Defense Environmental Programs

Annual Report to Congress

for FY 2016

June 2018

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense
for Acquisition and Sustainment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDICES

I. INTRODUCTION

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

- The funding invested in and progress of the Department of Defense's (DoD) environmental programs – Environmental Restoration, Environmental Quality (EQ), and Environmental Technology – in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2711 (Sections II-IV);

- The Department's ongoing decontamination activities on withdrawn or reserved lands in accordance with section 2916(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66) (Section V); and

- A list of DoD installations and Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) properties where DoD obligated funding in FY 2016, as well as reasons for increases in cleanup cost estimates since FY 2015, in accordance with language in House Report 113-113, accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014 (Section VI, Appendix A, and Appendix B).

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

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

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

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

* Includes all applicable congressional funding additions for FY 2012 through FY 2017.

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

** Excludes $50.5 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

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

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

II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

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

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

Environmental Restoration Goals

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

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

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

Table 2: RC Goals and Progress*

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

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

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

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

IRP Site Status and Funding

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

Table 3: IRP Site Status

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

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

[1] The Department measures the number of sites at RIP, which occurs when cleanup systems are constructed and operational.

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

Table 4: IRP Funding* (millions of dollars)

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

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

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

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

++ FY 2012 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

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

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

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

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

MRS Status and Funding

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

Table 5: MRS Status

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

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

+ DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

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

Table 6: MMRP Funding (millions of dollars)*

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

* This table does not include program management for the MMRP.

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

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

++ FY 2012 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

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

BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding

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

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

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

* Includes prior year funds and land sale revenue.

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

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

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

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

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

Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout (millions of dollars)

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

* FY 2018 amounts include anticipated land sale revenue.

\+ Due to rounding, subtotals and the DoD total may not equal FY totals.

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

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

*** This total differs from the value in Table 1 and the Operation & Maintenance Overview ($415.5 million) because this value includes the $2 million of prior year funds from DLA.

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

III. EQ PROGRAMS

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

Compliance

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

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

Table 9: Compliance Program Funding (millions of dollars)

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

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

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

Overall Trend Analysis

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

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

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

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

Natural and Cultural Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall Trend Analysis

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

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

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

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

Pollution Prevention

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall Trend Analysis

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

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

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

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

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

+ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps.

** Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies.

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

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

Overall Trend Analysis

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

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

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

Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

.

V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES

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

Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana

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

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

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

Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range (CMAGR), California

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Account for any increase of 10 percent or more in an installation's or property's projected cost estimate over the prior year estimate (detailed in Appendix B).

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

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

[2] The FY 2015 cost estimates are adjusted for inflation and work completed in FY 2016 to compare the estimates more accurately.
[3] If a location's liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested in FY 2016 but the cost estimate change was less than $25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers $25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.
[4] If a location's FY 2016 cost estimate increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2015 estimate but the cost estimate change was less than $25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers $25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.

