### FY 2018 DEP ARC

# Appendix B

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

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2018 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2017.

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 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	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
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	21	21	43	43	198%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		ABERDEEN PROVING						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Maryland	Army	GROUND	109,591	120,893	3,031	14,333	13%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
		ARMY RESEARCH						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		LABORATORY-						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Massachusetts	Army	WATERTOWN	1,005	1,570	609	1,174		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
		AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY,						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Florida	Army	49-A	201	33	284	116	58%	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
		BADGER ARMY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Wisconsin	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	17,078	19,267	1,016	3,205	19%	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
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,194	1,677	99	582		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
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	3,500	4,278	50	828	24%	in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	206	611	115	520	252%	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
		CHARLES MELVIN PRICE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Illinois	Army	SUPPORT CENTER	2,648	4,217	119	1,688	64%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			EV 0047 0	EV 0040	EV 0040	0	01	
					FY 2018	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)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		CLACKAMAS/CAMP						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Oregon	Army	WITHYCOMBE	324	262	182	120	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
		COLD REGIONS RESEARCH						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		AND ENGINEERING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New Hampshire	Army	LABORATORY	13,321	12,905	2,673	2,257	17%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		COOSA RIVER STORAGE						
Alabama	Army	ANNEX	490	1	810	321	65%	New Site.
								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
		DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Tennessee	Army	TENNESSEE	7,653	11,651	1,021	5,019	66%	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
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	341	352	268	279	82%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		DEVENS RESERVE						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Massachusetts	Army	TRAINING FACILITY	47,419	46,500	6,436	5,517	12%	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
		DUGWAY PROVING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Utah	Army	GROUND	42,732	63,466	282	21,016	49%	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	1.							by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	23,827	26,852	888	3,913	16%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			I	I		_	1-	
						Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			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 Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	14,119	31,471	3,752	21,104	149%	estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,040	1,079	74	113	11%	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
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	6,045	6,551	5,643	6,149	102%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								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
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	5,984	2,474	5,858	2,348	39%	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
New York	Army	FORT HAMILTON	79	907	122	950	1209%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	1,548	1,561	170	183	12%	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	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	1,948	1,949	229	230	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
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	12,738	16,761	1,106	5,129	40%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	. ,		,. 00		.,			

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
0.000			(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i di damaga)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	411	957	99	645	157%	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
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	27,101	29,444	3,108	5,451	20%	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
District of								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	108	376	4	272	251%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	13,969	17,792	493	4,316	31%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								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
0 117	1.	5007.000						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
California	Army	FORT ORD	211,326	260,115	16,619	65,408	31%	in schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Virginio	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	449	399	848	NI/A	estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	I ON I FIGNETT ARING WITC	<del>                                     </del>	449	399	048	IN/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	26,609	33,203	4,396	10,990	A1%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
ranous	, arriy	I OKI KILLI	20,009	55,205	4,530	10,990	T 1 /0	additional fish, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	lu stallation Name	Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	D(-)
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) 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
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	3,354	5,006	77	1,729	52%	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
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	11,943	11,586	2,058	1,701	14%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1.	50DT 01145T5D	0.000	0.500	0.40	<b>50.</b> 4	240/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	2,232	2,526	240	534	24%	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
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	41,672	46,664	3,089	8.081	10%	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Airiy	FORT WINGATE DEPOT	41,072	40,004	3,003	0,001	1370	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Mexico	Army	ACTIVITY	77,274	98,744	6,152	27,622	36%	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 – Change in cost
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,896	21,079	349	19,532	1030%	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
l								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	30,157	69,325	1,287	40,455	134%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	3,489	19,454	142	16,107	462%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	rainiy	I TONTER ARMIT AIRTIELD	3,409	13,434	142	10,107	40270	Change in 6031 estimating methodology of model.

	DoD		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	-	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
	·	JEFFERSON PROVING	,		. ,	``		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of 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 A	Army	GROUND	14,575	34,342	1,395	21,162	145%	address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
California A	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	3,362	12,802	8	9,448	281%	change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of 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 A	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,215	853	610	248	20%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia A	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	3,430	3,298	633	501	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Illinois A	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	6	27	16	37	602%	project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan A	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	3	27	19	43	1402%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Montana		JEHO MT ADNO	0	24	6	20	2029/	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional complies).
	,		9		-			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).
Michigan A	,		3		19	43	1402% 303%	project change (e.g increased physical pathway such as vaby DoD), change in address additional Project Scope – Ad project change (e.g increased physical pathway such as vaby DoD), change in address additional Project Scope – Ad project change (e.g increased physical pathway such as vaby DoD), change in address additional Project Scope – Ad project Scope – Ad project change (e.g increased physical pathway such as vaby DoD), change (e.g increased physical pathway such as vaby DoD), change in pathway such as vaby DoD), change in

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Otato	Component	motunation Humo	imiduon (¢000)	(φοσο)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(i crocinage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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 Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	0	44	10	54	N/A	address additional risk, additional sampling).
NOW WICKIOO	Airriy	or rigitivi / title		77	10	37	14/74	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	50	94	14	58	116%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	,y			<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
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	69	55	67	53	76%	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
Utah	Army	JFHQ UT ARNG	0	22	17	39	N/A	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
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	6	87	36	117	1908%	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
<u> </u>		JOINT BASE MYER-						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	0	69	6	75	N/A	address additional risk, additional sampling).

						Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
Ctata	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	December (a)
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 cost
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	25,098	30,348	757	6,007	24%	estimating methodology or model.
11111010	, arriy	COLIE 1 70 II	20,000	00,040	701	0,007	2470	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Kansas	Army	PLANT	1,108	1,839	927	1,658	150%	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
		LETTERKENNY ARMY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	Army	DEPOT	4,445	5,167	592	1,314	30%	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
DI LILI		LINGOLNI ANGA GO				40	4004	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	115	111	53	49	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
		LONGHORN ARMY						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Texas	A rmy	AMMUNITION PLANT	49.003	82.361	7,578	40,936	0.40/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Army	AWWONITION FLANT	49,003	02,301	7,576	40,936	04%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		LOUISIANA ARMY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,500	2,374	482	356	14%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	,y	r	2,000	2,074	-102	000	1 70	additional barriering/

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Coot	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Passan(s)
State	Component	installation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Fercentage)	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
		MAKUA MILITARY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	654	756	120	222	2/10/	estimating methodology or model.
Tawaii	Ailily	RESERVATION	034	750	120	222	34 /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
		MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Army	CONCORD	35,748	95,403	1,651	61,306	171%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Camorria	7 dilly	CONCORD	00,140	30,400	1,001	01,000	17170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		MISSISSIPPI ARMY						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Mississippi	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2.693	3,370	375	1,052	39%	in schedule.
	,y		_,000	3,3.3	0.0	.,002	3070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2.962	2,834	662	534	18%	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
		PARKS RESERVE FORCES						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Army	TRAINING AREA	6,759	7,298	294	833	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
		PHOENIX MILITARY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Maryland	Army	RESERVATION	1,068	1,982	58	972	91%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	79,572	118,440	1,505	40,373	51%	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
1	1.							by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,778	31,988	10,766	11,976	39%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate		FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost 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
L								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,480	1,725	112	357	24%	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.,
								monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
								remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost
		RAVENNA ARMY						Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Ohio	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	21,850	27,846	4,448	10,444	48%	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
l								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	7,367	10,550	1,254	4,437	60%	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
California	Δ ππος	CACDAMENTO ADMY DEDOT	2,298	2,657	92	451	200/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT SENECA ARMY DEPOT	2,290	2,657	92	431	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New York	Army	ACTIVITY	4.228	26,831	205	22,808	530%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
14CW TOTA	Airiiy	ACTIVITI	7,220	20,001	200	22,000	33370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		SIEVERS-SANDBERG						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New Jersey	Army	USARC	52	51	123	122	234%	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
		ST LOUIS ORDNANCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Missouri	Army	PLANT	4,478	5,274	98	894	20%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2018 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$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 by changes
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	1,234	1,252	337	355	29%	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
		SUNFLOWER ARMY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	30,949	31,748	18,125	18,924		estimating methodology or model.
ranoao	Airiiy	7 AVIIVICIATION 1 E. A.A.	30,343	31,740	10,120	10,024		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
North Carolina	Army	PLANT	100	98	109	107		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 cost
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	49,271	54,985	2,769	8,483		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	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	9,579	9,179	1,785	1,385		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Gamorria	Allily	TO ALLO ESS ALAWITOS	9,519	3,173	1,703	1,303	1470	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.,
		TWIN CITIES ARMY						monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Minnesota	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	30,324	30,909	3,372	3,957	13%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD				Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
State	Component	Ilistaliation Name	iiiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Fercentage)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		UMATILLA CHEMICAL						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Oregon	Army	DEPOT	38,226	68,269	1,420	31,463	920/	in schedule.
Oregon	Allily	DEFOI	30,220	00,209	1,420	31,403	02 /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
		USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Ohio	Army	59)	4,342	7,241	153	3,052	70%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Offic	Allily	39)	4,542	7,241	133	3,032	7076	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1.084	1,275	209	400	270/	in schedule.
virginia	Allily	VINT HILL FARIVIS STATION	1,004	1,273	209	400	31 70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		WELDON SPRING TRAINING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Missouri	A rmy	AREA	2,000	2,714	98	812	/110/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
IVIISSOUTI	Army	ANEA	2,000	2,714	90	012	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
		WHITE SANDS MISSILE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
New Mexico	Army	RANGE	3,479	2,981	1,524	1,026	30%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
TTOW WICKIGO	Airiy	10.002	5,475	2,501	1,024	1,020	3070	address additional fisk, 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.,
								monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
								remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost
								for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
								This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	38,107	37,659	7,727	7,279	10%	schedule.
Wost virginia	ituvy	ALLEGART DALLIGHOG LAD	30,107	37,039	1,121	1,219	13/0	ourioudio.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD					Change	Change	
State	-	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Otate	Component	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY	ΠΠατιστί (ψοσο)	(\$000)	(ψοσο)	(4000)	(i crecitage)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Maryland	Navy	HEAD ANNEX	359	253	299	193	54%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Marylaria	itary	TIERO / WWWEX	000	200	200	100	0170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	Navy	DAM FACILITY	686	1,616	705	1,635	238%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								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
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	101,741	146,672	2,784	47,715	47%	in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		DADICINIO CANIDO DIADE	0.007	0.400	400	004	400/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	2,087	2,189	162	264	13%	in schedule. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs
Tennessee	Navy	BRISTOL NWIRP	357	355	189	187	52%	lincluded in the CTC.
Termessee	INAVY	BRISTOL WIRT	337	333	103	107	32 /0	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs
								included in the CTC. 2) Technology – Change to a different or
								improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural
								attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed,
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	13,501	18,516	1,991	7,006	52%	technology was ineffective).
	1 ′		,	,	,			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	Navy	CAMP H.M. SMITH OAHU	1,446	1,405	1,264	1,223	85%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	D. D		FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	139,207		12,718			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) 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). 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC	1,628	1,829	14	215		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	CARDEROCK NSWC	37	201	260	424		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,100	11,528	1,652	2,080	19%	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.

