

FY 2015 DEP ARC

Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2015 Environmental Restoration Funding and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2014.

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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	94,388	108,232	4,867	18,711	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	10,021	11,152	51	1,182	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	51,035	74,542	1,677	25,184	49%	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).
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	1,582	2,799	21	1,238	78%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,783	2,037	518	772	43%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,138	1,338	86	286	25%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	145	158	36	49	34%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	18,073	17,562	4,840	4,329	24%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY AIRFIELD	0	1,731	36	1,767	N/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	3,940	6,652	340	3,052	77%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	399	378	98	77	19%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,893	6,353	1,971	1,431	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	8,828	10,242	429	1,843	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	1,473	1,380	840	747	51%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	48,084	142,049	318	94,283	196%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	6,956	30,823	547	24,414	351%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	18	158	25	165	901%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	3,301	6,335	253	3,287	100%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	7,120	8,012	781	1,673	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).
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	852	1,003	56	207	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	41,328	53,132	9,733	21,537	52%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	4,628	6,483	23,222	25,077	542%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	5,313	6,534	1,782	3,003	57%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	0	2,175	1,006	3,181	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	4,334	4,196	651	513	12%	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).
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	940	1,261	825	1,146	122%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	970	837	237	104	11%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	1,649	416	2,218	985	60%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,067	1,047	1,285	1,265	119%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,620	2,137	3,898	4,415	273%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	0	30	522	552	N/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	12,396	13,116	527	1,247	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. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	9,912	11,845	2,427	4,360	44%	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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	14,541	17,025	669	3,153	22%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,336	1,455	170	289	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) New Site.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	12,037	8,099	7,531	3,593	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	1,251	3,935	418	3,102	248%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	0	10	335	345	N/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	151,248	75,378	138,833	62,963	42%	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).
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	0	2,451	2,357	4,808	N/A	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	102,999	133,672	5,785	36,458	35%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	29,278	45,934	1,534	18,190	62%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	3,520	5,407	5,368	7,255	206%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	3,435	7,693	605	4,863	142%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,366	1,341	2,380	2,355	173%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	722	373	436	87	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 by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	26,676	52,252	1,895	27,471	103%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,845	4,992	5,851	7,998	281%	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).
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	94	732	2,210	2,848	3014%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	29,127	28,004	6,072	4,949	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,203	2,473	30	300	14%	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).
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	953	466	6,725	6,238	655%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	14,682	16,595	961	2,874	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	NG EMMONAK ARMORY	993	1,830	427	1,264	127%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	NG KOTLIK ARMORY	1,060	1,413	427	780	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Army	NG SAVOONGA ARMORY	1,190	1,771	121	702	59%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	221	1,538	653	1,970	889%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	3,528	9,643	405	6,520	185%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	26,925	86,439	2,392	61,906	230%	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).
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	23,544	30,328	5,886	12,670	54%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	102,975	124,291	20,956	42,272	41%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	13,877	15,163	66	1,352	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).
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	13,204	20,338	342	7,476	57%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	470,205	935,715	18,184	483,694	103%	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).
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	5,739	20,431	3,490	18,182	317%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	196,787	210,538	11,370	25,121	13%	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.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,019	2,516	665	1,162	58%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	23,468	29,491	912	6,935	30%	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.
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	14,049	19,094	435	5,480	39%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	49,055	35,511	23,364	9,820	20%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	40,349	38,529	5,706	3,886	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).
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	9,413	46,786	1,337	38,710	411%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	0	78	41	119	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC (SOUTH)	0	140	2	142	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,091	1,250	6	165	15%	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.
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	51	26	89	64	126%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAU AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	0	476	104	580	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	51,016	55,165	1,980	6,129	12%	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.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	7,283	7,902	3,759	4,378	60%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	620	2,198	36	1,614	260%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	93,544	89,873	13,635	9,964	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	6,434	7,041	25	632	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).