FY 2016 DEP ARC

Appendix A

Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

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

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

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Army	1LT CHARLES L. WAPLES USARC	217	0	23	(194)	No explanation required.
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	0	234	72	306	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	109,964	107,267	9,511	6,814	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59	58	72	71	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	0	0	247	247	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	11,330	12,869	410	1,949	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	20,644	18,111	2,699	166	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.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	350	551	98	299	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	1,273	1,418	5	150	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	75,735	42,504	815	(32,416)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1,197	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	2,070	1,054	67	(949)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	320	1,154	6	840	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,359	1,215	29	(115)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	161	0	19	(142)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	17,843	12,237	1,762	(3,844)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY AIRFIELD	1,759	1,203	127	(429)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,350	3,284	286	1,220	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	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	6,758	3,257	50	(3,451)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	384	272	32	(80)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	2,501	2,501	93	93	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	69	34	986	951	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,455	6,524	5,736	5,805	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Army	CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	56,363	53,357	3,122	116	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,406	8,074	781	449	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	10,406	9,571	443	(392)	No explanation required.
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	138,243	44,835	7,374	(86,034)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	1,402	600	448	(354)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	39,934	43,495	2,703	6,264	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	79,917	38,722	12	(41,183)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	144,322	143,116	12	(1,194)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	31,316	23,365	554	(7,397)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	161	61	54	(46)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	15,959	16,544	1,838	2,423	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	17,493	40,089	2,715	25,311	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	40,296	34,501	147	(5,648)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	9,005	6,091	154	(2,760)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,436	6,249	396	209	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	8,140	9,628	363	1,851	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	12,266	11,199	1,138	71	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019	1,508	108	597	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	15,079	6,499	417	(8,163)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236	698	2,173	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	53,982	29,426	1,415	(23,141)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6,587	5,473	5,171	4,057	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).
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	FORT HAMILTON	130	0	32	(98)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	2,210	1,889	245	(76)	No explanation required.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	4,263	2,044	136	(2,083)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	1,281	274	112	(895)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	10,331	6,045	2,937	(1,349)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	5,027	4,842	147	(38)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1,168	95	413	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570	26,255	667	20,352	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.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	11,504	9,577	327	(1,600)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,064	1,018	131	85	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wisconsin	Army	FORT MCCOY	230	205	6	(19)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	161	116	4	(41)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	2,171	1,377	8,039	7,245	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	30	5	29	4	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	29,039	15,317	2,450	(11,272)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	13,326	9,404	964	(2,958)	No explanation required.
California	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003	15,071	23,303	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	0	694	694	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	12,035	6,259	1,273	(4,503)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	2,232	3,177	19	964	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	17,297	9,936	396	(6,965)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,478	3,433	528	2,483	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.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	8,229	6,920	101	(1,208)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	3,998	11,625	466	8,093	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	40,127	57,812	4,378	22,063	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	10	10	20	20	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	76,584	64,915	9,115	(2,554)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	GERSTLE RIVER TEST SITE	0	0	243	243	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	2,490	1,836	876	222	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	135,811	90,028	7,733	(38,050)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	10,553	10,241	622	310	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,433	9,081	203	7,851	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	46,669	45,961	7,179	6,471	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	5,494	3,608	2,987	1,101	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	7,816	14	11	(7,791)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,362	1,320	56	14	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	0	210	210	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	85,999	18,773	133	(67,093)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	284	122	87	(75)	No explanation required.
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	379	91	69	(219)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	53,088	43,967	2,565	(6,556)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1,002	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	20,656	20,762	1,644	1,750	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	5,072	10,208	590	5,726	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	744	270	44	(430)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE SITE	0	0	441	441	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KUNIA FIELD STATION	801	622	19	(160)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	130,920	109,428	1,878	(19,614)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	28,452	5,751	1,995	(20,706)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	LOMPOC BRANCH DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS	1,608	1,032	476	(100)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	56,888	53,545	1,534	(1,809)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	719	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	0	747	124	871	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.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825	1,944	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	32,509	31,438	1,217	146	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	47,533	33,609	13,062	(862)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,513	2,465	79	31	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	0	25	25	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,561	3,562	1,715	1,716	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	473	282	4,721	4,530	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,885	2,866	100	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	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	16,861	13,520	2,125	(1,216)	No explanation required.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	18,686	15,398	314	(2,974)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	1,563	1,340	681	458	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	9,797	280	8,505	(1,012)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	767	1,096	106	435	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	87,822	23,614	1,057	(63,151)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,813	30,171	860	218	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	93,597	96,899	156	3,458	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857	24,012	102,589	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	15,406	13,556	196	(1,654)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	27,219	17,846	3,789	(5,584)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	20,663	30,511	814	10,662	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	950,686	861,905	22,250	(66,531)	No explanation required.
Delaware	Army	RIVER ROAD TRAINING SITE	0	0	7	7	No explanation required.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	20,758	7,445	1,072	(12,241)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777	8,388	323	1,934	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	213,907	201,076	10,247	(2,584)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,556	2,218	364	26	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Army	SAGINAW	160	0	40	(120)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	72,527	60,966	792	(10,769)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	21,201	18,106	1,154	(1,941)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	8,009	5,399	601	(2,009)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	29,963	29,725	787	549	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	0	1,784	165	1,949	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	19,400	18,516	189	(695)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,066	1,036	209	179	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	93	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	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.
North Carolina	Army	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	170	1,049	335	1,214	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,039	4,463	97	521	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	39,145	34,457	1,484	(3,204)	No explanation required.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	21,653	2,315	1,865	(17,473)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	1,946	1,059	22	(865)	No explanation required.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	15,630	13,666	78	(1,886)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4,806	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.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228	33,730	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
New Jersey	Army	USARC CAVEN POINT	0	0	40	40	No explanation required.
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	268	140	119	(9)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	USARC LODI	48	47	21	20	No explanation required.
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Army	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC (SOUTH)	142	0	92	(50)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509	5	244	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	26	0	6	(20)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	VOLUNTEER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	21,916	20,020	450	(1,446)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAUA AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1,351	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	5,711	3,601	196	(1,914)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	WELDON SPRING TRAINING AREA	1,965	1,909	55	(1)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	56,048	57,510	438	1,900	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	8,028	3,568	123	(4,337)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,233	2,185	350	302	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	16,823	10,907	5,206	(710)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	91,311	77,484	10,309	(3,518)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	7,154	5,390	464	(1,300)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	59,766	45,301	8,799	(5,666)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	15,027	12,723	412	(1,892)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	37,722	42,751	2,030	7,059	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
District of Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	3,864	2,627	638	(599)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2,214	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS US NAVAL ACADEMY	9,675	11,015	7	1,347	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	1,239	607	1,044	412	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	33,796	32,038	397	(1,361)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	76,166	77,848	2,577	4,259	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	48,146	50,738	1,530	4,122	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	29,445	32,499	3,707	6,761	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	21,513	14,861	533	(6,119)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM NATCAPREG	315	504	297	486	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	297,943	345,881	8,178	56,116	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	16,545	17,315	4,120	4,890	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	30,640	30,124	1,218	702	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	21,729	18,852	1,442	(1,435)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	121,437	156,143	10,592	45,298	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	54,073	60,877	8,382	15,186	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC	1,994	1,655	269	(70)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	10,482	11,418	928	1,864	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	792	2,658	22	1,888	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	3,195	4,908	59	1,772	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	95,596	75,752	2,450	(17,394)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	375	118	170	(87)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	105,400	106,436	9,699	10,735	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New SIte. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,512	40,445	1,684	617	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	60,950	59,721	4,397	3,168	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oregon	Navy	COOS HEAD NAV OCEAN PROCESSING FAC.	462	281	146	(35)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	2,852	5,012	1,044	3,204	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	18,418	20,404	2,387	4,373	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620	2,979	4,628	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	7,222	5,581	357	(1,284)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	3,368	3,377	11	20	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	26,392	20,548	1,187	(4,657)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	20,407	20,070	940	603	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	17,846	17,651	458	263	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	34,076	32,156	2,433	513	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	24,653	23,265	1,592	204	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	35,403	22,880	787	(11,736)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	28,617	27,097	1,757	237	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.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	6,005	7,451	415	1,861	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	181,400	175,886	687	(4,827)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500	6,184	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90	151	18	79	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,972	1,432	80	(460)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	18,849	18,709	1,300	1,160	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	10,607	13,675	4,255	7,323	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	172,664	180,418	4,478	12,232	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New SIte. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Indiana	Navy	INDIANAPOLIS NAWC	905	762	150	7	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425	37,332	2,944	6,851	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract 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	11,873	9,998	1,310	(565)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,182	742	47	(393)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,017	961	34	(22)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	76,021	77,590	976	2,545	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	24,359	19,998	639	(3,722)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,934	4,095	417	578	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	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	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	285,186	299,359	1,635	15,808	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	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3,093	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	763	681	132	50	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	4,784	1,800	87	(2,897)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	63,960	66,444	3,120	5,604	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,715	63,167	3,448	1,900	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	MCGREGOR NWIRP	26,890	24,743	1,152	(995)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	2,794	3,431	88	725	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).
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	19,116	16,635	383	(2,098)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	6,752	675	711	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746	1,682	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	MIRAMAR MCAS	46,316	45,335	1,198	217	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	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	58,839	49,168	1,825	(7,846)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	47,646	46,157	4,268	2,779	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42,167	41,994	1,913	1,740	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328	849	8,383	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.
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	120	114	12	6	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	60,510	65,826	17,956	23,272	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	31,606	19,150	1,640	(10,816)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	10,709	9,843	659	(207)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	86,723	78,048	8,071	(604)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	1,079	704	26	(349)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	42,645	44,242	1,235	2,832	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	44,855	76,432	6,523	38,100	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	11,763	15,065	775	4,077	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,218	4,511	116	409	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	18,925	74,882	1,102	57,059	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	35,414	33,633	4,495	2,714	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	13,259	16,775	3,657	7,173	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NS	130,190	127,742	4,775	2,327	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	343	327	8	(8)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	8,023	6,076	1,057	(890)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	64,024	61,378	4,143	1,497	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	5,817	6,036	533	752	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,269	1,272	36	39	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	462	329	130	(3)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	31,815	29,280	2,638	103	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	POINT MUGU NAWS	19,512	16,598	2,580	(334)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	POMONA NIROP	0	0	85	85	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	2,983	2,927	89	33	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	10,611	9,578	345	(688)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	13,315	5,348	508	(7,459)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,427	3,342	83	(2)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	585	1,431	115	961	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS	21,063	20,407	238	(418)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	107,794	97,151	2,396	(8,247)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	121,786	106,458	8,075	(7,253)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	14,310	18,590	399	4,679	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,792	1,247	492	(53)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	4,133	6,507	3,772	6,146	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	964	1,478	171	685	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	293,111	308,855	2,635	18,379	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	3,008	2,485	504	(19)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,918	8,144	533	759	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	40,099	40,262	837	1,000	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926	41,425	2,408	25,907	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	SPOKANE NMCRC	402	0	374	(28)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ST INIGOES NISE EAST COAST DET	941	394	314	(233)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	9,170	8,817	1,192	839	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	270,211	218,615	60,622	9,026	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,387	19,756	998	367	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	18,581	17,007	1,316	(258)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	17,767	22,792	875	5,900	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	319,278	245,533	21,723	(52,022)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,210	5,775	10	575	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	4,008	6,762	290	3,044	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6,429	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	54	241	44	231	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).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18,267	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289	217	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66,950	70,115	3,526	6,691	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.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4,106	3,248	237	(621)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	32,166	20,557	4,936	(6,673)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	22,284	40,078	4,202	21,996	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,839	49,305	2,986	1,452	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).
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	26,150	16,324	789	(9,037)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	52,231	52,455	2,441	2,665	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	19,025	30,587	1,348	12,910	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	91	2,929	78	2,916	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171	35,462	373	30,664	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,540	3,107	76	643	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	23,762	34,788	2,748	13,774	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