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)			Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	installation Name	imation (\$000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i ercentage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	123	943	269	1,089	889%	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,617	50,258	850	9,491	23%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	61,850	60,446	8,111	6,707	11%	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.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	4,958	3,710	2,146	898	18%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$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 address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	6,013	6,476	442	905	15%	in schedule.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	15,067	16,769	733	2,435	16%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Virginia	Navy	DAM NECK FCTC	1,842	2,988	496	1,642	89%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	DIXON NRTF	878	1,323	98	543	62%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Navy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	474	521	15	62	13%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
						Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD					Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name				(\$000)	1	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 – 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	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	8,408	8,222	1,187	1.001	12%	schedule.
· OAGO	,		0,100	0,222	1,101	.,001	,	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	3,682	2,109	3,165	1,592	43%	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
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	19,627	18,408	7,381	6,162	31%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Ivavy	COLIT CITT NODO	15,027	10,400	7,001	0,102	3170	address additional fish, additional 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
California	Nove	IMPERIAL REACTIONS	40.770	40.454	0.070	0.000	400/	greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,770	13,154	2,878	2,262	16%	be caused by changes in schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	177,294	186,366	8,523	17,595	10%	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	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	37,017	42,601	4,275	9,859	27%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	11,686	13,529	3,444	5,287	45%	schedule.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
- Clusto			(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i or comage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such 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
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	17,752	19,759	2,908	4,915	28%	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
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,308	3,321	494	507	15%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	ivavy	KINGS BAT NOB	3,300	3,321	434	301	1370	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
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,038	6,789	725	4,476	147%	address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
			4.075	4.050		470		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	1,275	1,050	404	179	14%	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
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	2,599	2,937	933	1,271	49%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Torradity	. 10.17	200101122110110	2,399	2,001	333	1,211	7370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,171	4,204	361	1,394	44%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
rennsylvania	inavy	INIECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,171	4,204	361	1,394	44%	auuress auuliionai risk, auuliionai Sampiing).

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	News	NEW ORLEANS NAS	700	4.074	475	700	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) 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
Louisiana  Rhode Island	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	61,473	1,071	4,620			scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).  1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	28,383	31,571	3,104	6,292	22%	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 methodology or model.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	12,243	16,309	678	4,744		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2018 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	82,289	85,172	13,358	16,241		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	90,984	167,207	7,033	83,256	92%	in schedule.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	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
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	35,462	38,448	4,582	7,568	21%	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 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
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	15,432	16,248	2,274	3,090		greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	INAVY	PEARETIARBOTTIO	10,402	10,240	2,214	3,030	2070	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	PEARL HARBOR NSB	327	493	1	167	51%	in schedule.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,071	4,326	178	3,433		change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
i ciirisyivariia	INAVY	THEADELITHATO	1,071	4,020	170	0,400	32170	included in the OTO.
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
								technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	217	418	39	240	110%	active 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
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	32,169	30,877	4,493	3,201	10%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-
		PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC						scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or
Washington	Navy	DIV DET	3,400	3,509	673	782	23%	Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
. ruoi ii igioi i	. 144 y	12.4 22.1	J,700	0,000	L 0/3	102	2070	resorant and Appropriate Requirements.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD					Change	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) 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	PORT HUENEME NCBC	9,147	8,265	2,094	1,212	13%	schedule.
<b>.</b>		DODTONOUTUNOV						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	4,958	5,035	441	518	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
		PUGET SOUND FISC						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Washington	Navy	BREMERTON	3,422	3,720	519	817	24%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
vasimigton	INAVY	DIVERNITY OF T	5,422	3,720	313	017	2470	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		PUGET SOUND FISC						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Washington	Navy	MANCHESTER	1,994	3,256	358	1,620	81%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California	Navy	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	2,948	2,945	518	515	17%	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.
		SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND						This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	NALF	2,032	2,466	666	1,100	5,10/.	schedule.
Galilottila	INGVY	INALI	2,032	2,400	000	1,100	J4 /0	Jonoualo.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	7,039	8,653	808	2,422		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	2,841	898	2,538	595	219/	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NSB	2,041	500				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	9,232	13,983				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.