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	11,614	14,790	464	3,640	31%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	32,658	36,926	3,043	7,311	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	269	1,520	609	1,860	691%	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).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	848	1,219	156	527	62%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BAINBRIDGE NTC	7,959	33,264	196	25,501	320%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,167	5,462	680	975	19%	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.
Maine	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	21,800	30,157	1,239	9,596	44%	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.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	600	780	303	483	80%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHINA LAKE NAWS	36,915	103,740	4,499	71,324	193%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	63,482	59,990	9,716	6,224	10%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	15,006	18,128	1,284	4,406	29%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 7) 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	5,921	7,108	369	1,556	26%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	17,365	20,086	508	3,229	19%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	15,423	17,565	1,218	3,360	22%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	26,999	33,539	557	7,097	26%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	336	337	32	33	10%	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	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	30,830	34,845	2,056	6,071	20%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	26,516	28,166	1,070	2,720	10%	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) Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	5,457	5,910	1,687	2,140	39%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,167	2,194	2,020	2,047	94%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	8,480	10,440	5,825	7,785	92%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	27,612	32,899	2,297	7,584	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	9,343	11,686	3,398	5,741	61%	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.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	601	1,001	38	438	73%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	45,313	74,824	3,538	33,049	73%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,613	3,872	112	371	10%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,700	3,638	802	740	20%	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	LEMOORE NAS	17,648	19,075	1,605	3,032	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,182	2,448	129	395	18%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	539	751	114	326	60%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	3,108	4,709	159	1,760	57%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	51,298	62,953	2,150	13,805	27%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	10,749	13,980	1,803	5,034	47%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,109	2,750	1,013	654	21%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	16,334	18,815	346	2,827	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,162	6,610	790	1,238	20%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored 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.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	43,306	45,587	3,531	5,812	13%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	39,816	46,896	9,372	16,452	41%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	76,320	59,557	30,352	13,589	18%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	49,048	85,357	7,126	43,435	89%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	34,710	44,149	277	9,716	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	9,571	11,578	894	2,901	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).
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	15,480	18,627	495	3,642	24%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	9,638	13,050	2,060	5,472	57%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	9,298	7,897	3,137	1,736	19%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	2,379	5,725	170	3,516	148%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,869	1,249	1,017	397	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	POINT MUGU NAWS	17,611	19,205	994	2,588	15%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	2,565	2,936	152	523	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PORT HUENEME NCBC	10,719	10,444	1,454	1,179	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	100,754	106,096	9,969	15,311	15%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	1,638	1,759	208	329	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,141	949	2,432	2,240	196%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	7,159	2,961	8,828	4,630	65%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	5,665	7,793	594	2,722	48%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	36,566	21,610	30,774	15,818	43%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	16,608	18,288	1,261	2,941	18%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	4,433	5,128	4,233	4,928	111%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,304	41,560	7,412	6,668	16%	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.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	53	53	39	39	74%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	6,517	7,827	1,306	2,616	40%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4,030	4,041	930	941	23%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	25,336	31,659	3,200	9,523	38%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	15,580	21,933	1,636	7,989	51%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	YORKTOWN NWS	42,340	51,408	3,834	12,902	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	13,220	23,388	360	10,528	80%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	40,423	74,576	2,129	36,282	90%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	3,701	7,001	588	3,888	105%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	10,845	22,201	1,067	12,423	115%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Air Force	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT	337	5,627	236	5,526	1638%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	33,939	44,737	1,039	11,837	35%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	11,905	12,669	1,143	1,907	16%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	13,475	52,419	3,105	42,049	312%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	10,686	11,603	162	1,079	10%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	BEALE	105,455	328,156	6,613	229,314	217%	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 – 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.
