,279 6,462	668 41		sampling). No explanation required.
Fuerto Rico	F0D3	RAIVIET AIR FORCE BASE	7,304	0,402	41	(1,001)	INO 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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
							technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
New Jersey		RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,000	11,709	811	1,520	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	RED BLUFF AIR FORCE STATION	80	0	110	20	No explanation required.
California		RIALTO AMMUNITION	80	U	110	30	Ino explanation required.
California	FUDS	STORAGE POIT	5	0	9	4	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 –
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	439	307	196	64	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio		ROSSFORD AD	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
Now Verl	FUDC	DOTTEDDAM INDUCT DADY	70	4 400		4.07.4	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York Arizona	FUDS FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK SAHUARITA AFR	79 26,938				sampling). No explanation required.
AHZUHA	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE	20,938	20,413	160	(0,305)	ino expianation required.
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	412	53	51	(308)	No explanation required.
	1	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE	112	30	31	(000)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	68	61	59	52	estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State			Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	85	82	51	48	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).
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,387	7,399	327	2,339	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		SANFORD AIRPORT	2,457	1,586			No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	4,178	1,410	712	(2,056)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	11	6	2	(3)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	1,381	1,564	30	213	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas Kansas	FUDS FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03 SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	350 2,682				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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	5,251	4,791	245	(215)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,790				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	3,217	1,879	58	(1,280)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	81	0	10	(71)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	7,051	0	41	(7,010)	No explanation required.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
Otato	Component	mistanation Hame	Ππατιστί (φοσο)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	3,167	3,676	89	598	estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	4,566		218		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	63			\ ' '	No explanation required.
		SHUMAKER NAVAL AMMO				(- /	
Arkansas	FUDS	DEPOT	10	16	1	7	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
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	28,543	32,472	43	3,972	sampling).
		SOUTHWESTERN PROV					
Arkansas	FUDS	GROUNDS	99,369	14,561	74	(84,734)	No explanation required.
		SPENCER ARTILLERY					
Tennessee	FUDS	RANGE	15,357	6,965	127	(8,265)	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
D							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
District of							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	33,669	34,143	13,860	14,334	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
\	EUDO	CT ALDANG AEC 7.44	0.044	450	0.400		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	2,811	153	3,132	4/4	sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK CENERAL HOSE	043	1,265	12	264	lestimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP STEWART AFB	913 9,259				No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	2,086				
Nalisas	LODO	ISTUDITIEK FIELD	∠,∪86	1,102	00	(818)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		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 –
	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,315				Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AFS MCC-10	145	0	3	(142)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	25,562	40,936	618	15,992	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Northern	ELIDO	TANABAO EUEL EADM	570	004	077	(40)	No combanation required
Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	578 7,727	261 345	277		No explanation required.
Alaska Massachusetts		TIGALDA ISLAND TISBURY GREAT POND	1,727				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).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	17,554	16,443	138	(973)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	484	315	59	(110)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	520	618	25	123	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	61	54	15	8	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

						Cost Estimate	
	DoD					Change	
State		Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
0.0000			(vece)	(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 – 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
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,704	15,604	1,857	3,757	methodology or model.
	E	TYSON VALLEY POWDER	40 =00	40.000		(070)	
Missouri	FUDS	FARM	18,530	18,052	202	(276)	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
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	18,000	18,709	164		sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	237,376				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	9,366				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALGA ISL NAV RADIO	16,477	14,506			No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	108	102	6	0	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	US NAV SUP DEPOT	1,790	0	4	(1,786)	No explanation required.
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
New York	FUDS	US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN	674	697	69	92	needed, technology was ineffective).
		l	_				Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	8	101	18	111	estimating methodology or model.
American	ELIDO	\\A D TQ\\\ AQE		0.47	40	400	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	266	347	48	129	estimating methodology or model.
Missississi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	65 650	13,125	389	(EO 44E)	No evalenation required
Mississippi	FUD5	CAIVIP	65,659	13,125	369	(52,145)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	14,378	12,421	13	(1 0///)	No explanation required.
California	1 000	VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR	14,376	14,441	13	(1,344)	ino explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	STATION	53	0	21	(32)	No explanation required.
	. 525	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY	- 55			(32)	
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	259	61	38	(160)	No explanation required.

				FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD			Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		VIRGINIA ORDNANCE					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Virginia	FUDS	WORKS	29	14,966	26	14 963	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	4,979	3,451	268		No explanation required.
		WAIKOLOA MANEUVER	.,0.0	5,101		(1,=00)	
Hawaii	FUDS	AREA	858,105	629,737	10,842	(217,526)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,859	7,031	93		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
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	26,157	26,304	1,077	4 004	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	WATERTOWN AF STA 249	26,157 75	26,304			No explanation required.
INEW TOIK	1 003	WATERTOWN AT STA 249	73	U		(13)	ino explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,960	759	19	(3.182)	No explanation required.
		WAUGOSHANCE POINT	-,			(2) 2)	
Michigan	FUDS	TARGET	2,358	1,546	136	(676)	No explanation required.
_							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 – Change in cost estimating methodology
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,706				or model.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	1,149	800	44	(305)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WELLSBACH PLT NOBS 258	20	17	5	2	No explanation required.
New Jersey	1 000	WEST VIRGINIA ORD	20	17			ino explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WORKS	69,162	62,893	1,791	(4.478)	No explanation required.
- I see I mg			00,102	02,000	.,	(.,)	
		WESTERN REMOUNT AREA					
California	FUDS	& RECEPTION CENTER	25	0	5	(20)	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
Managahuasus	ELIDO	WESTOVED AED	4 400	7.404	1 ,	F 700	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,486	7,101	151	5,766	sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
		WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS			,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Missouri Alaska	FUDS FUDS	TRANSMITTER SITE WILDWOOD AFS	1,516 2,609		36 55		sampling). No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,151	1,614			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		WITHLACOOCHEE CWS					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida New Jersey	FUDS FUDS	SITE WOODBINE AIRPORT	654 184				estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	33,171	46,309	96	13,234	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).
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	7.504	9.482	1.982	3.960	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 – Regulation Change – A broadscale 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 – 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.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	7,504	9,482	1,982	3,960	

			Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		.,	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
		YELLOW JACKET TARGET					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Utah	FUDS	AREA	22,962	23,583	877	1,498	sampling).
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	5	0	31	26	No explanation required.
		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE					
Pennsylvania	FUDS	PLANT	428	264	53	(111)	No explanation required.
		YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	2,504	2,638	28	162	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

FY 2017 DEP ARC

Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2017 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2016.

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.

