FY 2018 DEP ARC

Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	21	21	43	43	198%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	109,591	120,893	3,031	14,333	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	1,005	1,570	609	1,174	117%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	201	33	284	116	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).
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	17,078	19,267	1,016	3,205	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).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,194	1,677	99	582	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).
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	3,500	4,278	50	828	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.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	206	611	115	520	252%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	2,648	4,217	119	1,688	64%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	324	262	182	120	37%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	13,321	12,905	2,673	2,257	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	Army	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX	490	1	810	321	65%	New Site.
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	7,653	11,651	1,021	5,019	66%	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.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	341	352	268	279	82%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	47,419	46,500	6,436	5,517	12%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	42,732	63,466	282	21,016	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).
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	23,827	26,852	888	3,913	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	14,119	31,471	3,752	21,104	149%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,040	1,079	74	113	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	6,045	6,551	5,643	6,149	102%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 GILLEM	5,984	2,474	5,858	2,348	39%	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.
New York	Army	FORT HAMILTON	79	907	122	950	1209%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	1,548	1,561	170	183	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	1,948	1,949	229	230	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).
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	12,738	16,761	1,106	5,129	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	411	957	99	645	157%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	27,101	29,444	3,108	5,451	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).
District of Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	108	376	4	272	251%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FORT MONMOUTH	13,969	17,792	493	4,316	31%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	FORT ORD	211,326	260,115	16,619	65,408	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.
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	449	399	848	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	26,609	33,203	4,396	10,990	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	3,354	5,006	77	1,729	52%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	11,943	11,586	2,058	1,701	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).
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	2,232	2,526	240	534	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	41,672	46,664	3,089	8,081	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) New Site.
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	77,274	98,744	6,152	27,622	36%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,896	21,079	349	19,532	1030%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	30,157	69,325	1,287	40,455	134%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	3,489	19,454	142	16,107	462%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	14,575	34,342	1,395	21,162	145%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	3,362	12,802	8	9,448	281%	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	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,215	853	610	248	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).
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	3,430	3,298	633	501	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	6	27	16	37	602%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	3	27	19	43	1402%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	9	31	6	28	303%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	JFHQ NE ARNG	0	22	3	25	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	0	44	10	54	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 York	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	50	94	14	58	116%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	69	55	67	53	76%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	JFHQ UT ARNG	0	22	17	39	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).
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	6	87	36	117	1908%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	0	69	6	75	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	25,098	30,348	757	6,007	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	1,108	1,839	927	1,658	150%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	4,445	5,167	592	1,314	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	115	111	53	49	42%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	49,003	82,361	7,578	40,936	84%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,500	2,374	482	356	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	654	756	120	222	34%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	35,748	95,403	1,651	61,306	171%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,693	3,370	375	1,052	39%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2,962	2,834	662	534	18%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	6,759	7,298	294	833	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).
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	1,068	1,982	58	972	91%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	79,572	118,440	1,505	40,373	51%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,778	31,988	10,766	11,976	39%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,480	1,725	112	357	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).
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	21,850	27,846	4,448	10,444	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) 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.
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	7,367	10,550	1,254	4,437	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).
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,298	2,657	92	451	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.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	4,228	26,831	205	22,808	539%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	52	51	123	122	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).
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	4,478	5,274	98	894	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	1,234	1,252	337	355	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	30,949	31,748	18,125	18,924	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	Army	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	100	98	109	107	107%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	49,271	54,985	2,769	8,483	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.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	9,579	9,179	1,785	1,385	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).
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	30,324	30,909	3,372	3,957	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) 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	38,226	68,269	1,420	31,463	82%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	4,342	7,241	153	3,052	70%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,084	1,275	209	400	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Missouri	Army	WELDON SPRING TRAINING AREA	2,000	2,714	98	812	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).
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	3,479	2,981	1,524	1,026	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).
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	38,107	37,659	7,727	7,279	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	359	253	299	193	54%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	686	1,616	705	1,635	238%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	BANGOR NSB	101,741	146,672	2,784	47,715	47%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	2,087	2,189	162	264	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.
Tennessee	Navy	BRISTOL NWIRP	357	355	189	187	52%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	13,501	18,516	1,991	7,006	52%	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).
Hawaii	Navy	CAMP H.M. SMITH OAHU	1,446	1,405	1,264	1,223	85%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	139,207	140,772	12,718	14,283	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC	1,628	1,829	14	215	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).