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

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	73,817	82,569	5,859	14,611	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	3,266	6,565	2,144	5,443	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	12,872	10,669	1,688	(515)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	3,356	4,061	95	800	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	53,258	43,384	1,618	(8,256)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	54	105	5	56	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	11,789	19,138	165	7,514	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	BEALE	333,406	352,760	4,888	24,242	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	764	991	10	237	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	11,573	8,743	55	(2,775)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	10,032	23,461	180	13,609	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	4,118	2,192	10	(1,916)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,194	11,703	255	1,764	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.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	627	1,908	36	1,317	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	209	6,300	135	6,226	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.
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	469	486	5	22	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295	7,086	246	7,037	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	8,229	8,978	295	1,044	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	28,193	50,420	2,660	24,887	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	841	227	511	(103)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	741	848	674	781	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	14,038	10,359	171	(3,508)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	0	465	1,680	2,145	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	515	1,050	84	619	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	14,266	14,503	316	553	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	39,172	31,024	2,401	(5,747)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	109,326	254,209	4,771	149,654	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	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1,469	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	15,089	14,394	633	(62)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	5,377	4,368	94	(915)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	75,624	70,688	1,832	(3,104)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,355	1,083	1,695	1,423	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	44,423	22,073	1,699	(20,651)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238	14,293	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	Air Force	CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	10,139	6,134	26	(3,979)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	6,202	7,300	417	1,515	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	4,278	2,697	143	(1,438)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,495	9,405	220	3,130	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Oregon	Air Force	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	28	90	119	181	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	3,456	4,113	42	699	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	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	1,416	2,346	30	960	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	2,917	7,631	356	5,070	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Iowa	Air Force	DES MOINES	518	0	30	(488)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1,152	2,239	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	26	242	52	268	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	70,725	128,265	1,409	58,949	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	9,348	7,917	528	(903)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,333	4,884	2,358	5,909	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,382	8,098	435	6,151	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	8,488	11,344	171	3,027	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.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,143	6,325	705	887	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	78,295	98,565	2,033	22,303	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	444,018	607,907	12,027	175,916	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7,595	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	171,185	409,328	26,181	264,324	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	ELLINGTON	944	0	144	(800)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	23,196	31,199	1,936	9,939	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	13,023	14,968	1,611	3,556	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	57,964	67,664	4,305	14,005	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	3,278	7,157	98	3,977	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	247	155	1	(91)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	23,183	103,873	1,069	81,759	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.
New York	Air Force	FRANCIS S. GABRESKI (WEST HAMPTON)	666	1,109	940	1,383	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	279	671	315	707	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	145,709	224,975	22,249	101,515	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	7,085	9,781	473	3,169	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	5,270	4,910	156	(204)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	GEORGE	63,194	65,031	1,778	3,615	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,532	1,764	45	277	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	5,248	6,750	386	1,888	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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..
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1,500	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	HAYWARD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	919	604	202	(113)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	4,492	3,615	26	(851)	No explanation required.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7,317	112,980	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	40,474	35,879	5,748	1,153	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	20,394	26,746	5,560	11,912	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	668	6,152	420	5,904	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,622	10,907	374	(341)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	32,280	26,222	406	(5,652)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	109	288	89	268	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	2,465	9,943	484	7,962	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	132,993	122,856	7,874	(2,263)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	102,376	141,353	7,268	46,245	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	31,878	46,710	2,454	17,286	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	75,952	53,034	1,973	(20,945)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	138,829	184,381	3,731	49,283	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). 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.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	47,572	41,681	3,501	(2,390)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	23,814	21,194	1,332	(1,288)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	16,014	18,521	828	3,335	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 Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	31,196	27,625	2,014	(1,557)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305	57,463	5,891	6,049	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.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	116,818	214,844	6,527	104,553	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,833	3,770	252	189	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1,212	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	44,285	42,957	3,104	1,776	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	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	471	5,032	262	4,823	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	606	882	16	292	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	3,209	3,390	62	243	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	KEESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1,510	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	44,583	77,836	1,494	34,747	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	150	2,281	68	2,199	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	57,023	83,364	1,240	27,581	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	47,353	54,412	5,737	12,796	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	105,002	108,390	24,857	28,245	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Air Force	KLAMATH FALLS IAP (KINGSLEY FIELD)	184	4,194	136	4,146	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	10,710	7,548	250	(2,912)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	5,085	6,413	182	1,510	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,160	17,255	843	14,938	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	LAPORTE AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	419	0	40	(379)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	14,800	35,292	545	21,037	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	296	7,626	73	7,403	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	20,315	25,890	236	5,811	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2,979	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5,435	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	3,823	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9,641	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	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.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	1,495	620	1,147	272	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.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	21,124	24,658	1,499	5,033	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	357	2,805	93	2,541	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Air Force	MATHER	116,640	103,701	4,943	(7,996)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Air Force	MAXWELL	33,317	31,644	1,333	(340)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	106,556	98,093	5,600	(2,863)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,957	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	1,631	658	263	(710)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	MCENTIRE AIR GUARD BASE	5,418	3,373	6	(2,039)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	2,179	7,219	398	5,438	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	423	641	20	238	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	1,418	2,098	64	744	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	239	2,585	104	2,450	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.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13,276	16,072	1,593	4,389	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	142	3,248	104	3,210	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.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	15,192	14,073	690	(429)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	3,934	4,986	271	1,323	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	1,838	2,915	149	1,226	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	10,860	11,290	1,661	2,091	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	829	974	13	158	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186	3,571	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246	2,888	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3,386	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	6,234	4,984	108	(1,142)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,273	4,975	160	(138)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	7,909	9,450	927	2,468	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 IAP (ANG)	9	18	10	19	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	11,220	14,596	446	3,822	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	7,725	5,918	1,061	(746)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	NORTON	17,342	8,815	519	(8,008)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	16,844	35,500	1,187	19,843	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.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	5,439	5,748	140	449	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	8,365	15,473	221	7,329	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Connecticut	Air Force	ORANGE AIR GUARD STATION	72	205	346	479	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	19,372	48,501	2,540	31,669	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.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24,291	95,756	10,068	81,533	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	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.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	33	14	4,178	4,159	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	40,138	88,606	1,693	50,161	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247	7,577	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	423	14,004	20	13,601	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213	83	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	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.