			FY 2016 Cost	_	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	Pagagar(a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	18,419	21,427	405	3.413		added to project scope).
riabama	, unity	7 WWW. CONT. WWW. BELOT	10,110	21,127	100	0,110	1070	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
		ARMY RESEARCH						regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
		LABORATORY-						that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document
Massachusetts	Army	WATERTOWN	560	984	245	669		review or approval).
	•							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		AVIATION SUPPLY						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Florida	Army	FACILITY, 49-A	0	197	8	205	N/A	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		BLUE GRASS ARMY						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Kentucky	Army	DEPOT	1,072	1,169	176	273	25%	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
T		CAMP DADKELEY		0.050	4.5	0.074	N1/A	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	0	2,856	15	2,871	N/A	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	12,445	12,259	7,980	7,794		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
wasnington	Allily	CAMP BONNEVILLE	12,445	12,259	7,960	7,794	03%	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
		CLACKAMAS/CAMP						to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Oregon	Army	WITHYCOMBE	35	317	62	344		methodology or model.
	<u> </u>	COLD REGIONS		_				,
		RESEARCH AND						
		ENGINEERING						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Hampshire	Army	LABORATORY	6,635	13,047	1,634	8,046	121%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		COOSA RIVER STORAGE						
Alabama	Army	ANNEX	0	480	1,474	1,954	N/A	New Site.
		DEFENDE DESCT						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
_		DEFENSE DEPOT	0.044	7 400	4 004	4 000		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Tennessee	Army	MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,211	7,496	1,801	1,086	13%	added to project scope). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE						project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
California	Army	FACILITY	45,597	48.666	2,076	5,145		added to project scope).
Calliullia	Ailly	I ACILII I	40,597	40,000	2,076	5,145	1170	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	Armv	FORT BLISS	35,088	37,002	1.691	3.605		added to project scope).
· chao	,y	I CITI DEIGO	35,000	07,002	1,001	0,000	1070	addod to project coopej.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 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)
								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
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	6,195	9,947	104	3,856	62%	changes in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,355	11,354	211	5,210	82%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Draiget Coope Added alconus phages as the project
								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
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	11,389	18,736	3,176	10,523		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	<u> </u>		,	,	,	,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	4,308	5,585	2,173	3,450		added to project scope).
	•							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		FORT INDIANTOWN GAP						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Pennsylvania	Army	TRAINING SITE	279	1,154	37	912	327%	added to project scope).
								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
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	6,148	12,476	3,343	9,671	157%	methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Kanaas	A	FORT LEAVENING DELL	4 400	0.000	005	4 000		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,188	2,086	395	1,293	109%	added to project scope).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
State	Component	mistaliation Name	initiation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	438	403	1,297	1,262		added to project scope).
Virginia	7 (IIII)	I OKT LLL	+30	+00	1,207	1,202	20070	added to project scope).
								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
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	9.740	9,656	2.010	1,926		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
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,035	4,551	119	3,635	351%	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 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
0	Δ	FORT MODULED COM	4 400	4 440	454	404	400/	prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,400	1,410	154	164	12%	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
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	9,564	11,899	1,471	3,806		risk, additional sampling).
· ii gii iid	, willy	I SKI MOITIOL	3,304	11,000	1,771	5,550	+570	non, additional barripring).

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate 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 scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	6,365	6,889	400	924	15%	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 future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,973	26,062	2,664	15,753	121%	needed, technology was ineffective).
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	10,105	11,697	321	1,913	19%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	10	7,059	9	7,058	69399%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	66,019	75,685	7,511	17,177	26%	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.
INEW IVIEXICO	Allily	ACTIVIT	00,019	75,085	1,311	17,177	20%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,867	1,857	492	482	26%	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	10,415	12,502	81	2,168	21%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
	,		\			, ,	,	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Iowa	Army	PLANT	46,742	64,146	1,161	18,565	40%	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). 2) Standards or
								Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
		JEFFERSON PROVING						policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Indiana	Army	GROUND	3,669	14,275	1,572	12,178	332%	
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	14	3,293	3	3,282	23049%	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	3,359	3,361	6,720	N/A	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
l		l	_					progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	0	6	94	100	N/A	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Minhimon	Δ	IELIO MI ADNIO			0.4	0.7	N1/A	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	0	3	94	97	N/A	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
North Dolcoto	Δ	IELIO ND ADNO		074	400	400	NI/A	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
North Dakota	Army	JFHQ ND ARNG	0	271	138	409	N/A	added to project scope). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
New York	Λ προς τ	JFHQ NY ARNG		40	188	237	NI/A	added to project scope).
New fork	Army	JERQ INT ARING	0	49	100	231	IN/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	93	1,402	49	1,358	1/68%	added to project scope).
VEIIIIOIIL	Ailly	OFFIG VEARING	93	1,402	49	1,336	1400%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	0	6	159	165	ΝΙ/Δ	added to project scope).
vv yonning	I, MILLY	OTTIC WITHING			139	100	IN/A	μασσα το ρτομού σουρομ.

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Olulo	Component	motunation name	mination (¢000)	(ψοσο)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(i crocinage)	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
		IOINT DAGE LEVAGO						risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change
\\/ h : +	Δ	JOINT BASE LEWIS-	44.744	50.050	4 000	45.400	0.40/	Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Washington	Army	MCCHORD	44,714	58,050	1,826	15,162	34%	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
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	21,115	24,582	1,285	4,752	23%	risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Hawaii	Army	SITE	0	524	122	646	N/A	added to project scope).
								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
		LOUISIANA ARMY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,387	2,449	475	537		risk, additional sampling).
	ĺ		,					. <u> </u>
								New Site. 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 –
		MANGUA MUUTA SV						Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
"		MAKUA MILITARY			2 522	0.400		the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	760	641	3,539	3,420	450%	by changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	3,479	239	3,718		added to project scope).
niavailla	I-VIIIII	INICIDILL CINIC 20 & 28	1 0	3,479	239	3,110	IN/A	αίασα το ριοjσεί δουρσ <i>ί.</i>

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
	-							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,623	7,261	301	3,939	109%	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Utah	Army	WEST FED	287	296	117	126	44%	added to project scope).
							40-04	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,915	7,816	770	5,671	195%	Change in contract or contract method.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
		NATIONAL TRAINING						added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
California	Λ ννου τ		10.750	44207	1 015	1 500		methodology or model.
California	Army	CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	13,750	14,327	1,015	1,592	12%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		PARKS RESERVE FORCES						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
California	Army	TRAINING AREA	285	6,620	90	6,425		added to project scope).
Camorna	Alliy	TRAINING AREA	200	0,020	30	0,423	223070	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
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	24,015	77,935	601	54,521		methodology or model.
,			,			,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,501	1,450	744	693	46%	added to project scope).
	•							475 : 10
								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) 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
		PUEBLO CHEMICAL						work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
Colorado	Army	DEPOT	208,340	201,132	30,532	23,324		may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	, willy	DE: 01	200,040	201,102	50,552	20,024	1170	may also be eaded by changes in schedule.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	_	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Percental
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 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
		RAVENNA ARMY						Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Ohio	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	18,149	21,401	4,636	7,888	43%	to Change in Scope – Change in 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
California		RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	7 570	10.000	88	40.005	1640/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	AMINION PLANT	7,572	19,869	00	12,385	104%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,256	2,251	279	274	120/	the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Airiy	DEI OI	2,230	2,201	213	214	1270	by changes in scriedale.
								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 – Actual contract cost for prior or
Howeii	A rm) (SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	18,414	30,323	550	12,459	690/	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	10,414	30,323	330	12,409	08%	adultional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		ST LOUIS ORDNANCE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Missouri	Army	PLANT	1,054	4,386	53	3,385	321%	to Change in Scope - Change in 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
Massachusatta		SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	985	1.209	15	239	240/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Massachusetts	AIIIIy	AININEA	985	1,∠09	15	239	24%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