			EV 0047 0	EV 0040	EV 0040		01	
			FY 2017 Cost Estimate		FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
Ctata	_	Installation Name			_	Change	Change	Bassar/a)
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
California	Navy	STOCKTON NCS	0	1,446	482	1,928	N/A	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
		TREASURE ISLAND NS						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	HUNTERS PT ANNEX	200,991	218,221	85,766	102,996	51%	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 Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	22,574	24,448	1,552	3,426	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
								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 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
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	256,093	261,969	29,854	35,730	14%	schedule.
	,		255,500		20,001	23,.30	. 170	
								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)
		VIEQUES PUERTO RICO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Puerto Rico	Navy	NASD	7,575	8,350	291	1,066	14%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NASD	7,575	8,350	291	1,066	14%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			EV 0047 0 4	EV 0040	EV 0040	04	04	
						Cost	Cost	
	D . D		Estimate			Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			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
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	47,335	49,156	6,806	8,627	18%	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
District of								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	218	510	168	460	210%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	22,605	26,755	1,202	5,352	24%	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.
Columbia	ivavy	WASHINGTON NAVT TARD	22,003	26,755	1,202	5,352	24%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
District of								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	744	984	329	569	769/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Columbia	ινανγ	VVASHING FON INKL	/44	964	329	509	70%	auuress auunnonai risk, auunnonai sampiing).

State	DoD	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated		Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oldio	Component	motunation Numb	milation (¢ooo)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(ψοσο)	(i crocinage)	``
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such 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
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	80,640	89,955	8,089	17,404	220/	or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
vasnington	INAVY	WINDELT IGEAND NAG	00,040	09,933	0,009	17,404	22 /0	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,
		WILLIAMSBURG FISC						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
Virginia		CHEATHAM ANNEX	36,099	40,860	1,074	5,835	16%	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
g	,		23,000	10,000	1,574	0,000	1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	58,966	56,172	9,944	7,150	12%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2018 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	53,543	61,121	5,538	13,116	24%	Change in contract or contract method.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,251	3,564	128	441	14%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.  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
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	31,503	48,445	1,240	18,182	58%	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
						,		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) 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 –
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	134,296	154,117	6,433	26,254	20%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
	<u> </u>			, ,	, ,	, ,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	13,257	14,413	280	1,436	11%	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
	l –	AUD FOR OF DUALITY DUAG	22.245		400	0.400	400/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	20,645	22,309	462	2,126	10%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dokoto	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	4,798	6,524	208	1,934	400/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
South Dakota	All Force	RANGE	4,790	6,524	200	1,934	40%	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
		BARKSDALE AIR FORCE						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Louisiana	Air Force	BASE	43,185	54,815	2,621	14,251	33%	model.
		BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	1,124	1,236	14	126	11%	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,
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	26,061	28,770	132	2,841	11%	additional sampling).
· ondo	7 111 1 0100	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO	20,001	20,110	102	2,011	1170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	12,661	17,863	268	5,470	43%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			,	,				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
	1							increased physical dimensions of 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	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	10,716	13,480	108	2,872	27%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Coot	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
Ctata	-	Installation Name				_		Becom/o
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
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	4,568	5,493	64	989	22%	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,
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	23,121	50,919	565	28,363	123%	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
		COLD BAY LONG RANGE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	3,684	6,812	96	3,224	88%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		COLUMBUS AIR FORCE						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mississippi	Air Force	BASE	9,385	10,484	384	1,483	16%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,499	2,805	39	345	14%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								<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 sampling). 2) 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 –
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	8,738	10,998	512	2,772		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Joongia	1 0100	2 2 3 5 11 C 7 III C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1	5,750	.0,000	512	-,,,,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	109,761	124,241	3,271	17.751	16%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Dolaware	/ iii 1 0100	DOVER AIR FORCE BACE	100,701	127,241	5,271	17,731	1070	address additional fisit, additional sampling).

			I			-		
					FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
					Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD				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
		DUNCAN CANAL RADIO						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,214	2,533	123	442	20%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	11,435	14,496	208	3,269	29%	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,
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	7,509	25,499	140	18,130	241%	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
		EARECKSON AIR FORCE						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	BASE	98,717	108,976	2,269	12,528	13%	estimating methodology or model.

State	DoD Component		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	598,268	652,790	11,943	66,465	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	43,535	50,734	2,421	9,620	22%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
	·	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) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
South Dakota	Air Force	BASE	33,868	44,544	5,552	16,228	48%	estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	16,245	35,902	820	20,477		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).
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	58,397	63,955	467	6,025		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	6,503	9,168	708	3,373		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).