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	1,942	25	1,609	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	76	209	31	164	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	76	211	21	156	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52	1,438	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14,657	20,911	320	6,574	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Nevada	Air Force	RENO TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117	5,683	98	5,664	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,948	1,959	2,225	1,236	New Site.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743	1,873	42	1,172	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	265	168	414	317	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	56,316	66,414	10,733	20,831	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	40,571	33,423	2,504	(4,644)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	327	314	25	12	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,488	3,400	300	212	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	54	303	304	553	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,923	1,152	244	(527)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	89	1,810	52	1,773	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,387	1,920	521	(946)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,697	1,110	89	(498)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	56,914	78,437	2,186	23,709	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575	8,971	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Air Force	SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD STATION	4	10	10	16	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	10,659	13,604	607	3,552	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	55,064	74,103	1,294	20,333	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	5,126	7,470	340	2,684	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Iowa	Air Force	SIOUX CTY APT ANG	465	0	20	(445)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2	5	5	8	No explanation required.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	110	532	42	464	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	2,539	3,895	75	1,431	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	253	2,319	243	2,309	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
New York	Air Force	STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,128	3,889	36	(203)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	1,603	2,579	10	986	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	24,110	17,743	525	(5,842)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,205	4,493	156	3,444	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	46,793	55,556	8,896	17,659	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	135,210	122,622	9,566	(3,022)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,541	2,720	208	387	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	3,841	11,579	61	7,799	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	165	568	31	434	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	102,968	189,129	17,914	104,075	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366	11,636	143	5,413	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	5,865	8,118	2,247	4,500	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	181,370	268,186	28,472	115,288	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	1,093	7,050	19	5,976	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	229	86	1,501	1,358	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	8,588	4,869	3,535	(184)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,020	19,074	200	8,254	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	3,729	2,852	620	(257)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	3,641	5,973	231	2,563	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site.
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	5,379	6,076	62	759	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288	6,260	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	4,656	5,620	315	1,279	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893	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).
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	73,018	102,815	2,888	32,685	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	186	789	63	666	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	2,927	1,592	2,618	1,283	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	9,050	9,716	606	1,272	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW CUMBERLAND FAC.	7,488	5,431	334	(1,723)	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,484	3,559	122	197	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	2,377	1,515	20	(842)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	42,642	43,418	1,900	2,676	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	47,872	43,671	1,819	(2,382)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,628	6,662	424	458	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 13	20	0	1	(19)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	3,889	96	48	(3,745)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	4,170	4,161	330	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).
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 18	1,034	949	14	(71)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 68	22	0	5	(17)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	AIEA MILITARY RESERVATION	248	0	45	(203)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT #46	16	0	5	(11)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	63	41	5	(17)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	45	49	20	24	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	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	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	1,285	936	19	(330)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	12,428	10,952	149	(1,327)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	6,218	3,846	31	(2,341)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	39	3	2	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	681	643	57	19	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211	5,603	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984	23,964	1,822	11,802	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	59,873	27,409	1,222	(31,242)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	10,373	97	270	(10,006)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	6,090	2,947	41	(3,102)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729	752	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	21,269	10,228	746	(10,295)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,381	193,688	8,661	18,968	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,178	2,278	52	152	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	132	153	58	79	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	83	41	24	(18)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	403	413	10	20	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	5,973	2,097	1,024	(2,852)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,066	1,456	125	515	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	13,635	9,436	221	(3,978)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	254,962	246,395	8,681	114	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	4,214	4,253	174	213	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	FUDS	BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	5,182	52	33	(5,097)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	30,269	24,375	35	(5,859)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	3,141	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	13,826	9,642	3	(4,181)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,542	2,439	81	(1,022)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	31,888	18,923	62	(12,903)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	FUDS	BROWNWOOD AAF	20	0	17	(3)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	36,732	20,226	882	(15,624)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	2,286	161	94	(2,031)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	6,425	6,780	36	391	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	46,179	27,856	202	(18,121)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	155,782	158,915	871	4,004	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	69,254	72,688	28	3,462	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	30,075	14,926	31	(15,118)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	27,570	14,875	2,508	(10,187)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	5,350	126	83	(5,141)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	39,932	26,846	1,937	(11,149)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING RANGE	11,428	9,151	27	(2,250)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAMP EDWARDS	513	472	32	(9)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	25,511	27,076	116	1,681	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	6,580	6,867	148	435	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP FANNIN	64,387	61,390	59	(2,938)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	23,581	23,735	6	160	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	17,381	199	152	(17,030)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	146,529	88,478	5,152	(52,899)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP HOWZE (FELDERHOFF)	90,506	86,210	113	(4,183)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	27,479	23,740	232	(3,507)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP LOCKETT	17,228	12,176	168	(4,884)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877	92	26,715	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP MURPHY	599	0	49	(550)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	4,445	4,486	68	109	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	99,114	90,978	236	(7,900)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2,474	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1,254	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	9,308	7,397	1,477	(434)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	28,381	36,880	89	8,588	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	22,276	6,843	128	(15,305)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,772	14,738	62	28	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	1,690	1,414	289	13	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	2,940	2,994	50	104	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	7,800	7,802	4	6	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100	63	126	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	3,396	3,265	60	(71)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	4,053	374	31	(3,648)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,503	560	214	(729)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567	62	7,348	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 Jersey	FUDS	CAVEN PT AR TER	1,457	78	10	(1,369)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	20	0	19	(1)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,616	3,915	38	337	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CHENNAULT AFB	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	35,735	26,728	1,429	(7,578)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	20	7	10	(3)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,971	7,110	888	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).
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	38,347	44,785	2,557	8,995	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213	210	38	35	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	0	149	298	447	New Site.
Oregon	FUDS	CONDON AFS	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	21,802	12,480	208	(9,114)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	575	568	13	6	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	780	830	38	88	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	15,832	12,354	55	(3,423)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,376	22,922	31	(423)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	21,338	13,222	659	(7,457)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILMER	499	53	2	(444)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	32,200	29,620	1,025	(1,555)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,514	1,640	469	(405)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,390	263	373	(754)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484	587	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	108,533	105,857	4,521	1,845	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,218	3,001	37	(180)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	1,359	78	99	(1,182)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	604	351	77	(176)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	2,372	1,450	113	(809)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	DENTON NIKE (DFW NIKE BAT 1)	20	0	8	(12)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,705	8,416	1,610	4,321	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	74	1,930	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).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718	9,293	1,374	3,949	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	92	157	99	164	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	DREW FIELD	10,040	5,466	21	(4,553)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	9,961	7,135	86	(2,740)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	719	1,056	67	404	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,508	4,541	25	58	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	DYESS AFB-NIKE DY10	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	625	589	55	19	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,978	5,895	281	198	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB AF FAC S-1	1	0	3	2	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB AF FAC S2	1	0	2	1	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-01	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-20	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-40	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE BATTERY E-70	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	410	170	42	(198)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119	1,594	1,066	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	408	335	28	(45)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	605	669	413	477	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	3,166	285	3,021	140	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	20,253	20,792	6	545	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	1,721	285	1,970	534	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,071	2,474	49	(548)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13	2,403	820	266	(1,317)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	55,876	56,411	73	608	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	58,573	63,796	182	5,405	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	0	0	14	14	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	3,035	289	2,870	124	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).