	ge) Reason(s) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
State Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000)	
State Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000)	
	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Pennsylvania	22% added to project scope).
	,= /, uaucu to p.o.) out occups).
	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
Utah Army TOOELE ARMY DEPOT 35,043 48,258 3,327 16,542	17% additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Utah Army SOUTH 2,354 64,769 2,636 65,051 27	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
USARC KINGS MILLS	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Ohio Army (AMSA 59) 142 4,253 146 4,257 29	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 reuse, site reopened to
	address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost
	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska Navy ADAK NAS 78,801 100,986 4,559 26,744	34% cost estimating methodology or model.
	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Guam Navy AGANA NAS 5,482 6,045 319 882	6% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	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) 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 additional cost may also be caused
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	46,071	58,566	15,275	27,770	60%	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
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,939	12,670	1,790	1,521	12%	by changes in schedule. 1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
District of Columbia	Nova	ANACOSTIA NS	2,672	3,913	271	1,512	E79/	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.
Columbia	Navy		2,072	3,913	271	1,512	57%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	617	672	305	360	E00/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	79,171	99,648	2,759			New Site.
gom	,,,,,,		13,171	33,040	2,733	23,230		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	116	2,044	129	2,057		address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	51,601	49,246	8,761	6,406	12%	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).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	15,114	19,628	989	5,503		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).
Maryland	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,592	4,042	419	1,869		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.
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	120	120	118	118		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN						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
Arizona	Navy	AGR	9,804	9,147	2,053	1,396		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 – 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
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	20,751	30,202	2,056	11,507	55%	included in the CTC. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NWIRP	2,229	2,435	99	305	14%	change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	-	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	46,623	52,118	1,511	7,006	15%	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	INAVY	EL TORO MICAS	40,023	32,110	1,511	7,000	1370	
								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
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	27,558	29,804	1,305	3,551	120/	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 –
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	32,131	37,292	1,400	6,561	20%	Change in contract or contract method.
								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). 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) New Site. 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
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	7,578	8,235	1,270	1,927	25%	by changes in schedule.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway 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	57,785	70,694	1,897	14,806	26%	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
		GUAMI						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Guam	Navy	COMNAVMARIANAS	2,352	3,606	326	1,580	67%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
Mississinni	Nova	GULFPORT NCBC	19,027	19,223	3,990	4,186	220/	technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Mississippi	Navy	GOLFFORT NOBC	19,021	19,223	3,990	4,100	22 /0	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
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,907	13,487	1,895	1,475	11%	changes in schedule.
			. 5,007	. 5, . 67	.,555	.,	7170	
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway 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 –
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	10,168	11,446	1,770	3,048	30%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	1		. 5, 700	, . 10	.,	5,5.0	2370	<u> </u>

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
0.11				0.40				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
California Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	1,831	942 2,546				address additional risk, additional 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 schedule.
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,241	65,413	8,954			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 – Change in contract or contract method. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in 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	MAYPORT NS	14,557	19.636	404	5,483	38%	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) New Site.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$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, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed,
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,867	8,755	1,962	3,850	56%	technology was ineffective). 3) 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
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	583	584	400	401	69%	by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	116	764	11	659	568%	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.
Virginia		NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	19,476					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.
Virginia		NORFOLK NSY	10.010		517	2,498	25%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	79,375	80,596	11,964	13,185	17%	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) 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.
								1) 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). 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 – 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) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	77,731	89,113	2,654	14,036	18%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,588	16,864	737	13,013	284%	methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
	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 intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	333	320	550	537	162%	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 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
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	6,179	6,580	917	1,318	21%	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) 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
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	29,778	31,507	3,081	4,810		changes in schedule.
								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
		PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC						that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document
Washington	Navy	DIV DET	2,977	3,330	81	434	15%	review or approval).
								4) Nov. Cita 2) Coat Fatimata Channa Haralatad ta Channa
Maina	Nova	DODTEMOLITH NEV	E 400	4 056	1 507	044	170/	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scane. Change in cost actimating methodology or model
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,439	4,856	1,527	944	17%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-
								scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple
		PUGET SOUND FISC					1	sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or
Washington	Navy	MANCHESTER	1,455	1,953	31	529	36%	Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
vvasinigion	inavy	IVI AND ILOTEIX	1,400	1,933	31	529	30%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
		PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP						the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Washington	Navy	BREMERTON	1,646	3.024	93	1,471	80%	by changes in schedule.
doi in gion	1. 144 y	DITEMENTON	1,040	0,024	<u> </u>	1,71	0070	Dy shangoo in concadio.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,268	1,990	218	940	74%	1) 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). 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 also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	6,618	6,894	616	892	13%	1) 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). 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.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,503	2,783	1,536	2,816		address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	2,527	1,344	1,530	347		the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		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
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	42,129	45,776	1,655	5,302	13%	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) Standards or Regulations –
								DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive
								that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost
L	L.							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	26,204	27,995	16,815	18,606	71%	cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Novar	TREASURE ISLAND NS	222 224	106 057	40 201	22 907	110/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Calliornia	Navy	HUNTERS PT ANNEX	222,331	196,857	49,281	23,807	11%	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 caused
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,092	22,110	1,280	3,298		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) Standards or Regulations –
								Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a
								result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		VIEQUES PUERTO RICO						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project
Puerto Rico	Navy	NASD	5,873	7,419	200	1,746	30%	scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
			·					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
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	43,055	46,361	2,356	5,662	13%	by changes in schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	71,307	78,981	12,422	20,096		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.
Florida		WHITING FIELD NAS	20,906					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) 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,143	57,753	12,078	19,688		by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	16,602	26,562	869	10,829		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	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
	D-D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
				(Accept	(4000)		(V ocomagy)	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
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	36,065	40,959	2,803	7,697	21%	vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	891	888	710	707	79%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		ADMOLD	00.070	440.004	0.750	00.400	900	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
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	83,973		3,750			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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	6,677	7,253	149	725	11%	methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
0.0.10			((((((((((((((((((((4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i or contage)	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		BADLANDS BOMBING						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
South Dakota	Air Force	RANGE	4,130	4,699	187	756	18%	added to project scope).
		BARNES MUNICIPAL	·					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Massachusetts		AIRPORT	107	336	8	237	222%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		BEAR CREEK RADIO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	1,008	1,101	9	102	10%	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
Alabama		BIRMINGHAM	1,940	4,125	39	2,224	115%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		BLUE ASH AIR GUARD						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Ohio	Air Force	STATION	6,407	8,190	155	1,938	30%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	494	565	12	83	17%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	51,277	58,964	4,269	11,956	23%	1) New Site. 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.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	231	1,998	443	2,210		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		BULLEN POINT	862	10,496				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			((C C C)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(creening cy	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
		BURLINGTON						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional
Vermont	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	10,535	21,587	629	11,681	111%	risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	l	CALUMET AIR FORCE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Michigan	Air Force	STATION	473	5,800	175	5,502	1163%	added to project scope).
Classista.	Λ: ₋ Γ	CAMP BLANDING MIL	744	0.040	00	4 404	4.000/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION CAMP MURRAY AIR	741	2,049	93	1,401	189%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Washington	Air Force	GUARD STATION	1,068	1,812	30	774	72%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
vvasinigton	All I OICE	CAMPION AIR FORCE	1,000	1,012	30	774	12/0	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	14,750	21,316	178	6,744	46%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
<i>7</i>	7 1 0.00		,	2.,0.0		0,	.070	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
New Mexico	Λ:π Γ οποο	CANINIONI	24 554	20 204	0.444	0.044		Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
inew iviexico	Air Force	CANNON	31,551	38,384	2,111	8,944	28%	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) Technology – Change to a
								different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored
l	l	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG						natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	14,639	33,420	539	19,320	132%	needed, technology was ineffective).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	_	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
	l							by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,101	1,162	348	409	37%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS	40.000			4.040	2001	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
North Carolina	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	16,376	21,190	102	4,916	30%	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
		CLEAR AIR FORCE						address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost
Alaska		CLEAR AIR FORCE	7 40 4	0.075	254	0.000	240/	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	7,424	9,375	351	2,302	31%	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
		COLD BAY LONG RANGE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	2,743	3,608	62	927	34%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
riasia	711110100	TO TO THE	2,140	3,000	02	321	J+70	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
		DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	FORCE BASE	7,761	11,455	418	4,112	53%	estimating methodology or model.
			,,,,,	11,100		.,		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
		DOTHAN REGIONAL						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alabama	Air Force	AIRPORT	246	947	76	777	316%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								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).
		DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO						2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	8,052	9,666	392	2,006	25%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	•	•			•			

			Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
Do	-		Adjusted for			Change	Change	December 1
State Co	omponent	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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
Minnocoto		DULUTH INTERNATIONAL	4.067	11 000	050	6 200	1200/	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Minnesota Air	r Force	AIRPORT	4,967	11,089	258	6,380	128%	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
Arkansas Air	r Force	EAKER	6,433	7,355	113	1,035	16%	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alkalisas Ali	i i oice	LANLIX	0,433	7,555	113	1,033	1078	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 reuse, site reopened to
								address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska Air	r Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	416,287	614,589	17,765	216,067	52%	Change in 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 scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
								to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
South Dakota Air		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	31,729	33,171	1,996	3,438	110/	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Barota Air	1 1 OICE	BAGE	31,723	33,171	1,990	3,430	1170	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
								to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
								methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
		FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE						to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Washington Air		BASE	68,814	84,472	3,765	19,423	28%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

				_	_	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	_		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
State	Component	IIIStaliation Name	iiiiiatioii (\$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 property reuse, site reopened to
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	158	200	5	47		address additional risk, additional sampling).
							5575	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	682	1,101	108	527	77%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska		GALENA GEN B MITCHELL	228,800 9,947	258,341	1,324			1) 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). 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. 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.
vvisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	9,947	12,317	296	2,666	27%	methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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 – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the
								prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	4,993	6,369	113	1,489	30%	changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Arizona		GOLDWATER RANGE	1,794	3,078	4,043	5,327	297%	added to project scope).
		GULFPORT BILOXI						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mississippi	Air Force	REGIONAL AIRPORT	157	659	69	571	365%	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 sampling). 2) Cost
	l						,	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	2,092	3,051	240	1,199	5/%	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
Magagah	Air Force	HANGCOM	05.000	25 400	0.000	11.005	470/	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	25,693	35,429	2,229	11,965	4/%	contract or contract method. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	3,676	6,482	38	2,844	770/	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Dakota	All Force	ILECTOR IAL	3,076	0,482	38	2,044	11%	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	_	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) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 –
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	36.489	32,844	9.100	5,455	15%	Change in 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 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
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	27,201	38,067	1,924	12,790	47%	methodology or model.
		HULMAN REGIONAL				6.05-		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
Indiana	Air Force	AIRPORT	6,257	9,088	124	2,955	47%	methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			, ,	. ,	V . /	, ,	Ì	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
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,092	10,962	1,404	1,274	11%	estimating methodology or model.
		JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mississippi	Air Force	THOMPSON)	293	2,461	132	2,300	785%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	10,112	15,988	332	6,208	61%	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, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate
Mamdand	A : =	ID ANDDEWC	404.045	405.050	0.000	44.000	400/	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	124,945	135,952	3,362	14,369	12%	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) 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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	187,515	256,419	5,073	73,977	39%	methodology or model.
	7 1 0100	1	107,010	200,110	0,070	. 5,577	3370	

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	•			_		Reason(s)
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 – 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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	42,390	67,345	4,366	29,321		methodology or model.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	28,095	28,438	3,300	3,643		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.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,834	5,282	335	1,783		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	3,411	4,977	89			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	6,029	10,346	124	4,441		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.
		JEFFERSON BARRACKS	,					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri	Air Force	AIR GUARD STATION	5,118	5,992	62	936	18%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,258	13,879	280	4,901	53%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_	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) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g.,
								newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	6,095	9,095	278	3,278	54%	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 – Change in
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	4,988	6,453	270	1,735	35%	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
T	A : F	KELLY	70.450	404 400	074	00.404	000/	Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	79,159	101,469	871	23,181	29%	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 – Change in cost estimating
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	110,233	137,306	7,794	34,867	32%	methodology or model.
		LAMBERT ST. LOUIS	, 200	,	.,	0 .,001	3270	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	17,548	20,027	217	2,696	15%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost	_	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
	1			, ,	· /	, ,	ì	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
		MAKAH AIR FORGE						added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Machinatan	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	631	3,887	210	3,466		to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	All Force	STATION	031	3,007	210	3,400	550%	methodology of model.
								1) New Site. 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 contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE						the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Montana	Air Force	BASE	25,077	31,815	1,851	8,589	34%	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
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	993	2,124	154	1,285		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 scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Mamdand	A : E	MARTIN CTATE AIRPORT	0.050	5.050	00	0.500		to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	2,853	5,353	93	2,593	91%	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
California	Air Force	MATHER	105,464	120,988	3,411	18,935	18%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		l						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
14	A : E	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE	000	707	400	004		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Kansas	Air Force	BASE TITAN SITES	669	727	163	221	33%	added to project scope). 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
	1							Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	652	1,520	32	900	138%	cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	2 202	E 620	104	2.452	7/10/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	INON I GOWER I ANGS	3,303	5,632	124	2,453	74%	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.

			FY 2016 Cost	_	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	14,312	12,499	3,941	2,128		methodology or model.
Georgia	All Folce	WOODT AIR FORCE BASE	14,312	12,499	3,941	2,120	15/6	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)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than
		MOUNTAIN HOME AIR						the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Idaho	Air Force	FORCE BASE	5,071	44,101	2,029	41,059	810%	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) Cost
. .	. –	MUDDUNA DOME	0.005	- 0	074	0.000		Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	2,965	5,257	974	3,266	110%	cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Λ:π Γ οποο	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	001	1 100		140	450/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL	991	1,129	11	149		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	CAMP II	12,091	13,380	162	1,451		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	All I OICE	CAWFII	12,091	13,300	102	1,401	12/0	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 sampling). 2) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	5,069	7,115	275	2,321	46%	contract or contract method.
	•		•	•	•			

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
.	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	6,010	6,788	423	1,201		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 – Change in cost estimating
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,060	5,736	108	784	16%	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
		NORTH RIVER RADIO						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	6,019	8,819	1,813	4,613	77%	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
	۸. =	NORTON	0.005	40.074	000	4 700		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Air Force	NORTON	8,965	10,371	382	1,788	20%	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 additional cost may also be caused by
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	97,384	113,475	26,042	42,133	43%	changes in schedule.