Maryland	Navy	CARDEROCK NSWC	37	201	260	424	1154%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,100	11,528	1,652	2,080	19%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	123	943	269	1,089	889%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,617	50,258	850	9,491	23%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	61,850	60,446	8,111	6,707	11%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	4,958	3,710	2,146	898	18%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	6,013	6,476	442	905	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	15,067	16,769	733	2,435	16%	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.
Virginia	Navy	DAM NECK FCTC	1,842	2,988	496	1,642	89%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	DIXON NRTF	878	1,323	98	543	62%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Navy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	474	521	15	62	13%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	8,408	8,222	1,187	1,001	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	3,682	2,109	3,165	1,592	43%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	19,627	18,408	7,381	6,162	31%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,770	13,154	2,878	2,262	16%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	177,294	186,366	8,523	17,595	10%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	37,017	42,601	4,275	9,859	27%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	11,686	13,529	3,444	5,287	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 – 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	17,752	19,759	2,908	4,915	28%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,308	3,321	494	507	15%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,038	6,789	725	4,476	147%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	1,275	1,050	404	179	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	2,599	2,937	933	1,271	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).
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,171	4,204	361	1,394	44%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	780	1,071	475	766	98%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	61,473	65,971	4,620	9,118	15%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	28,383	31,571	3,104	6,292	22%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	12,243	16,309	678	4,744	39%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	82,289	85,172	13,358	16,241	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 – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	90,984	167,207	7,033	83,256	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	35,462	38,448	4,582	7,568	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).
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	15,432	16,248	2,274	3,090	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 – 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.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	327	493	1	167	51%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,071	4,326	178	3,433	321%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	217	418	39	240	110%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	32,169	30,877	4,493	3,201	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).
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	3,400	3,509	673	782	23%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	9,147	8,265	2,094	1,212	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	PORTSMOUTH NSY	4,958	5,035	441	518	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,422	3,720	519	817	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).
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	1,994	3,256	358	1,620	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).
California	Navy	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	2,948	2,945	518	515	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	2,032	2,466	666	1,100	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 – 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	7,039	8,653	808	2,422	34%	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	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	2,841	898	2,538	595	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NSB	0	500	69	569	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	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	9,232	13,983	2,109	6,860	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	STOCKTON NCS	0	1,446	482	1,928	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).
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	200,991	218,221	85,766	102,996	51%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	22,574	24,448	1,552	3,426	15%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	256,093	261,969	29,854	35,730	14%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	7,575	8,350	291	1,066	14%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	47,335	49,156	6,806	8,627	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).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	218	510	168	460	210%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	22,605	26,755	1,202	5,352	24%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	744	984	329	569	76%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	80,640	89,955	8,089	17,404	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.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	36,099	40,860	1,074	5,835	16%	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.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	58,966	56,172	9,944	7,150	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	53,543	61,121	5,538	13,116	24%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,251	3,564	128	441	14%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	31,503	48,445	1,240	18,182	58%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	134,296	154,117	6,433	26,254	20%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	13,257	14,413	280	1,436	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	20,645	22,309	462	2,126	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).
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	4,798	6,524	208	1,934	40%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	43,185	54,815	2,621	14,251	33%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,124	1,236	14	126	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	26,061	28,770	132	2,841	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	12,661	17,863	268	5,470	43%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	10,716	13,480	108	2,872	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	4,568	5,493	64	989	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).
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	23,121	50,919	565	28,363	123%	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	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	3,684	6,812	96	3,224	88%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	9,385	10,484	384	1,483	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,499	2,805	39	345	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	8,738	10,998	512	2,772	32%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	109,761	124,241	3,271	17,751	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,214	2,533	123	442	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).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	11,435	14,496	208	3,269	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	7,509	25,499	140	18,130	241%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	98,717	108,976	2,269	12,528	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) 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	598,268	652,790	11,943	66,465	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	43,535	50,734	2,421	9,620	22%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	33,868	44,544	5,552	16,228	48%	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.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	16,245	35,902	820	20,477	126%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	58,397	63,955	467	6,025	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).