State	DoD Component		Estimate	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,143	3,489	21	367	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	7,000	18,394	294	11,688	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) 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.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	7,167	8,226		,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	13,752					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.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	3,901	4,300	65	464	12%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.     Sost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2018 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) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	301,552	361,493	3,998	63,939	21%	cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	33,534	31,480	6,725	4.671		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.
New Mexico	All Folce	HOLLOWAN	33,334	31,460	0,725	4,071	14 70	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	A	LIGHTOTEAR	00.000	44.047	4.040	0.707		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
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	38,866	44,317	1,346	6,797	17%	model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	_	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,192	11,388	1,383	1,579	14%	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 – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	104,559	122,763	10,810	29,014	28%	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.
IVIGOSGUIUSGUS	All I OICE	BD OAI E OOD	104,559	122,703	10,610	23,014	20%	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
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	46,028	47,412	3,884	5,268	11%	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 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 Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	50,404	57,310	6,232	13,138	26%	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of
								negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed
								by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
								estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	261,804	288,434	3,666	30,296	12%	be caused by changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion
								(that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	22,893	25,778	597	3,482	15%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	5,393	9,593	229	4,429	82%	added to project scope).
_								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	10,563	14,249	95	3,781	36%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	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)
		JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	936	1,070	19	153	16%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	2,156	2,382	28	254	12%	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 – Change in cost
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	6,589	10,286	269	3,966	60%	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
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	58,322	90,009	2,556	34,243	59%	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 cost
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	50,585	58,587	1,587	9,589	19%	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 – 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
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	28,164	31,827	599	4,262	15%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	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) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Maine	Air Force	LORING	18,929	31,150	468	12,689	67%	additional sampling).
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,668	8,053	262	1,647	25%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	MARCH	125,885	131,004	7,131	12,250	10%	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	Air Force	MATHER	123,529	148,263	2,346	27,080	22%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	90,283	110,386	2,519	22,622	25%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			ĺ	,	,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,228	2,581	39	392	18%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2018 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	15,414	17,836	672	3,094	20%	estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	12,761	58,387	1,055	46,681		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).  2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	12,382		1,016			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).
			,			,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	19,013	30,268	1,330	12,585	66%	estimating methodology or model.

FY 2017 Cost FY 2018 FY 2018 Cost Cost Estimate Cost Funds Estimate Estimate	
DeD Adjusted for Estimate Obligated Observed	
DoD	
	ason(s)
1) Pr	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	gresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
	ded to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
	uirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
	covered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of
	cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion at is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	perty reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
	ditional sampling).
	st Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
	ange in cost estimating methodology or model.
	oject Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
	ject change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
	reased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
	hway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
	DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California         Air Force         NORTON         10,589         11,865         748         2,024         19% address	dress additional risk, additional sampling).
Progradde requirement of the control	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project agresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation ded to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added aurements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly covered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion at is required and initiated by DoD), change in future aperty reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, ditional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD licy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that defines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate ange Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost imating methodology or model.
1) Pr	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	gresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
	ded to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
	uirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly covered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of
	cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion
	at is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	perty reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
	ditional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	mination (\$000)	(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) 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
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	115,858	167,849	16,005	67,996		scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
		PETERSON AIR FORCE						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of 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	Air Force	BASE	37	132,310	50,116	182,389	496216%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	49,684	76,029	3,991	30,336		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	4,122	18,108	124	14,110		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	34,526	39,126	735	5,335		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).     2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost		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,
Texas	Air Force	REESE	22,923	195,734	4,120	176,931	772%	additional sampling).
. 67.00	7 0.00			100,101	.,0	,		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,
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,931	11,065	156	8,290	283%	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,
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	1,750	7,132	133	5,515	315%	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
Now Verl	A:= Fa	DOME DESEADOU SITE	45.540	F7 070	4.040	40.040	000/	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	45,546	57,370	1,016	12,840	28%	model.