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	19,175	19,155	747	727	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).
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,252	3,233	388	369	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	781	813	26	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). 3) New Site.
Texas	FUDS	FLAMINGO PROPERTIES CO (REV.)	20	0	11	(9)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	1,862	175	332	(1,355)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1,338	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).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,468	5,679	57	268	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,437	5,671	49	283	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	103	73	82	52	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	4,116	1,476	307	(2,333)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,814	1,775	148	109	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,267	1,177	121	31	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	1,117	657	41	(419)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	535	799	147	411	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	FORT A.P. HILL	0	0	214	214	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,778	2,716	151	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	FUDS	FORT BAKER	113	2,073	8	1,968	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	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,377	1,030	74	(273)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	23,525	19,973	12	(3,540)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	4,134	3,580	115	(439)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,474	5,946	3,357	1,829	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	436,157	337,343	15	(98,799)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	102	104	631	633	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	51	40	77	66	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	31,062	19,509	173	(11,380)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40	62	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).
Nevada	FUDS	FORT MCDERMITT	53	41	2	(10)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	5,731	4,609	157	(965)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	7,843	19,851	2,263	14,271	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,084	17,132	67	8,115	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FORT SAN JACINTO	15	0	8	(7)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT	20	0	6	(14)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,529	4,611	34	116	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	16,925	7,060	377	(9,488)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	8,510	6,113	33	(2,364)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	8,800	9,065	201	466	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665	4,322	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	GEIGER AIRFIELD	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	GETTYSBURG WASTE AX	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964	5,830	919	785	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	137	86	37	(14)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	146	81	62	(3)	No explanation required.
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	48	48	1	1	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNRY R	18,544	6,959	28	(11,557)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	116,177	109,652	61	(6,464)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	6,549	8,343	870	2,664	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	GUNTER AIR FORCE STATION	192	187	4	(1)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	2,214	2,226	62	74	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	11,255	13,516	3,015	5,276	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.
Hawaii	FUDS	HALEIWA LANDING FIELD	42	0	24	(18)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	886	5,276	121	4,511	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	133	108	241	216	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	7,339	1,880	50	(5,409)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	607	544	208	145	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	1,564	401	142	(1,021)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	35,521	35,666	132	277	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	598	296	11	(291)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	647	561	134	48	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	19,322	17,012	150	(2,160)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	26,788	12,936	17	(13,835)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	31	32	3	4	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43	1,104	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386	3,372	891	877	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Guam	FUDS	IBANEZ/GUERRERO PROPERTIES	185	123	78	16	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466	5,365	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.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158	339	182	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,548	1,460	28	(60)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	883	758	46	(79)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	JEFFERSONVILLE QUARTERMASTER DEPOT	13	0	1	(12)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	740	825	18	103	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	1,480	1,442	28	(10)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	KILAUEA RADAR STATION	608	504	41	(63)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	21,461	12,823	1,213	(7,425)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,459	3,999	165	2,705	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIELD	120	21	1	(98)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE ANNEX	12,327	7,039	2	(5,286)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	7,027	6,717	332	22	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	2,174	1,255	140	(779)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3	11,758	9,057	51	(2,650)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	11,824	12,607	100	883	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914	56,389	1,503	14,978	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	KOFA NWR	33,563	32,598	84	(881)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	KOKEE STATE PARK	450	350	50	(50)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	63,677	6,853	81	(56,743)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	LAKE CHABOT MACHINE GUN RANGE	147	15	8	(124)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	252	96	79	(77)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	9,946	9,883	225	162	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	461	261	17	(183)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	5,098	4,827	66	(205)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	LARSON AIR FORCE BASE	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	10,227	7,709	338	(2,180)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	LIBERAL AAF	1,821	579	87	(1,155)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	218	113	45	(60)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,500	3,073	726	299	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	24,879	23,362	1,642	125	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	13,642	13,005	32	(605)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	5,920	6,023	145	248	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,218	3,156	64	2	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	3,835	3,902	60	127	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	309	77	9	(223)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	33,857	34,526	1,876	2,545	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
New York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	7,368	7,100	135	(133)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1,407	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).
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	52	52	24	24	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	179	141	33	(5)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	974	897	51	(26)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	3,916	3,980	204	268	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	522	84	358	(80)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	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).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	0	5,447	1,054	6,501	New Site.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE	9,324	8,423	61	(840)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	3,578	4,508	55	985	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).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER AAA SITE	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	7,010	6,417	371	(222)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	284	279	4	(1)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	2,795	2,854	117	176	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	656	643	65	52	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777	115	3,325	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.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	MAYAGUEZ MISSILE ANNEX	62	0	34	(28)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	4,566	3,780	54	(732)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	195	310	37	152	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	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	73,709	45,772	51	(27,886)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	MOORE AIRFORCE BASE (USDA SITE	20	0	10	(10)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	97	12	2	(83)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	14,190	0	131	(14,059)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE RANGE	587	31	13	(543)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	2,748	2,206	111	(431)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	841	696	131	(14)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Florida	FUDS	MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN RANGE	729	0	36	(693)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	19,512	15,433	236	(3,843)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	9,891	10,594	163	866	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	45,359	34,153	623	(10,583)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	497	392	108	3	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	1,334	137	151	(1,046)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,889	1,596	12	(281)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	497	354	87	(56)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	10,500	10,105	892	497	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	584	0	5	(579)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	117	95	383	361	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	12,934	7,561	2,026	(3,347)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	7,336	6,837	26	(473)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	7,960	4,987	873	(2,100)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	44	5,645	55	5,656	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251	755	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 VERNALIS	22	0	1	(21)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30	262	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	3,298	0	78	(3,220)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE PLANT	73	455	11	393	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	6,365	5,531	805	(29)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	248,987	239,771	5,312	(3,904)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	39,823	29,473	4,066	(6,284)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,992	1,299	195	(498)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	126	87	54	15	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,344	1,347	29	32	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	2,985	0	106	(2,879)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	590	2,058	120	1,588	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 BAT NY 15 LAUNCH	52	20	25	(7)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE BAT NY 80	109	0	7	(102)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219	766	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	5,900	4,409	10	(1,481)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-46 - MUNSTER	0	0	5	5	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,014	2,232	344	562	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	302	153	8	(141)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	0	2,988	71	3,059	New Site.