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	6,503	9,168	708	3,373	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,143	3,489	21	367	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	7,000	18,394	294	11,688	167%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	7,167	8,226	172	1,231	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	13,752	20,293	1,015	7,556	55%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	3,901	4,300	65	464	12%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	301,552	361,493	3,998	63,939	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 – 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.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	33,534	31,480	6,725	4,671	14%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	38,866	44,317	1,346	6,797	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). 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,192	11,388	1,383	1,579	14%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	104,559	122,763	10,810	29,014	28%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	46,028	47,412	3,884	5,268	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	50,404	57,310	6,232	13,138	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.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	261,804	288,434	3,666	30,296	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	22,893	25,778	597	3,482	15%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	5,393	9,593	229	4,429	82%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	10,563	14,249	95	3,781	36%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	936	1,070	19	153	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	2,156	2,382	28	254	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	6,589	10,286	269	3,966	60%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	58,322	90,009	2,556	34,243	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).
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	50,585	58,587	1,587	9,589	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.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	28,164	31,827	599	4,262	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. 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maine	Air Force	LORING	18,929	31,150	468	12,689	67%	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).
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,668	8,053	262	1,647	25%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	MARCH	125,885	131,004	7,131	12,250	10%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	MATHER	123,529	148,263	2,346	27,080	22%	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	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	90,283	110,386	2,519	22,622	25%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,228	2,581	39	392	18%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	15,414	17,836	672	3,094	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 – 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.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	12,761	58,387	1,055	46,681	366%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	12,382	21,620	1,016	10,254	83%	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).
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	19,013	30,268	1,330	12,585	66%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,856	7,862	96	2,102	36%	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).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	9,315	9,698	833	1,216	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	NORTON	10,589	11,865	748	2,024	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).
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	39,170	81,251	1,990	44,071	113%	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.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	6,346	24,201	150	18,005	284%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	115,858	167,849	16,005	67,996	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) 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	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	37	132,310	50,116	182,389	496216%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	49,684	76,029	3,991	30,336	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).
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	4,122	18,108	124	14,110	342%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	34,526	39,126	735	5,335	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	REESE	22,923	195,734	4,120	176,931	772%	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).
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,931	11,065	156	8,290	283%	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).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	1,750	7,132	133	5,515	315%	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).
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	45,546	57,370	1,016	12,840	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) 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,535	4,283	64	812	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).
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	770	879	216	325	42%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	14,581	16,335	616	2,370	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	8,656	9,496	340	1,180	14%	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	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	4,346	4,936	156	746	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	2,930	3,179	156	405	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	14,550	27,178	444	13,072	90%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	67,939	89,863	4,311	26,235	39%	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	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	97,477	113,924	3,898	20,345	21%	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.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	165	106	121	62	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	195,886	209,056	6,529	19,699	10%	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.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	11,015	12,628	150	1,763	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).
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	9,535	20,431	1,112	12,008	126%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	5,767	11,115	454	5,802	101%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,596	2,877	26	307	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).
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	5,425	8,992	254	3,821	70%	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.
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	19,832	38,704	811	19,683	99%	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).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	41,283	45,198	5,466	9,381	23%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	122,803	132,940	3,592	13,729	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	136,735	213,474	3,220	79,959	58%	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	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,888	2,340	66	518	27%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	11,472	13,495	1,163	3,186	28%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	108	109	26	27	25%	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).
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	1,286	2,948	78	1,740	135%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	3,714	7,746	327	4,359	117%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	669	1,630	217	1,178	176%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AUA FUEL FARM	27	7,667	41	7,681	28936%	New Site.
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	203	128	132	57	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).
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	2,499	2,493	258	252	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	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	99	5,281	787	5,969	6027%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	BETHEL ARPT	3,751	6,367	21	2,637	70%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	3,625	4,454	702	1,531	42%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	24,131	29,345	453	5,667	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	153	223	17	87	57%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	19,876	24,320	386	4,830	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).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	180	233	58	111	62%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	32,035	44,873	560	13,398	42%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	33	31	69	67	206%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	1,888	2,354	249	715	38%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	21,477	36,592	121	15,236	71%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP STONEMAN	15	13,402	15	13,402	87507%	New Site.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	6,351	29,372	116	23,137	364%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	2,007	640	1,593	226	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).