FY 2017 Cost Estimate	covered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk on (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
State Component Installation Name Adjusted for Inflation (\$000) (	covered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk on (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
State Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (Percentage) Reason(s)  Project Scope – Added requirer project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change in future proper pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change in future proper pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions of pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper project change (e.g., newly discincreased physical dimensions).	covered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk on (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
Project Scope – Added requirer project change (e.g., newly disc increased physical dimensions pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future properties.  New York Air Force ROSLYN 3,535 4,283 64 812 23% address additional risk, addit	covered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk on (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
project change (e.g., newly disconsincreased physical dimensions pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper New York  Air Force ROSLYN  3,535  4,283  64  812  23% address additional risk,	covered contaminants, of the cleanup, additional risk on (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
increased physical dimensions pathway such as vapor intrusion by DoD), change in future proper New York  Air Force ROSLYN  3,535  4,283  64  812  23% address additional risk, a	of the cleanup, additional risk in (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
New York Air Force ROSLYN 3,535 4,283 64 812 23% address additional risk, addition	n (that is required and initiated erty reuse, site reopened to
New York Air Force ROSLYN 3,535 4,283 64 812 23% address additional risk, addition	erty reuse, site reopened to
New York Air Force ROSLYN 3,535 4,283 64 812 23% address additional risk, addition	•
9,000	
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	ments due to other site-level
project change (e.g., newly disc	
increased physical dimensions	
SAN DIEGO SPACE pathway such as vapor intrusion	
SURVEILLANCE FIELD by DoD), change in future proper	
California Air Force STATN 770 879 216 325 42% address additional risk, addition	
1) Project Scope – Added requi	
project change (e.g., newly disc	
increased physical dimensions	
pathway such as vapor intrusion	n (that is required and initiated
by DoD), change in future prope	erty reuse, site reopened to
address additional risk, addition	nal sampling). 2) Cost Estimate
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR Change In Change Unrelated to Change in	n Scope – Change in cost
North Carolina Air Force FORCE BASE 14,581 16,335 616 2,370 16% estimating methodology or mod	
1) Project Scope – Added clear	
progresses (e.g., feasibility stud	
added to project scope). 2) Cos	
to Change in Scope – Change i	in cost estimating methodology
Texas         Air Force         SHEPPARD         8,656         9,496         340         1,180         14% or model.	
SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE Cost Estimate Change Unrelate	
Alaska Air Force STATION 4,346 4,936 156 746 17% Change in cost estimating meth	
SUNDANCE AIR FORCE Cost Estimate Change Unrelate	ŭ i
Wyoming Air Force STATION 2,930 3,179 156 405 14% Change in cost estimating meth	
1) Project Scope – Added requi	
project change (e.g., newly disc	
increased physical dimensions	• •
pathway such as vapor intrusion	
by DoD), change in future prope	•
	nal sampling). 2) Cost Estimate
TATALINA AIR FORCE  Change Unrelated to Change in	
Alaska Air Force STATION 14,550 27,178 444 13,072 90% estimating methodology or mod	DEI.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ottale	Somponent		mutaion (voos)	(wood)	(4000)	(4000)		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	67,939	89,863	4,311	26,235		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.
			31,000	55,555	,,,,,,			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
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	97,477	113,924	3,898	20,345	21%	in schedule.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	165	106	121	62	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	195,886	209,056	6,529	19,699		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.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	11,015	12,628	150	1,763		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	9,535		1,112	12,008		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Ost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		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 Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	5,767	11,115	454	5,802	101%	estimating methodology or model.
Wake Island	7111 1 0100	WARE IGEA WAS A WALLED	0,707	11,110	707	0,002		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,596	2,877	26	307	12%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
								increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review
		WHITEMAN AIR FORCE						or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Missouri	Air Force	BASE	5,425	8,992	254	3,821	70%	Scope – 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) Technology – Change to a different or
								improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural
								attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed,
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	19,832	38,704	811	19,683	99%	technology was ineffective).
								A) Desirat Course Added as a since as a dual to a sile.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
								address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or
								Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	41,283	45,198	5,466	9,381	23%	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
								to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	122,803	132,940	3,592	13,729	11%	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,
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	136,735	213,474	3,220	79,959	58%	additional sampling).
Michigan	All 1 Olde	WORTOWITT	100,700	210,474	5,220	70,000	3070	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
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1.888	2,340	66	518	27%	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
		DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	DLA	FACILITY	11,472	13,495	1,163	3,186	28%	estimating methodology or model.
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
		ALMAREN AIR FORCE						regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
California	EUD0	ALMADEN AIR FORCE	400	400	00	07	050/	increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review
California	FUDS	STATION	108	109	26	27	25%	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
		ANTIGO AIR FORCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Wisconsin	FUDS	STATION	1,286	2,948	78	1,740	135%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1 000		1,200	2,040	10	1,770	10070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	3,714	7,746	327	4,359	117%	added to project scope).
				. ,	, ,	.,500	,0	

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			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
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	669	1,630	217	1,178	176%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
American		1						l., a.,
Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	27	7,667	41	7,681	28936%	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
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	NO. 8	203	128	132	57	28%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Camorria	1 020	140.0	200	120	102	0,	2070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	AREA	2,499	2,493	258	252	10%	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
California	FUDS		00	E 204	707	F 000	00070/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	99	5,281	787	5,969	6027%	address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,751	6,367	21	2,637	70%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
			2,: 0.	2,23.			1 370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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	BLUE BEACH	3,625	4,454	702	1,531	42%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	3,625	4,454	702	1,531	42%	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to