State Component Installation Name Estimate Cost Estimate (\$000) (y discovered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
1) Project Scope – Added require level project change (e.g., newly increased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional	y discovered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
level project change (e.g., newly increased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional	y discovered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
increased physical dimensions o pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional	of the cleanup, additional risk n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional	n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional	erty reuse, site reopened to
address additional risk, additional	
PEASE ANG NEW Estimate Change Unrelated to C	
New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 3,540 4,889 99 1,448 41% cost estimating methodology or n	
PETERSON AIR FORCE Cost Estimate Change Unrelated	
Colorado Air Force BASE 14 36 36 58 406% Change in cost estimating method	
POINT ARENA AIR FORCE Cost Estimate Change Unrelated	
California Air Force STATION 3,310 3,630 30 350 11% Change in cost estimating method	odology or model.
1) Project Scope – Added require level project change (e.g., newly increased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional – Change to a different or improve	y discovered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk in (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to all sampling). 2) Technology oved cleanup technology (e.g.,
PORT HEIDEN RADIO monitored natural attenuation did	
Alaska Air Force RELAY STATION 15,278 33,816 6,032 24,570 161% remediation is needed, technology	
Oregon Air Force PORTLAND 1,975 6,512 40 4,577 232% Change in cost estimating method	
Cost Estimate Change Unrelated	
Rhode Island	
Missouri Air Force RICHARDS-GEBAUR 1) Project Scope – Added require level project change (e.g., newly increased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper address additional risk, additional risk, additional risk, additional estimate Change Unrelated to C cost estimating methodology or not project change (e.g., newly disconsincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper intrusion by DoD).	y discovered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk in (that is required and initiated enty reuse, site reopened to all sampling). 2) Cost Change in Scope – Change in model. ments due to other site-level overed contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk in (that is required and initiated)
Virginia Air Force FIELD 1,905 3,750 663 2,508 132% address additional risk, additional	

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		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
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	67,543	86,203	1,065	19,725	29%	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 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.
NI a Ma ala	A : -	DOME DECEMBOLI OITE	00.004	44.000	4 554	40.400	000/	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	33,991	44,609	1,551	12,169	36%	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
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	319	1,225	78	984		address additional risk, additional sampling).
IVIISSOUIT	All I Oice	ROSECIANS WEW	319	1,223	70	304	30076	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,129	1,907	131	909	910/	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
INEW TOIK	All Foice	SCHENECTADI CO	1,129	1,907	131	909	01/0	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 sampling). 2) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	21,130	24,949	1,204	5,023	24%	cost estimating methodology or model.
morngan	7 1 0100	022.1002	21,100	21,040	1,204	0,020	2-70	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	7,597	8,478	81	962	13%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
. 0,140	1 0100	SOUTH PORTLAND	7,557	5, 170	31	002	1370	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Maine	Air Force	FACILITY	541	620	92	171	32%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	1 0100	<u> </u>	1 341	020	JZ		02/0	The state of the s

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	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 sampling). 2) Cost
		SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY						Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Ohio	Air Force	MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,358	2,864	255	761	32%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-
		TED STEVENS						scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple
Alaaka	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4.500	10 202	116	44.050		sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or
Alaska	All Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,569	19,303	116	14,850	325%	Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
								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 – 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	56,500	66,542	1,728	11,770	21%	by changes in schedule.
		TUCSON INTERNATIONAL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arizona	Air Force	AIRPORT	2,766	3,416	304	954		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	578	629	31	82	14%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2017 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name			(\$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 site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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. 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	8,256	9,339	1,799	2,882	35%	by changes in schedule.
		VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD						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
Wisconsin	Air Force	BASE	7,170		106	2,554		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 reuse, site reopened to
		WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	4,952 6.075	5,648 5,313	1,394	1,076		address additional risk, additional 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 schedule.
		WILLOW GROVE ANG	5,485		7,971	42,920		Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broadscale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			The state of the s	(4000)	(+000)	(4000)	(* ***********************************	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.
	1	l						This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	104,563	133,923	8,617	37,977	36%	schedule.
\\\+ \\\::-:-	A:	VEACED AND	000	4 0 4 0	00	4 400	4.400/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	802	1,848	93	1,139	142%	Change in cost estimating 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 requirement imposed by the regulator
								that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,619	1,849	2,125	2,355		review or approval).
			.,0.0	1,010		_,000	1.070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	DLA	FACILITY	9,881	11,236	1,268	2,623	27%	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 reuse, site reopened to
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,775	9,776	338	3,339		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iviairie	1 003	I GAT	0,773	9,770	330	3,339	43 /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
		AF RADAR TRACKING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Maine	FUDS	STATION	4,232	5,144	2,196	3,108		address additional risk, additional sampling).
		AIR FORCE PLANT 15						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	(NAA)	42	64	20	42	101%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	231	2	193	487%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	654	1,260	70	676		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
**1000110111	1 020	CITTION	001	1,200	,,	070	10070	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	27,875	35,250	382	7,757		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). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	2,997	3,638	38	679		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.
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	156	199	677	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).
<u> </u>	. 020	BAYWOOD PARK			0		.0070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	TRAINING AREA	661	2,448	262	2,049	310%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	42	97	41	96		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	420		38			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).
Virgin Islands								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	2,133	3,479	51	1,397	66%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Passon(s)
State	Component	installation Name	imation (\$000)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(ψουο)	(i ercentage)	iveason(s)
								New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	876	10,808	853	10,785	1232%	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 property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,481	3,828	47	2,394		address additional risk, additional sampling).
7 11.00.10	. 525		.,	0,020		_,00.	10270	additional riotty additional camping).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway 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 – Change in
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	9,596	12,226	83	2,713	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 property reuse, site reopened to
								address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost
		BOARDMAN AIR FORCE						Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Oregon	FUDS	RANGE	24,789	30,363	103	5,677		cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	9,806	13,194	20	3,408	35%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
0 - 1'f' -	FUDO	BORDER FIELD STATE	0.400	4.455	40	4 704	000/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	PARK	2,480	4,155	49	1,724	69%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	11,962	12,246	1,104	1,388	12%	so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
		BROOKSVILLE TURRET	,					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	587	878	7	298	51%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Florido	LIDE	BUSHNELL ARMY	4 400	0.075	40	000		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Florida	FUDS	AIRFIELD	1,432	2,075	40	683	48%	added to project scope).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
.	DoD		Adjusted for			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) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g.,
								newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	20,570	23,635	749	3,814	19%	methodology or model.
								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
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	164	165	30	31	19%	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 sampling). 2) Cost
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	73,924	87,363	1,978	15,417		Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tionda	1 003	CAIVII BEANDING	73,924	67,303	1,970	13,417	2170	cost estimating methodology of model.
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
L								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	15,180	17,370	4,740	6,930	46%	so active 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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	15,128	19,467	505	4,844		cost estimating methodology or model.
10.110.01()	. 555	5 5 5	10,120	10,107		1,017	3270	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	128	176	135	183	143%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	ELIDE	CAMPELLIOT	07 500	24.070	400	2.040	4.407	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	27,536	31,376	100	3,940	14%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
0 4.4	DoD		Adjusted for		_	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) 1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
		CAMP ELLIS MILITARY						so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Illinois	FUDS	RESERVATION	6,984	16,624	3,949	13,589	195%	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g.,
100 1 -		CAMP GRANT RIFLE	4 044	0.040		000	400/	monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Illinois	FUDS	RANGE	1,811	2,646	4	839	46%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	89,982	112,485	3,001	25,504	28%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
0 117	FUDO			4.040	0.45	4 40 4	0.470/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	660	1,849	245	1,434	217%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	63	1,102	1	1,040		project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	92,525	124,737	238	32,450	35%	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 cost estimating methodology or model.
			·					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	18,668	21,035	62	2,429	13%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missississi		CAMP SHELBY MANUVER	44.055	40,000	405	0.740	400/	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	14,255	16,869	135	2,749	19%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

	D-D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	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
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	37,507	107,727	25	70,245		address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,989	16,906	434	2,351	169/	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). New Site.
Massachusetts		CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	1,438		3,758	4,286		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine		CASWELL AFS Z-80	570			830		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	10,742	,	2	9,838		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	27.562	35,517	944	8.899	32%	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.