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215	83	129	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	52	52	17	17	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 88	52	0	24	(28)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 93/94	465	0	10	(455)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY-73	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 32	202	0	10	(192)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74	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	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,530	1,515	43	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).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523	371	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,533	2,496	172	135	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,240	1,192	71	23	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	94	53	22	(19)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	3,815	3,110	289	(416)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,447	2,488	94	(865)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,837	697	36	(1,104)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,402	873	33	(1,496)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	658	622	6,429	6,393	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7,310	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,421	63	119	(2,239)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	4,494	797	242	(3,455)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	190	126	34	(30)	No explanation required.
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2,302	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	7,383	8,306	133	1,056	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	FUDS	OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE WORKS	5,246	0	45	(5,201)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	280	607	604	931	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).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	1,613	1,631	18	36	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	73	36	35	(2)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	7,703	2,306	94	(5,303)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ORANGE PORT OF NAV SHIP STOR	187	48	2	(137)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ORLANDO RANGE AND CHEMICAL YARD	648	0	42	(606)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	OROVILLE PRECISION BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	932	942	60	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	8,149	7,831	111	(207)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	468	895	104	531	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PALI TRAINING CAMP	35,994	34,914	96	(984)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PALMYRA ISLAND	5	0	3	(2)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	269	95	1	(173)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	4,949	1,115	490	(3,344)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	1,055	711	48	(296)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	39	64	12	37	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Oregon	FUDS	PENDLETON FIELD	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PETALUMA BOMBING TARGET	12,250	5,533	136	(6,581)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	PHILOMATH GAP FILLER	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	14,529	4,220	28	(10,281)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	9,156	8,830	28	(298)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-1	135	20	20	(95)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-4	187	45	4	(138)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-8	147	45	10	(92)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	22,965	13,717	11,195	1,947	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	42,614	28,891	59	(13,664)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	5,508	1,349	113	(4,046)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	POINT CABRILLO RADAR SIMULATOR ANNEX	81	0	3	(78)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	30,669	27,056	153	(3,460)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	249	1,374	43	1,168	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	8,817	3,720	46	(5,051)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	19,870	17,236	86	(2,548)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	1,097	107	81	(909)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	201	110	265	174	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	4,137	6,138	532	2,533	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	299	219	39	(41)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,519	20,341	131	(47)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916	2,309	159	552	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	9,516	7,379	43	(2,094)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,329	10,816	939	426	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	FUDS	RED BLUFF AIR FORCE STATION	99	79	168	148	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	57	0	21	(36)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	RIALTO AMMUNITION STORAGE POIT	33	5	15	(13)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	724	432	72	(220)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ROSSFORD AD	23	9	6	(8)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	655	78	95	(482)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	25,893	26,488	21	616	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO DEFENSE AREA SITE 61-R	22	0	6	(16)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 25	15	67	14	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).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 93	606	0	20	(586)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,063	5,297	57	291	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	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2,416	20	727	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,827	4,108	99	2,380	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	3,595	1,358	72	(2,165)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	449	344	142	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).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,688	2,637	130	79	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	5,845	5,163	200	(482)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,665	5,693	100	128	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	3,849	3,163	98	(588)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	259	80	59	(120)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	4,044	6,933	64	2,953	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	4,954	3,114	34	(1,806)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	6,481	4,490	66	(1,925)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	171	62	25	(84)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SHUMAKER NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	133	10	1	(122)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	27,481	28,066	57	642	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Iowa	FUDS	SIOUX CITY MUNI AIRPORT	9	0	3	(6)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	97,172	97,708	608	1,144	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	25,915	15,100	47	(10,768)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	16,346	33,106	7,467	24,227	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	559	2,764	34	2,239	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518	898	20	400	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	STOCKTON ORDNANCE DEPOT	10	0	11	1	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	3,633	2,051	32	(1,550)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,987	6,209	112	(666)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	96,183	23,999	1	(72,183)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AAF	15	0	3	(12)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	TAFUNA MILITARY RESERVATION	255	262	9	16	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	81,949	25,135	5,575	(51,239)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	10,161	568	247	(9,346)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	6,738	1,274	8,185	2,721	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	18,305	17,261	393	(651)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	2,103	476	184	(1,443)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	508	511	10	13	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRINIDAD BOMBING TARGET	48	0	4	(44)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	58	60	18	20	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,849	13,475	219	(155)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TWO ROCK RANCH STATION	112	0	77	(35)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	17,619	18,220	284	885	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,681	17,699	3,980	1,998	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213,385	233,408	809	20,832	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	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	8,687	9,209	92	614	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	UNIV OF CAL, SANTA BARBARA	28	0	30	2	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	107	106	9	8	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	USAF AVON PARK RANGE	21,505	2,635	65	(18,805)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	USCG RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	0	0	51	51	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	16	8	5	(3)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	904	262	319	(323)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	61,786	64,561	347	3,122	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	VAN VLECK GAP FILLER	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	13,478	14,138	61	721	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
Florida	FUDS	VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR STATION	313	52	18	(243)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	100	255	73	228	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS	29	29	18	18	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	21,225	4,896	528	(15,801)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	815,060	843,761	5,985	34,686	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,867	7,728	57	(82)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	31,066	25,720	1,112	(4,234)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,879	3,894	45	60	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	WAUGOSHANCE POINT TARGET	5,679	2,319	946	(2,414)	No explanation required.
Iowa	FUDS	WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	158	0	51	(107)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,835	3,644	25	(166)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	2,138	1,130	46	(962)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WELLSBACH PLT NOBS 258	482	20	212	(250)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER AIR FORCE AUXILIARY FIELD	2,617	0	44	(2,573)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER BOMBING RANGE	5,368	0	22	(5,346)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER SPECIAL WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	500	0	19	(481)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	86,040	68,006	3,089	(14,945)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	WESTERN REMOUNT AREA & RECEPTION CENTER	674	25	71	(578)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,496	1,461	92	57	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	2,256	1,491	528	(237)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	4,181	2,565	55	(1,561)	No explanation required.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	757	1,132	4	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).
Arizona	FUDS	WILLIAMS FIELD BOMB TAR RGE #6	838	568	21	(249)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WILLOW RUN AIRPORT	137	0	11	(126)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	6,221	643	141	(5,437)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	82,203	32,617	116	(49,470)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	49,591	7,379	3,621	(38,591)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	36	5	33	2	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	434	421	154	141	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	1,767	2,462	72	767	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