FY 2017 Cost FY 2018 Cost Cost Estimate Cost Funds Estimate Estimate	
	ato.
DoD   Adjusted for   Estimate   Obligated   Change   Change	
State   Component   Installation Name   Inflation (\$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 property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska FUDS BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL 24,131 29,345 453 5,667	23% address additional risk, additional sampling).
	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
North Carolina   FUDS   BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY   153   223   17   87	57% 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
Kentucky FUDS CAMP BRECKINRIDGE 19,876 24,320 386 4,830	24% address additional risk, additional sampling).
	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Arkansas	62% 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 Estimate
	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California         FUDS         CAMP ELLIOT         32,035         44,873         560         13,398	42% 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 review
California FUDS CAMP HAAN 33 31 69 67	206% or approval).
	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
California         FUDS         CAMP IBIS (CAMA)         1,888         2,354         249         715	38% added to project scope).
	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
California         FUDS         CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO         21,477         36,592         121         15,236	71% Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California         FUDS         CAMP STONEMAN         15         13,402         15         13,402         8	87507% 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
Georgia         FUDS         CAMP WHEELER         6,351         29,372         116         23,137	364% address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	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
	EU 10.0	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK		0.40	4 = 00	200	440/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Massachusetts	FUDS	BOMB TARGET SITE	2,007	640	1,593	226	11%	address additional risk, additional sampling).  Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	326	586	7	267	82%	added to project scope).
Техаз	1 000	CASTINER NAMOE	320	300	,	201	02 /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
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,412	1,554	44	186	13%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	21,010	23,215	1,745	3,950	19%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								T
		OLIA DI OTTE NIAVI ANANA						Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3.892	3,796	1.958	1.862	100/	technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
North Carolina	FUDS	DEFO	3,092	3,790	1,936	1,002	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	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	283	488	431	636	225%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Virginia	FUDS	TRAINING SITE	19,927	23,812	88	3,973	20%	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
		CLEARFIELD NAVAL						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Utah	FUDS	SUPPLY DEPOT	103	182	300	379	367%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Otan	1 000	00.1 21 021 01	103	102	300	313	301 /6	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
		COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR						technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so
Ohio	FUDS	STATION	2,987	4,650	3	1,666	56%	active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	1,157	1,434	18	295	26%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	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)
			(4000)	(+555)	(+ )	(+000)	( creamings)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		CORRY ST USN TECH						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Florida	FUDS	TRAINING	1,226	1,325	39	138	11%	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
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,070	2,239	101	270	13%	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,
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	9,236	10,521	321	1,606	17%	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
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	726	1,601	74	949	131%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
Alaaka	ELIDO	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	F04	660	00	047	400/	increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review
Alaska	FUDS	SITE	521	669	69	217	42%	or approval).  Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	331	404	23	96	200/	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Onio	FUDS	ERIE ARMIT DEPOT	331	404	23	90	29%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	622	1.499	31	908	1/160/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
vvyorining	ניטט	IL WAIT ALD AF FAC 3-0	022	1,499	31	900	140%	address additional risk, additional Sampling).

	D-D		Estimate	Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
			(,,,,,	(122)	<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
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	320	1,170	61	911	285%	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Calcusta	ELIDO	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE	404	4 075	000	057	000%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	12	401	1,275	83	957	238%	address additional risk, additional sampling).  Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	320	1,282	55	1,017	318%	project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	1,369	1,992	60	683	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 sampling).
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	1,224	1,505	41	322		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).     Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								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
Louisiana	FUDS	FORMER CAMP CLAIBORNE	28,233	30,654	559	2,980	11%	estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	1,243	5,180	52	3,989	321%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

nate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
cost estimating methodology or model.
ope – Added requirements due to other site-level
ange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
uch as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
change in future property reuse, site reopened to
dditional risk, additional sampling).
ope – Added requirements due to other site-level
ange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
uch as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
change in future property reuse, site reopened to
dditional risk, additional sampling).
ope – Added requirements due to other site-level
ange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
uch as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
hange in future property reuse, site reopened to
dditional risk, additional sampling).
ope – Added requirements due to other site-level
ange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
uch as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
hange in future property reuse, site reopened to
dditional risk, additional sampling).
ope – Added requirements due to other site-level
ange (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
uch as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
hange in future property reuse, site reopened to
dditional risk, additional sampling).
or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
the project as a result of negotiations with the
e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
project scope, delay in regulatory document review
ıl).

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate 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) 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
		HAINES FAIRBANKS						Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	FUDS	PIPELINE	12,983	13,683	1,168	1,868	14%	cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	3,229	3,135	443	349	11%	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).
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	276	292	192	208	76%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	HOONAH RRS	77	73	70	66		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,311	1,789	90	568	43%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,504	3,680	275	451	13%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for					
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Ilistaliation Name	ililiation (\$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
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,444	1,642	18	216	150/	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	LOD9	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,444	1,042	10	210	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
								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
		KENTUCKY ORDNANCE						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project
Kentucky	FUDS	WORKS	1,340	3,018	160	1.838	1270/	scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Remucky	F0D3	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY	1,340	3,016	160	1,030	137 70	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Arizona	FUDS	RANGE	1,555	1,588	156	189	120/	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alizona	1 003	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB	1,555	1,300	130	109	12 /0	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Mexico	FUDS	RGE	541	1,285	91	835	154%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
TYCW WICKIGO	1000	NOE	341	1,200	- 51	000	10470	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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-1	158	691	343	876	553%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
1100140144				55.	0.0	0.0	33373	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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-6	12,789	14,130	23	1,364	11%	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-8	848	421	1,048	621	73%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
					,,,,,			,

			EV 0047 0 4	EV 0040	EV 0040	04	04	
					FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
	D-D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
04-4-	DoD	In stallation Name	Adjusted for		_	Change	Change	D(-)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		l						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	359	152	324	117	32%	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
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	1B)	68	302	24	258	377%	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
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Colorado	FUDS	1C)	69	336	29	296	426%	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
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	5,144	7,427	89	2,372	46%	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
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	163	225	16	78	48%	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	5,053	5,731	1,216	1,894	37%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	_		1,000	-, -	, = 1 -	,	1	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
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
			1	[				by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	484	852	41	409	85%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
00	1. 555	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	101	302		.50	3070	additional data to the data of

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate		FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$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
Tonnogoo	FUDC	MOTLOW RANGE	0.050	2 000	070	222	400/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RAINGE	2,850	2,909	273	332	12%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	RANGE	15	142	15	142	925%	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
		MOUNT OWEN RIFLE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	RANGE	315	5,549	100	5,334	1691%	address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
				,		,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	323	295	120	92	29%	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
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	452	519	121	188	41%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wilchigan	1 000	MOCKEGON OKB I EANY	402	313	121	100	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
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	5,456	6,008	40	592	11%	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 AUXILIARY AIR						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	STATION ARCATA	2,436	5,191	1,140	3,895	160%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
Camorria	1. 222		2,400	3,101	1,140	0,000	13070	ass. 555 sessional rior, additional ourispinity).