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	8,980	11,391	122	2,533	28%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	8,843	9,874	455	1,486	17%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	729	617	209	97	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	455	206	509	260	57%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS CITY-BASE	5,653	8,099	425	2,871	51%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	21,776	27,749	818	6,791	31%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	0	729	110	839	N/A	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	9,797	13,817	299	4,319	44%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	82	123	39	80	97%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	85	507	40	462	541%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	12,961	38,555	4,194	29,788	230%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	79,308	107,604	8,217	36,513	46%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	8,042	11,164	157	3,279	41%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	62,297	74,433	327	12,463	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	33,695	43,723	1,726	11,754	35%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHENA RIVER	0	225	10	235	N/A	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	3,252	4,211	120	1,079	33%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	484	3,402	86	3,004	621%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	437	1,394	33	990	227%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	5,183	7,295	65	2,177	42%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	36,256	69,611	6,553	39,908	110%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	5,922	9,201	3,368	6,647	112%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	893	2,344	445	1,896	212%	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.
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	1,322	8,354	361	7,393	559%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	66,309	77,062	4,841	15,594	24%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	28,702	37,905	6,689	15,892	55%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	39,792	168,489	23,060	151,757	381%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	ELLINGTON	992	929	1,925	1,862	188%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	20,027	22,831	930	3,734	19%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	41,249	57,051	4,459	20,261	49%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	83	3,226	41	3,184	3821%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	261	243	287	269	103%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	15,239	22,818	539	8,118	53%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	254	275	24	45	18%	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	5,999	6,973	731	1,705	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	GEORGE	50,597	62,199	3,100	14,702	29%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	4,183	5,987	119	1,923	46%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	2,386	5,165	418	3,197	134%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	558	4,032	90	3,564	639%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	106	55	161	N/A	New Site.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	13,373	14,066	2,112	2,805	21%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	226	2,363	129	2,266	1005%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	11,458	16,337	844	5,723	50%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	186,540	194,782	18,807	27,049	15%	
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	41,604	39,837	9,199	7,432	18%	
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	19,442	20,073	3,024	3,655	19%	
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	9,380	11,439	1,718	3,777	40%	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.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	19,804	31,376	3,959	15,531	78%	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.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	68,646	74,756	8,804	14,914	22%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	117,404	136,643	7,888	27,127	23%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	36,886	46,823	5,945	15,882	43%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	15,990	23,439	4,318	11,767	74%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	12,950	15,762	989	3,801	29%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	993	2,337	40	1,384	139%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	3,447	4,899	149	1,601	46%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	319	596	16	293	92%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	K.I. SAWYER	32,713	56,125	821	24,233	74%	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.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	755	3,159	196	2,600	344%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,259	3,517	123	381	12%	1) 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, technology was ineffective).
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	27,476	43,881	298	16,703	61%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	29,545	46,607	2,379	19,441	66%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	45,465	103,348	38,405	96,288	212%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	5,344	10,541	236	5,433	102%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	4,278	5,005	350	1,077	25%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	7,129	14,567	1,653	9,091	128%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	83	291	31	239	286%	New Site.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	13,890	19,995	627	6,732	48%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	0	1,173	24	1,197	N/A	New Site.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	600	6,282	12	5,694	948%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,254	1,258	117	121	10%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	7,838	15,255	376	7,793	99%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	34,577	40,010	3,366	8,799	25%	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.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	0	1,471	463	1,934	N/A	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	7,563	20,791	2,945	16,173	214%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	0	88	20	108	N/A	New Site.
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	228	351	324	447	197%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
California	Air Force	MATHER	64,625	114,803	868	51,046	79%	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.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	88,898	104,878	20,264	36,244	41%	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 – 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	263	1,396	30	1,163	442%	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).
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	5,698	13,067	431	7,800	137%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	10,992	14,953	2,507	6,468	59%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	1,617	3,872	794	3,049	188%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	490	1,809	134	1,453	297%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	6,465	8,370	240	2,145	33%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	5,315	15,860	1,046	11,591	218%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	2,716	6,136	201	3,621	133%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	4,717	5,190	372	845	18%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	4,855	7,784	871	3,800	78%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	7,475	11,043	3,656	7,224	97%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	320	7,603	1,228	8,511	2659%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	NORTON	11,777	17,069	369	5,661	48%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	4,496	5,353	143	1,000	22%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	22,150	19,067	5,978	2,895	13%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	15,095	23,908	755	9,568	63%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	26,021	39,506	454	13,939	54%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	1,642	1,923	395	676	41%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	0	416	602	1,018	N/A	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	0	166	615	781	N/A	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	13,256	10,429	14,100	11,273	85%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	0	352	10	362	N/A	New Site.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	84	75	41	32	38%	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	228	117	246	135	60%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	Air Force	REESE	13,385	14,426	1,281	2,322	17%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	36,786	39,932	1,478	4,624	13%	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.