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	326	586	7	267	82%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,412	1,554	44	186	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	21,010	23,215	1,745	3,950	19%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,892	3,796	1,958	1,862	48%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	283	488	431	636	225%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP TRAINING SITE	19,927	23,812	88	3,973	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	103	182	300	379	367%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR STATION	2,987	4,650	3	1,666	56%	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	1,157	1,434	18	295	26%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	1,226	1,325	39	138	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,070	2,239	101	270	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).
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	9,236	10,521	321	1,606	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	726	1,601	74	949	131%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	521	669	69	217	42%	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).
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	331	404	23	96	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	622	1,499	31	908	146%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	320	1,170	61	911	285%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	401	1,275	83	957	238%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	320	1,282	55	1,017	318%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	1,369	1,992	60	683	50%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	1,224	1,505	41	322	26%	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.
Louisiana	FUDS	FORMER CAMP CLAIBORNE	28,233	30,654	559	2,980	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.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	1,243	5,180	52	3,989	321%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	16,803	19,068	9	2,274	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	13,695	14,853	588	1,746	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).
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	7,202	7,839	1,259	1,896	26%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	403	351	99	47	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).
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	63	65	40	42	66%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,794	1,754	1,029	989	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).
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	4,778	5,697	1,113	2,032	43%	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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	12,983	13,683	1,168	1,868	14%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	3,229	3,135	443	349	11%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	276	292	192	208	76%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	77	73	70	66	87%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,311	1,789	90	568	43%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,504	3,680	275	451	13%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,444	1,642	18	216	15%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	1,340	3,018	160	1,838	137%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,555	1,588	156	189	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	541	1,285	91	835	154%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	158	691	343	876	553%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	12,789	14,130	23	1,364	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	848	421	1,048	621	73%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	359	152	324	117	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).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	68	302	24	258	377%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	69	336	29	296	426%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	5,144	7,427	89	2,372	46%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	163	225	16	78	48%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	5,053	5,731	1,216	1,894	37%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	484	852	41	409	85%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	2,850	2,909	273	332	12%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE RANGE	15	142	15	142	925%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	315	5,549	100	5,334	1691%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	323	295	120	92	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	452	519	121	188	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).
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	5,456	6,008	40	592	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).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	2,436	5,191	1,140	3,895	160%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	5,530	9,507	2,022	5,999	108%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	2,787	3,295	52	560	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).
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	19	39	20	40	204%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	128	127	69	68	54%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE BU 34/35	150	95	2,362	2,307	1537%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE BU 51/52	3,322	3,826	23	527	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).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	372	510	42	180	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,325	2,351	215	1,241	94%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	142	9	296	163	115%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	28	111	85	168	611%	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).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	45	56	70	81	180%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	6,800	7,840	434	1,474	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	NIKE SITE BAY	2,697	2,939	937	1,179	44%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	878	1,018	72	212	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).
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	99	105	204	210	212%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	1,333	1,382	239	288	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	NORTHWAY ACS	1,435	1,522	79	166	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	1,657	1,978	80	401	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	106	70	97	61	57%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	37	74	76	113	308%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	242	4,087	596	4,441	1835%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	12,771	11,941	4,704	3,874	30%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	8,719	4,803	7,140	3,224	37%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ohio	FUDS	OHIO RUBBER COMPANY	2,861	2,429	716	284	10%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	ORDNANCE PLAN	12,123	22,115	6,190	16,182	133%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	3,606	3,985	82	461	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	4,185	4,779	4	598	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	82	167	12	97	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).
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	2,904	6,931	2,156	6,183	213%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	7,083	7,968	4,750	5,635	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	2,325	3,078	66	819	35%	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	RICHMOND NAS	313	137	466	290	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) 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	54	59	200	205	379%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,440	2,446	59	1,065	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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	6	6	143	143	2332%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	7,111	16,069	119	9,077	128%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	34,860	34,296	25,204	24,640	71%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	STEWART AFB	6,693	7,901	15	1,223	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	266	648	63	445	167%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	TIGALDA ISLAND	352	128	277	53	15%	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,962	768	2,403	1,209	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).
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	322	217	427	322	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).
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4,227	4,655	40	468	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.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	104	139	22	57	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).
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	103	108	22	27	26%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	354	665	44	355	100%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,179	9,316	97	2,234	31%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	26,856	30,741	464	4,349	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).
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	64,214	68,716	2,084	6,586	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	7,250	7,698	1,451	1,899	26%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	2,693	4,081	62	1,450	54%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).