			FY 2017 Cost		FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for		Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
	i i			, ,	, ,	, ,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Alaska	FUDS	ISLAND)	5,530	9,507	2,022	5,999		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
Dhada laland	FUDO	NETO(MELVILLE IND. EAC)	0.707	0.005	50	500	200/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	2,787	3,295	52	560		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
		NEW RIVER ORDNANCE						pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	FUDS	PLANT	19	39	20	40		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virgina	FUD3	FLAINT	19	39	20	40	204%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
		NIKE BA-30/31						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Maryland	FUDS	(TOLCHESTER)	128	127	69	68		address additional risk, additional sampling).
Marylana	1 020	(TOLOTILOTER)	120	127	- 00	- 00	0470	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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 34/35	150	95	2,362	2,307	1537%	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 York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	3,322	3,826	23	527	16%	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	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	372	510	42	180	49%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Cost	FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,325	2,351	215	1,241	94%	technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	142	9	296	163	115%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	EUDe	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND	200	111	95	160	6110/	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
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	28	111	85			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
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	45	56	70	81	180%	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	NIKE PR-79	6,800	7,840	434	1,474	22%	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	NIKE SITE BAY	2,697	2,939	937	1,179	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 by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	878	1,018	72	212	24%	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
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	99	105	204	210	212%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

	DoD		FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2018 Cost Estimate	FY 2018 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	1,333	1,382	239	288	22%	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
rudenta	. 656		1,000	1,002	200	200		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,435	1,522	79	166	12%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	1,657	1,978	80	401	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	106	70	97	61	57%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	37	74	76	113	308%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	242	4,087	596	4,441	1835%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
lowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	12,771	11,941	4,704	3,874	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 property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	8,719	4,803	7,140	3,224	37%	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).
Ohio	FUDS	OHIO RUBBER COMPANY	2,861	2,429	716	284	10%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	ORDNANCE PLAN	12,123	22,115	6,190	16,182	133%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2017 Cost Estimate		FY 2018 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost 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
		OYSTER POINT STORAGE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Virginia	FUDS	AREA	3,606	3,985	82	461	13%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	4,185	4,779	4	598	14%	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
		PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Texas	FUDS	(TX TECH)	82	167	12	97	119%	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
		PINE RIDGE GUNNERY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
South Dakota	FUDS	RANGE	2,904	6,931	2,156	6,183	213%	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
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	7,083	7,968	4,750	5,635	80%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
								increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	2,325	3,078	66	819	35%	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) 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
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	313	137	466	290	92%	scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	313	137	466	290	92%	

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	_	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
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	54	59	200	205	379%	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
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,440	2,446	59	1,065	74%	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
		0011111110115		_				by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	6	6	143	143	2332%	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
		SPENCER ARTILLERY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Tennessee	FUDS	RANGE	7,111	16,069	119	9,077	1200/	estimating methodology or model.
Termessee	1 003	RANGE	7,111	10,009	119	9,011	12070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk
								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
District of								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	34,860	34,296	25,204	24,640	71%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
	. 020		0.,000	0 :,200	20,20	,	1.70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants,
								increased physical dimensions of 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	STEWART AFB	6,693	7,901	15	1,223	18%	address additional risk, additional sampling).
-	-	-		•	•			, =,

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	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
NI - wile - wa								pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
Northern	LIDO	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	200	640	63	445	4.070/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mariana Islands	FUD5	TANAPAG FUEL FARIVI	266	648	63	445	167%	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
Alaska	FUDS	TIGALDA ISLAND	352	128	277	53	15%	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
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,962	768	2,403	1,209	62%	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
		TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
California	FUDS	10	322	217	427	322	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
								pathway such 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
Alaaka	FUDC	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4.007	4.055	40	400	440/	Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4,227	4,655	40	468	11%	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
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	104	139	22	57	55%	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
<u>                                     </u>	ELIDO.	LITALI ODDALANOE DI ANT		400			600/	by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	103	108	22	27	26%	address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2017 Cost	FY 2018	FY 2018	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		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
American								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	354	665	44	355	100%	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) Cost Estimate
								Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,179	9,316	97	2,234	31%	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
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	26,856	30,741	464	4,349	16%	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
		WEST VIRGINIA ORD						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
West Virginia	FUDS	WORKS	64,214	68,716	2,084	6,586	10%	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
L								by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	7,250	7,698	1,451	1,899	26%	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
		VOLINIOSTOVA CONTRA	1					pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated
	51100	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC						by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	2,693	4,081	62	1,450	54%	address additional risk, additional sampling).