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	254	322	10	78	31%	
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,214	1,893	1,785	2,464	203%	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.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	83	88	26	31	37%	Project Scope – Added or removed requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,125	1,670	599	1,144	102%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	36,983	56,018	2,046	21,081	57%	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	SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD STATION	0	4	44	48	N/A	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	5,087	10,491	1,248	6,652	131%	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.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	2,222	5,045	174	2,997	135%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Iowa	Air Force	SIOUX CTY APT ANG	254	458	8	212	83%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	Air Force	SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	2	323	325	N/A	New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	1,450	2,499	70	1,119	77%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	19,815	23,730	2,900	6,815	34%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	1,186	12	1,198	N/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	43,192	46,056	2,330	5,194	12%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	7,638	3,781	5,452	1,595	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	95,210	101,346	5,208	11,344	12%	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.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	4,196	6,266	880	2,950	70%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	438	225	637	424	97%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	663	10,846	1,467	11,650	1756%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	1,597	3,584	220	2,207	138%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	83	5,294	26	5,237	6286%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	13,810	15,933	5,673	7,796	56%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,856	4,583	473	2,200	77%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,593	3,564	8,604	8,575	239%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	56,038	82,386	2,908	29,256	52%	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.
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	895	1,104	36	245	27%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	853	2,340	285	1,772	208%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	36,493	41,970	2,600	8,077	22%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	38,406	47,118	2,383	11,095	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	4,425	6,524	313	2,412	55%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	3,744	3,828	325	409	11%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	4,011	4,104	304	397	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).
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	0	62	5	67	N/A	New Site.
California	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	34	1,265	10	1,241	3703%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ANIAC ARPT	31	39	25	33	103%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ANNETTE ISL LAND FLD	9,359	10,581	2	1,224	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	537	598	32	93	17%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	13,249	20,934	36	7,721	58%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	158,547	180,493	8,226	30,172	19%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	941	1,049	45	153	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	BETHLEHEM LOADING	52	2,128	84	2,160	4169%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	218,990	250,947	3,426	35,383	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	2,902	4,148	120	1,366	47%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,242	3,486	74	318	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).
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	568	699	34	165	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	834	1,641	227	1,034	124%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	24,633	36,154	321	11,842	48%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	72	238	3	169	234%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	46,322	153,329	1,720	108,727	235%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	14,822	39,303	72	24,553	166%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	4,504	6,476	229	2,201	49%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAMP FANNIN	45,144	63,373	62	18,291	41%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	130,615	144,221	2,915	16,521	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	4,230	1,663	9,412	6,845	162%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	4,614	7,677	6	3,069	67%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	47	36	70	59	127%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	4,302	7,723	37	3,458	80%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	100	20	160	80	81%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	35,440	37,743	1,620	3,923	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) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	217	210	289	282	130%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,242	1,368	845	971	78%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	90,526	106,824	1,384	17,682	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,050	5,615	51	616	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	646	708	98	160	25%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	3,716	5,884	1,497	3,665	99%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	487	404	595	512	105%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	1,376	57,651	155	56,430	4102%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	13,960	84,319	3,517	73,876	529%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	154	391	261	498	322%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	925	1,247	127	449	49%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,248	2,734	50	536	24%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	3,572	4,069	1,100	1,597	45%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	23,346	30,573	518	7,745	33%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	76	99	98	127%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	635	4,458	39	3,862	608%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	229	135	577	483	211%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	34	144	91	201	601%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	3,860	6,446	1,032	3,618	94%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	10,049	11,078	1,302	2,331	23%	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 cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	8,504	7,223	2,385	1,104	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).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	947	1,181	71	305	32%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	305	3,333	62	3,090	1014%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Guam	FUDS	IBANEZ/GUERRERO PROPERTIES	174	182	40	48	28%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	3,518	4,238	534	1,254	36%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	707	728	63	84	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 by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	661	1,457	53	849	128%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	16,348	21,123	113	4,888	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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).