	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
		_				
	•		_			Reason(s)
tanation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	(i ercentage)	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
IICO ARMV AIREIEI D	500	277	532	301		cost estimating methodology or model.
	303	211	332	301	3370	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
	7	101	0	102		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
FFET BEFOT		101	0	102	1431/0	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
INTON CHEDMAN AED	7 021	0.063	200	2.040	410/	
INTON SHERWAN AFB	1,231	9,962	209	2,940	4170	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
N LIMBUIC NAVAL AID						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
	000	0.000	0	0.000		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
ATION	298	2,926	2	2,630	883%	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
	4-0					by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
NCORDIA POW CAMP	152	112	/1	31	21%	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 – Change in
IG	12,692	15,121	34	2,463	19%	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
	578	1,133	4	559	97%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
AINING	844	1,201	39	396	47%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
BUTNER TRNG CMP	12,564	209,433	163	197,032	1568%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	CO ARMY AIRFIELD EARFIELD NAVAL PPLY DEPOT NTON SHERMAN AFB LUMBUS NAVAL AIR ATION NCORDIA POW CAMP NWAY BMB&GUNRY G ROLLA NAVAL TARGET RRY ST USN TECH	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) CO ARMY AIRFIELD 509 EARFIELD NAVAL PPLY DEPOT 7 NTON SHERMAN AFB 7,231 LUMBUS NAVAL AIR ATION 298 NCORDIA POW CAMP 152 NWAY BMB&GUNRY G 12,692 ROLLA NAVAL TARGET 78 RRY ST USN TECH AINING 844	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) CO ARMY AIRFIELD 509 277 EARFIELD NAVAL 7 101 NTON SHERMAN AFB 7,231 9,962 LUMBUS NAVAL AIR ATION 298 2,926 NCORDIA POW CAMP 152 112 NWAY BMB&GUNRY 3 12,692 15,121 RROLLA NAVAL TARGET 578 1,133 RRY ST USN TECH AINING 844 1,201	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) CO ARMY AIRFIELD 509 277 532	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) CO ARMY AIRFIELD 509 277 532 301	Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) South Change (\$000) CO ARMY AIRFIELD South South South Change (\$000) South South South Change (\$000) South South

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	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
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	13,447	36,324	3,126	26,003	193%	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
Now Jorgov	FUDS	CP KILMER	E 4	20	106	90		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILIVIER	54	38	106	90	107%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								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).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	30,124	52,806	57	22,739		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
riabarria	1 000	or olderti	00,121	02,000	0,	22,100	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
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	1,668	2,027	92	451	27%	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 scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
								to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	267	711	26	470	176%	methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
_								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,193	1,680	44	531	45%	added to project scope).
L	ELIDO.		0.050	0.000	0.7	004	4.407	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,052	3,336	37	321	11%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
A I = = I = =	ELIDO	DAV40 AED	07.007	440 505		44.007	4.50/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	97,687	112,525	89	14,927	15%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	79	1.309	27	1.257		address additional risk, additional sampling).
INCW DEISEY	1, 000	DEAL TEOT OFF	13	1,309		1,207	150470	addioss additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	(4000)	(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
		DELAND NAVAL TRAINING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Florida	FUDS	CENTER	357	1,563	96	1,302	365%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1 020		00.	.,000	- 55	.,002	33373	additional month additional campining).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	160	2,133	47	2,020	1265%	so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
		DRY CANYON ARTILLERY				,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	RANGE	7,256	9,638	334	2,716	37%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Wyoming	FUDS	5	290	313	60	83	29%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Wyoming	FUDS	1	21,145	24,304	1,194	4,353	21%	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
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	11	290	2,048	1,897	3,655	1261%	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
\\/	ELIDO	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE	57.070	70.450	0.4	40 44 4	000/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Wyoming	FUDS	2 FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE	57,370	70,450	34	13,114	23%	address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Nahraaka	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE		313		74	250/	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Nebraska		FIVE POINTS	294	313	55	74	25%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	FUDS	OLF(TWINFARKSESTATES	827	1,199	19	391	170/	added to project scope).
10,03	1 000	l I	021	1,199	19	381	4170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,776	7,191	69	1.484	26%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1	<u></u>	5,110	.,		.,		

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
Ctata		In stallation Name			_	_		Page 27/2)
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
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,501	1,647	73	219	15%	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 reuse, site reopened to
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,197	1,231	107	141	12%	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 reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,762	4,160	107	1,505	54%	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 scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
								to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,048	33,520	18	32,490	3102%	methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Utah	FUDS	FORT DOUGLAS	10,455	12,095	26	1,666	16%	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
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	41	36	40	35	87%	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 scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	11,858	16,457	185	4,784	40%	estimating methodology or model.
	1. 323		,000	10, 107	.00	1,7.51	1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
			1					project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
			1					increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
			1					pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
			1					by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	3,942	5.334	1,172	2.564		address additional risk, additional sampling).
TACAN LOLK	, 000	I OICI OICI	0,042	5,554	1,172	2,004	0076	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 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 –
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	4,687	8,175	55	3,543	76%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	20,188	24,085	39	3,936	19%	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
New York	FUDS	FORT SLOCUM	3,474	25,210	1	21,737		address additional risk, additional sampling).
INGW TOTA	1 003	I OKT SEGGGW	3,474	23,210	<u> </u>	21,737	02076	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
Florida	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	14,193	13,413	2,924	2,144		so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
			·		·	,		,
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	9,219	10,716	39	1,536	17%	so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
		FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	BASE	17,320	26,496	118	9,294		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
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,929	7,054	844	1,969		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Montana	1 020	CERCOOV / N B	0,020	7,001	011	1,000	0070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	87	201	38	152	173%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			-					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
		GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
California	FUDS	RECREATION AREA	351	395	115	159	45%	or model.
								Taskaslami Ohannata adiffa
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,822	1,757	886	821		technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Knode Island	FUDO	GREAT BEND A-GRND	1,822	1,/5/	000	821	45%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Kansas	FUDS	GNRY R	7,077	8,011	18	952	13%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
ranous	1. 000	JOINT IX	1,011	0,011	10	902	1370	change in book commaning membadology of model.

			FY 2016 Cost		FY 2017		Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
								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
		HAINES FAIRBANKS						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	PIPELINE	13,746	12,716	3,207	2,177	16%	estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	110	270	15	175	159%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		HAMMOND BOMBING						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Louisiana	FUDS	RANGE	1,912	3,913	123	2,124	111%	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
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	571	939	49	417	73%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	13,156	16,260	26	3,130	24%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	33	75	2	44	137%	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
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	161	111	75	25	16%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

oD omponent						Estimate	
	Installation Name					Change (Percentage)	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
ı	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE						remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
		13,041	14,880	282	2,121	16%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		4.067	1 523	4.057	1 512	370/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							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 –
	LAKE ONTARIO						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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change 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 property 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 scope).
טני	DS DS DS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	DS BASE 13,041 KINGMAN G TO G DS GUNNERY RANGE 4,067 DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 9,211 DS LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS 10,051 DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1 115	DS BASE 13,041 14,880 KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE 4,067 1,523 DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 9,211 11,958 LAKE ONTARIO OS ORDNANCE WORKS 10,051 12,510 DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1 115 155	DS BASE 13,041 14,880 282 KINGMAN G TO G DS GUNNERY RANGE 4,067 1,523 4,057 DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 9,211 11,958 213 LAKE ONTARIO DS ORDNANCE WORKS 10,051 12,510 1,142 DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1 115 155 28	DS BASE 13,041 14,880 282 2,121 KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE 4,067 1,523 4,057 1,513 DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 9,211 11,958 213 2,960 DS CRONDANCE WORKS 10,051 12,510 1,142 3,601 DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1 115 155 28 68	DS BASE 13,041 14,880 282 2,121 16% KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE 4,067 1,523 4,057 1,513 37% DS KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3 9,211 11,958 213 2,960 32% LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS 10,051 12,510 1,142 3,601 36% DS LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1 115 155 28 68 59%