FY 2016 DEP ARC

Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Connecticut	Army	1LT JOHN S TURNER USARC	0	234	72	306	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	AFRC ALBANY	59	58	72	71	121%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	11,330	12,869	410	1,949	17%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	350	551	98	299	86%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	1,273	1,418	5	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).
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1,197	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.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	320	1,154	6	840	262%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491	129%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 KILMER	2,350	3,284	286	1,220	52%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	69	34	986	951	1376%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,455	6,524	5,736	5,805	90%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	39,934	43,495	2,703	6,264	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	15,959	16,544	1,838	2,423	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	17,493	40,089	2,715	25,311	145%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	8,140	9,628	363	1,851	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. 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.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019	1,508	108	597	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).
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236	698	2,173	79%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6,587	5,473	5,171	4,057	62%	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).
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054	69%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1,168	95	413	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).
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793	188%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570	26,255	667	20,352	310%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	2,171	1,377	8,039	7,245	334%	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	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003	15,071	23,303	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	2,232	3,177	19	964	43%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,478	3,433	528	2,483	168%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	3,998	11,625	466	8,093	202%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	40,127	57,812	4,378	22,063	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. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,433	9,081	203	7,851	548%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	46,669	45,961	7,179	6,471	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	5,494	3,608	2,987	1,101	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	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1,002	1617%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	5,072	10,208	590	5,726	113%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	2189%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	719	32%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	0	747	124	871	N/A	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825	1,944	40%	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.
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,561	3,562	1,715	1,716	48%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	473	282	4,721	4,530	957%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	1,563	1,340	681	458	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	767	1,096	106	435	57%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	56%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857	24,012	102,589	81%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	20,663	30,511	814	10,662	52%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777	8,388	323	1,934	29%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	0	1,784	165	1,949	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).
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,066	1,036	209	179	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	93	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	14%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	Army	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	170	1,049	335	1,214	716%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,039	4,463	97	521	13%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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.
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4,806	13%	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.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228	33,730	71%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	120%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509	5	244	19%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAUA AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1,351	279%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	61%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,233	2,185	350	302	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	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. 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	37,722	42,751	2,030	7,059	19%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2,214	12%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS US NAVAL ACADEMY	9,675	11,015	7	1,347	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).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	1,239	607	1,044	412	33%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	52%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	29,445	32,499	3,707	6,761	23%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Navy	BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM NATCAPREG	315	504	297	486	154%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	297,943	345,881	8,178	56,116	19%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	16,545	17,315	4,120	4,890	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.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	121,437	156,143	10,592	45,298	37%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	54,073	60,877	8,382	15,186	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	10,482	11,418	928	1,864	18%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	792	2,658	22	1,888	238%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	3,195	4,908	59	1,772	55%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	105,400	106,436	9,699	10,735	10%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New SIte. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	2,852	5,012	1,044	3,204	112%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	18,418	20,404	2,387	4,373	24%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620	2,979	4,628	13%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	11%	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	18%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	6,005	7,451	415	1,861	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. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	85%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500	6,184	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. 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.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90	151	18	79	87%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	10,607	13,675	4,255	7,323	69%	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).
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425	37,332	2,944	6,851	20%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,934	4,095	417	578	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393	11%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	34%	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	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	16%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3,093	38%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	2,794	3,431	88	725	26%	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).
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	6,752	675	711	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) 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.
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746	1,682	36%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328	849	8,383	71%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	60,510	65,826	17,956	23,272	38%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	44,855	76,432	6,523	38,100	85%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	11,763	15,065	775	4,077	35%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,218	4,511	116	409	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	18,925	74,882	1,102	57,059	301%	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.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	13,259	16,775	3,657	7,173	54%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	5,817	6,036	533	752	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.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	585	1,431	115	961	164%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	14,310	18,590	399	4,679	33%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	4,133	6,507	3,772	6,146	149%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	964	1,478	171	685	71%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,918	8,144	533	759	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).
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926	41,425	2,408	25,907	145%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	67%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	17,767	22,792	875	5,900	33%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,210	5,775	10	575	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	4,008	6,762	290	3,044	76%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6,429	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).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	54	241	44	231	429%	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).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18,267	230%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289	217	26%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66,950	70,115	3,526	6,691	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. 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	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	22,284	40,078	4,202	21,996	99%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	19,025	30,587	1,348	12,910	68%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	91	2,929	78	2,916	3188%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171	35,462	373	30,664	593%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,540	3,107	76	643	25%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	23,762	34,788	2,748	13,774	58%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	75,769	124,428	8,215	56,874	75%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	7,113	11,771	567	5,225	73%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	45,453	70,556	1,201	26,304	58%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	73,817	82,569	5,859	14,611	20%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	3,266	6,565	2,144	5,443	167%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	3,356	4,061	95	800	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	54	105	5	56	104%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	11,789	19,138	165	7,514	64%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	764	991	10	237	31%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	10,032	23,461	180	13,609	136%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,194	11,703	255	1,764	17%	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.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	627	1,908	36	1,317	210%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	209	6,300	135	6,226	2975%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295	7,086	246	7,037	2388%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	8,229	8,978	295	1,044	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).
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	28,193	50,420	2,660	24,887	88%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	741	848	674	781	105%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	0	465	1,680	2,145	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).
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	491%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	558%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	515	1,050	84	619	120%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	109,326	254,209	4,771	149,654	137%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1,469	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,355	1,083	1,695	1,423	105%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238	14,293	698%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	50%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	6,202	7,300	417	1,515	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).
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,495	9,405	220	3,130	48%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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.
Oregon	Air Force	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	28	90	119	181	635%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Air Force	COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	3,456	4,113	42	699	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	1,416	2,346	30	960	68%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	2,917	7,631	356	5,070	174%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1,152	2,239	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	26	242	52	268	1013%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	70,725	128,265	1,409	58,949	83%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,333	4,884	2,358	5,909	443%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,382	8,098	435	6,151	258%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	8,488	11,344	171	3,027	36%	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.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,143	6,325	705	887	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).
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	78,295	98,565	2,033	22,303	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	444,018	607,907	12,027	175,916	40%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7,595	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635	43%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	5,248	6,750	386	1,888	36%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	60%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266	18818%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	97%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960	70%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	90%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	51%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035	3709%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614	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 – Actual 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	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1,500	2343%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7,317	112,980	57%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	31,878	46,710	2,454	17,286	54%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	138,829	184,381	3,731	49,283	35%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	16,014	18,521	828	3,335	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).
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305	57,463	5,891	6,049	11%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	116,818	214,844	6,527	104,553	90%	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.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1,212	51%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	24%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	471	5,032	262	4,823	1023%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	606	882	16	292	48%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	103%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1,510	42%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	44,583	77,836	1,494	34,747	78%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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).