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	2,095	2,140	249	294	14%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	8,127	11,638	134	3,645	45%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	29,412	42,238	547	13,373	45%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	227	248	14	35	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	2,447	3,023	155	731	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	700	959	35	294	42%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	2,077	3,854	813	2,590	125%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	491	514	120	143	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,609	6,900	375	666	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	178	280	3	105	59%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	258	646	61	449	174%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MARPI POINT FIELD	3,133	4,173	246	1,286	41%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	10,875	13,967	75	3,167	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	83	101	13	31	37%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Florida	FUDS	MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN RANGE	645	718	38	111	17%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	621	317	377	73	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 by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,945	2,298	31	384	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,023	19,205	2,588	6,770	45%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	7,585	9,735	731	2,881	38%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,935	1,859	732	656	34%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	7,354	7,835	698	1,179	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	358	700	81	423	118%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION WATSONVILLE	25	47	18	40	156%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
West Virginia	FUDS	NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	0	486	53	539	N/A	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	2,853	3,246	72	465	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	259	560	123	424	164%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	0	124	490	614	N/A	New Site.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	320	581	34	295	92%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,129	5,807	174	1,852	45%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	1,585	1,982	58	455	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 address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	874	1,746	736	1,608	184%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13	166	11	164	1240%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 41/43	136	3,309	39	3,212	2359%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	184	555	39	410	223%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	3,897	5,690	375	2,168	56%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE SITE BAY	1,242	1,506	220	484	39%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,191	1,220	563	592	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).
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,123	3,393	339	609	19%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NORTHWAY ACS	1,325	1,808	340	823	62%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,028	2,364	34	370	18%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	584	648	490	554	95%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	4,220	4,423	1,174	1,377	33%	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	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	4,073	7,267	30	3,224	79%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	FUDS	OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE WORKS	2,512	5,163	23	2,674	106%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PEDRO DOME	30	38	72	80	261%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	PETALUMA BOMBING TARGET	93	12,057	14	11,978	12814%	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).
Florida	FUDS	PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	2,028	9,012	33	7,017	346%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	4,917	5,421	83	587	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 by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	15,347	19,557	168	4,378	29%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	920	1,080	32	192	21%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	3,648	4,072	48	472	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	334	294	474	434	130%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	17,708	20,196	286	2,774	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,547	1,886	632	971	63%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	10	56	10	56	550%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	720	713	250	243	34%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	104	82	48	26	25%	Need reason(s) from USACE
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,193	1,798	94	699	59%	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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,145	2,646	68	569	27%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	93	168	25	100	106%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	487	510	86	109	22%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	85,042	94,668	32	9,658	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	10,919	10,001	2,340	1,422	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	4,344	6,632	178	2,466	57%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	1,639	2,070	2,010	2,441	149%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	15,535	19,371	44	3,880	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).
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	673	890	49	266	40%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	47	98	55	106	227%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	28,653	30,577	885	2,809	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 – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Iowa	FUDS	WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	108	156	35	83	77%	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).
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	1,903	2,104	71	272	14%	New Site.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER SPECIAL WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	80	492	14	426	530%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	WESTERN REMOUNT AREA & RECEPTION CENTER	0	663	4	667	N/A	New Site.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	2,091	1,472	1,280	661	32%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	2,145	2,220	609	684	32%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	3,679	4,115	145	581	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	42,524	48,810	256	6,542	15%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	YOLO COUNTY AIRPORT	0	98	5	103	N/A	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	412	427	67	82	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).