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
-			(4000)	(4000)	(4555)	(4000)	(i ci cciiiuge)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	23,759	31,364	53	7,658		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 reuse, site reopened to
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	6,125	8,646	186	2,707	44%	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
L	=							by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	78	352	2	276	352%	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 reuse, site reopened to
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	53	145	11	103		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Walle	1 003	LON AI B LAG AX		143	11	103		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	4,443	6,618	217	2,392		address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1		.,	0,010		_,-,		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
		LOWRY AFB S-2						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	(COMPLEX 2C)	4,048	5,136	80	1,168	29%	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
		LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Vermont	FUDS	STA	85	62	353	330	386%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		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
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE	4 505	5 000	470	004	4.407	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	4,585	5,038	178	631	14%	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
		MARIETTA AIR FORCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Pennsylvania	FUDS	STATION	2,903	4,949	142	2,188	75%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	. 020		_,,,,,	.,0.10		2,.00	. 575	additional non-quadrional dampining).
Northern								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,574	46,644	213	42,283	924%	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
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	315	154	390	229	73%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
T	FUDC	MILLINGTON ODD WODKS		454	250	440	4700/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Tennessee	FUDS	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	88	154	352	418	472%	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
		MOJAVE GUNNERY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	RANGE	46,550	62,786	142	16,378	35%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		MONTGOMERY AF	ŕ			,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Alabama	FUDS	STATION	0	160	424	584	N/A	New Site.
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
		l						so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	0	2,791	4,695	7,486	N/A	2) New Site.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
		MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA						added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Alaska	FUDS	NOB	1.446	316	3,100	1,970	1260/	methodology or model.
πιαδλα	נעט ו	INOD	1,440	310	3,100	1,970	130%	iniculouology of filouel.

					_	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
.	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	_
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Northern								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,695	34,188	119	18,612		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	. 526		.0,000	0 1,100		.0,0.2		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,623	2,469	40	886		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
NA 1		NA 0 01 111 1 AV 1175				400		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	360	167	326	133	37%	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
		NAVAL AIR STATION						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California		OAKLAND	97	415	48	366		address additional risk, additional sampling).
			<u> </u>				0.070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	7,690	10,146	214	2,670	35%	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) Technology
								- Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g.,
								monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
		NAVAL AUX LANDING						remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) New
Rhode Island	FUDS	FIELD	6,953	8,094	135	1,276	18%	, ,
540 1014114	1. 000	<u> </u>	0,000	0,004	100	1,270	1070	

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
			•	(\$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)
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						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
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	1,236	482	1,190	436		remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	1,010	1,075	270	335		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 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
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,321	2,730	53	1,462	111%	risk, additional sampling).
No. Ved	FUDO	NIIKE DIL 54/50	0.000	0.054		700	6004	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	2,603	3,254	69	720	28%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NIKE C-32 - INDIANA						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Indiana	FUDS	DUNES	4,484	5,691	50	1,257	28%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
			<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 intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,270	2,458	120	308		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 reuse, site reopened to
Illinois		NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	156		82			address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	0	139	8	147		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
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	53	44	174	165		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 reuse, site reopened to
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	63	29	104	70	111%	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
		NUC BU (-) (MEBIA)						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	139	635	237	733		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
L	FUDO	NUKE DD 70						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	6,318	6,660	419	761	12%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

					FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		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
	FUDO	NULS OF BANK		0.040		4 004	000/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,541	2,642	290	1,391	90%	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
		NIDE (LINDEDCEA						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
C-1:6:-		NIRF (UNDERSEA	F.4	0.7	20	70	4000/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	CENTER)	54	97	30	73	136%	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
		NORTHEASTERN						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New York	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,530	4,088	245	1.803	710/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
INEW TOIK	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL FARK	2,550	4,000	240	1,603	/ 1 /0	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
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	709	1,405	7	703	99%	review or approval).
riadita	. 020	NORTHWALL AND	100	1,100	<u> </u>	7.00	3070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	888	1,623	8	743	84%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		OAKLAND MUNICIPAL		1,000	_			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	AIRPORT	64	36	55	27	42%	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
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	811	3,958	72	3,219	397%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
				,		,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
			1					project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
			1					by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	128	237	32	141	110%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	mstallation Name	initiation (\$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 property reuse, site reopened to
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	9,882	12,508	1,566	4,192	42%	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 reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost
		OLATHE NAVAL AIR						Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Kansas	FUDS	STATION	617	976	157	516	84%	cost estimating methodology or model.
ranoao	1 000	01711011	017	010	107	010	0170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,345	2,748	109	512	22%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			·	,				Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		OYSTER POINT STORAGE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Virginia	FUDS	AREA	958	3,532	45	2,619	273%	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
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	910	1,623	7	720	70%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
ivew Jersey	FUDS	FALERING COMING FAC	910	1,023	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	720	1970	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 reuse, site reopened to
								address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology
								 Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g.,
L								monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	1,134	16,124	322	15,312	1350%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO- GROUND GUN	723	1,468	23	768	1060/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Fiorida	FUDO	GROUND GUN	123	1,408	23	708	100%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	65	75	23	33	51%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
/ lidolid	1, 300	I EDITO DOME	0.5	73			J170	Change in cost commaning memoralogy of model.

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2017 Cost	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	In stallation Name	Adjusted for			Change	Change	Page 201/2)
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
		PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New York	FUDS	RESEARCH CENTER	14,576	17,741	62	3,227	22%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		POCATELLO BOMBING						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Idaho	FUDS	RANGE #3	1,372	2,380	27	1,035	75%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	1,397	2,277	257	1,137	81%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	109	303	32	226	208%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		PORTERVILLE ARMY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	AIRFIELD	112	72	135	95	85%	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
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	223	731	55	563	253%	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 reuse, site reopened to
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,687	53,330	681	33,324	161%	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
NA' - Is '	ELIDO		0.040	4.070	000	0.500	4440/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	2,348	4,279	668	2,599	111%	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 reuse, site reopened to
								address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology
								Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g.,
			1					monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,000	11.709	811	1.520	1,10/	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
140W OGISEY	1, 000	TO A ATTAIN THE COURT IN LED FR	11,000	11,709	011	1,320	14/0	romodiation is needed, teermology was ineliective.

			FY 2016 Cost	FY 2017	FY 2017	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	_	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			(+)	(+ /	(+ /	(+ /	J	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway 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
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	439	307	196	64	14%	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
		DOTTEDD ANA INIDIAGE						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
New York	FUDC	ROTTERDAM INDUST.	70	4 400	04	4.074		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
new fork	FUDS	PARK SAN FRANCISCO NIKE	79	1,132	21	1,074		address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	68	61	59	52		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	1 003	DATTERT 25	00	01	39	52	7078	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 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
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	85	82	51	48	56%	scope, 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 sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,387	7,399	327	2,339	/20/	cost estimating methodology or model.
Λιαοκα	1 003	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-	5,367	1,399	321	۷,۵۵9		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Kansas	FUDS	01	1,381	1,564	30	213		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
ranouo	. 555	I ~ ·	1,001	1,004	00	210	1070	Change in cost obtiniating motifications of model.

nts due to other site-level
ered contaminants,
the cleanup, additional risk
hat is required and initiated
reuse, site reopened to
sampling).
o Change in Scope –
ology or model.
o Change in Scope –
ology or model.
nts due to other site-level
ered contaminants,
the cleanup, additional risk
hat is required and initiated
/ reuse, site reopened to sampling).
nts due to other site-level
ered contaminants,
the cleanup, additional risk
that is required and initiated
reuse, site reopened to
sampling).
nts due to other site-level
ered contaminants,
the cleanup, additional risk
hat is required and initiated
reuse, site reopened to
sampling).
o Change in Scope –
ology or model.
phases as the project or remedial action operation
ct Scope – Added
el project change (e.g.,
creased physical
nal risk pathway such as
d initiated by DoD), change
ened to address additional
Estimate Change
change in cost estimating
_
to thitle of to service of the company

State Component Installation Name Installation Name Component Installation Name Component Component Installation Name Component				FY 2016 Cost Estimate		FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 Estimate Change in future property reuse, site reopered to display south as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopered to address estimating methodology or model. Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Scope – Added requirements due to other site—view of the project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rise pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DOD), change in future property reuse, site reopered to address additional rise, additional six pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DOD), change in future property reuse, site reopered to address additional rise, additional six, addi							_	Change	
level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future properly reuse, site responsed to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants), increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future properly reuse, site responsed to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 8% 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property 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 initiate 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 initiate by DoD), change in the required and initiate by DoD) change in the required and initiate by DoD). Change in the required and initiate by DoD) change in the required contaminants increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulational risk, additional sampling. 2) Standards Regulational risk, additional sampling of the requirement imposed by th	State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
Increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risp pathway such as a suppor insursion (that is required and initiate 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 (43% 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 suppor insursion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to support of the project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). Froject Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). Froject Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risk, additional sampling). Travis Field 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1									
Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. FOIGHT SCORP — Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rise pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to dead to the project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rise pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to dead to the project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rise, add									increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimation for Change in Scope — Change Intellated to Change in Scope — Added requirements due to ther site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risal pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risal, additional sampling). FUDS TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 80% address additional risal, additional sampling). FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risal, additional sampling). FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risal, 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 risal pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risal, additional sampling). 2) Slandards Regulation—Regulation—from the tise required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risal, additional sampling). 2) Slandards Regulation—Regulation from the regulator deviced and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risal sampling). 2) Slandards Regulation—reports reuse, site reopened to address additional risal sampling). 2) Slandards Regulation—from the regulation fath increases project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risal path and the regulation fath increases project change in factor of the regulation fath increases project change in factor of the regulation fath increases proj									pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. Froject Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DOD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to 80% 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, additional risk, additional sampling). Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% 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, 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, 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, additional risk, 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, additional									
Alaska FUDS TANAGA ISL 25,562 40,936 618 15,992 63% cost estimating methodology or model. Figled Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to 80% address additional risk, additional sampling). FUDS TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 80% address additional risk additional risk additional risk additional risk additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to 90,00,000 change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to 40 dress additional risk, additional sampling). TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% 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 initiate 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards and the requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards and the requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly disc									
Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rispathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rispathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rispathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional rispathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to dark sadditional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards in pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations are requirement imposed by the regulator diven Change in Scope – Added requirement imposed by the regulator regulator regulator diven Change in Scope – Added requirement review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay in regulator diven Change in Scope – Project Scope, delay	Alacka	FLIDS	TANAGA ISI	25 562	40.036	619	15 002	63%	
massachusetts Massachusetts FUDS TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 807 807 807 808 808 807 807	Alaska	1 003	TANAGAIGE	23,302	40,930	010	13,332	0376	
pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). FUDS TRAVIS FIELD TRAVIS F									
Massachusetts FUDS TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 80% address additional risk, additional sampling). FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risk, additional sampling). Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risk, additional sampling). TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risk, additional risk, additional risk, 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, 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, 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, additional sampling). 2) Standards in pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Capter of the Change in Cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Capter of the Change in Scope – Change in Capter of Capter of the Change in Scope in Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope in Scope in Capter of Capter of Change in Cost estimating methodology or model.									increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
Massachusetts FUDS TISBURY GREAT POND 1,296 1,922 404 1,030 80% 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 initiate 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator double of the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator double of the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator double of the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator double of the project as a result of negotiation and the proj									
Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to 24% 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, 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards in Regulations – Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., nerequirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Georgia FUDS TURNER AIR FORCE BASE 13,704 15,604 1,857 3,757 27% Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective. Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	N4	ELIDO.	TIODUDY ODEAT DOND	4 000	4 000	40.4	4 000		
Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% 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, 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, additional	Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,296	1,922	404	1,030	80%	
Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% address additional risk, additional risk 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,									
Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% 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, additional sisk, additional sixk, additio									increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
Georgia FUDS TRAVIS FIELD 520 618 25 123 24% 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 initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-doriven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne 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. New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne 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 – Georgia FUDS TURNER AIR FORCE BASE 13,704 15,604 1,857 3,757 27% Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work scope, delay in regulator document review or approval). 3; Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne 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. 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 Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% (Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	520	618	25	123	24%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional ris pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards Regulations – Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne 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. 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 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiate by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards of Regulations – Regulations – Regulations with the regulator (e.g., ne 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. New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards (Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., ne requirement imposed by the regulator requirement imposed by the requir									
address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards of Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., not 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. 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 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., no 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. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., no 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. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
Georgia FUDS TURNER AIR FORCE BASE 13,704 15,604 1,857 3,757 27% Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Georgia FUDS TURNER AIR FORCE BASE 13,704 15,604 1,857 3,757 27% Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project
Georgia FUDS TURNER AIR FORCE BASE 13,704 15,604 1,857 3,757 27% Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									
Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	Coordia	FUDC	TUDNED AID FORCE BASE	40.704	45.004	4.057	0.757		
New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 14% so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	Georgia	FUD5	TURNER AIR FURCE BASE	13,704	15,604	1,857	3,757	21%	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.
New York FUDS US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN 674 697 69 92 technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.									technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work
Utah FUDS UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT 8 101 18 111 1363% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.	New York	FUDS	US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN	674	697	69	92	14%	
	Litob	FUDE	LITALI ODDNIANCE DI ANT	_	404	40	444	40000/	
American Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –		רטט2	UTAR OKDINANCE PLANT	8	101	18	111	1363%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Samoa FUDS VAIPITO VILLAGE 266 347 48 129 48% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.		FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	266	347	48	129	48%	

			FY 2016 Cost Estimate	_	FY 2017 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State		Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			(4 - 2 - 2)	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(+)	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, and and	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		VIRGINIA ORDNANCE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Virginia	FUDS	WORKS	29	14,966	26	14,963	50732%	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
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,486	7,101	151	5,766	388%	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
		WHITEMAN						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		COMMUNICATIONS				4 =00	40004	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Missouri	FUDS	TRANSMITTER SITE	1,516	3,002	36	1,522	100%	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
		WILKINS AIR FORCE						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
Ohio		STATION	1,151	1,614	6	469		by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Offic		WITHLACOOCHEE CWS	1,131	1,014	6	409	4170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	FUDS	SITE	654	723	24	93	1.40/-	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tionua	1 000		034	123	24	33	1470	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
		WV MANEUVER						natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
West Virginia	FUDS	AREA/DOLLY SODS	33,171	46,309	96	13,234	40%	needed, technology was ineffective).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) 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). 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 – 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 –
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	7,504	9,482	1,982	3,960	53%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.