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	150	2,281	68	2,199	1462%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	57,023	83,364	1,240	27,581	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) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	47,353	54,412	5,737	12,796	27%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	105,002	108,390	24,857	28,245	27%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Air Force	KLAMATH FALLS IAP (KINGSLEY FIELD)	184	4,194	136	4,146	2255%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	5,085	6,413	182	1,510	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).
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,160	17,255	843	14,938	473%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	14,800	35,292	545	21,037	142%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	296	7,626	73	7,403	2504%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	20,315	25,890	236	5,811	29%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2,979	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) New Site.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5,435	456%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	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).
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	3,823	299%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9,641	62%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	117%	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.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	1,495	620	1,147	272	18%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	21,124	24,658	1,499	5,033	24%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459	209%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	357	2,805	93	2,541	713%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,957	32%	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	2,179	7,219	398	5,438	250%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	423	641	20	238	56%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	1,418	2,098	64	744	52%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	239	2,585	104	2,450	1026%	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.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13,276	16,072	1,593	4,389	33%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	142	3,248	104	3,210	2257%	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.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	3,934	4,986	271	1,323	34%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	1,838	2,915	149	1,226	67%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	10,860	11,290	1,661	2,091	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.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	829	974	13	158	19%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186	3,571	42%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246	2,888	35530%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3,386	21%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	63%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	7,909	9,450	927	2,468	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	11,220	14,596	446	3,822	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.
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	16,844	35,500	1,187	19,843	118%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	8,365	15,473	221	7,329	88%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Connecticut	Air Force	ORANGE AIR GUARD STATION	72	205	346	479	664%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	19,372	48,501	2,540	31,669	163%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24,291	95,756	10,068	81,533	336%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	2575%	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.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	33	14	4,178	4,159	12794%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	40,138	88,606	1,693	50,161	125%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	68%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247	7,577	180%	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	423	14,004	20	13,601	3218%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213	83	49%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	46%	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.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	1,942	25	1,609	450%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	76	209	31	164	215%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	76	211	21	156	204%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52	1,438	1210%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14,657	20,911	320	6,574	45%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Nevada	Air Force	RENO TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117	5,683	98	5,664	4848%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,948	1,959	2,225	1,236	42%	New Site.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743	1,873	42	1,172	158%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575	8,971	72%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property 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.
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	10,659	13,604	607	3,552	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.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	55,064	74,103	1,294	20,333	37%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	5,126	7,470	340	2,684	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	110	532	42	464	423%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	2,539	3,895	75	1,431	56%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	253	2,319	243	2,309	913%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	1,603	2,579	10	986	61%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,205	4,493	156	3,444	286%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	46,793	55,556	8,896	17,659	38%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,541	2,720	208	387	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).
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	3,841	11,579	61	7,799	203%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	165	568	31	434	264%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	102,968	189,129	17,914	104,075	101%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366	11,636	143	5,413	85%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	5,865	8,118	2,247	4,500	77%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	181,370	268,186	28,472	115,288	64%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	1,093	7,050	19	5,976	547%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	229	86	1,501	1,358	594%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,020	19,074	200	8,254	75%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	3,641	5,973	231	2,563	70%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site.
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	5,379	6,076	62	759	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).
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288	6,260	39%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	4,656	5,620	315	1,279	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).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893	52%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480	52%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	73,018	102,815	2,888	32,685	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New Site.
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	186	789	63	666	358%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	2,927	1,592	2,618	1,283	44%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	9,050	9,716	606	1,272	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	83%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	199%	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).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211	5,603	279%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984	23,964	1,822	11,802	84%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	85%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729	752	63%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,381	193,688	8,661	18,968	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) New Site.
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61	111%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	132	153	58	79	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	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	29%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,066	1,456	125	515	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).
California	FUDS	BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	3,141	44%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	88%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	1307%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103	14%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967	57%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	12%	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	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877	92	26,715	187%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2,474	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).
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1,254	10%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	28,381	36,880	89	8,588	30%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	33%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100	63	126	346%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567	62	7,348	2611%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	1502%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562	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).
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	38,347	44,785	2,557	8,995	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) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213	210	38	35	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	0	149	298	447	N/A	New Site.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	780	830	38	88	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484	587	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).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,705	8,416	1,610	4,321	76%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	74	1,930	14%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718	9,293	1,374	3,949	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) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	92	157	99	164	177%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	719	1,056	67	404	56%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119	1,594	1,066	165%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	605	669	413	477	79%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	1,721	285	1,970	534	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238	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).
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,252	3,233	388	369	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1,338	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).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	103	73	82	52	51%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577	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).
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	535	799	147	411	77%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	FORT BAKER	113	2,073	8	1,968	1745%	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	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,474	5,946	3,357	1,829	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).
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	102	104	631	633	623%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	51	40	77	66	130%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	65%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40	62	25	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).
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	7,843	19,851	2,263	14,271	182%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	24290%	New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,084	17,132	67	8,115	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).
Florida	FUDS	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665	4,322	28%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964	5,830	919	785	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).
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	1280%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	6,549	8,343	870	2,664	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	11,255	13,516	3,015	5,276	47%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	886	5,276	121	4,511	509%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	HAMMER FIELD	133	108	241	216	162%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	607	544	208	145	24%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43	1,104	92%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386	3,372	891	877	26%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466	5,365	125%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158	339	182	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).
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	740	825	18	103	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).
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,459	3,999	165	2,705	185%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914	56,389	1,503	14,978	35%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	153%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1,407	46%	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).
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	37	69%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	0	5,447	1,054	6,501	N/A	New Site.
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	3,578	4,508	55	985	28%	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).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777	115	3,325	25%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	195	310	37	152	78%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	1294%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	259%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785	34%	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	117	95	383	361	309%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	44	5,645	55	5,656	12947%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251	755	106%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30	262	549%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE PLANT	73	455	11	393	537%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	189%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	590	2,058	120	1,588	269%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219	766	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).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,014	2,232	344	562	28%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	0	2,988	71	3,059	N/A	New Site.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215	83	129	77%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	18%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74	70	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741	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).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523	371	59%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	658	622	6,429	6,393	971%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7,310	266%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2,302	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	OGLIUGA ISL	7,383	8,306	133	1,056	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).
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	280	607	604	931	332%	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	FUDS	OROVILLE PRECISION BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	162%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PALERMO COMMU FAC	468	895	104	531	113%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	39	64	12	37	97%	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	249	1,374	43	1,168	469%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	201	110	265	174	86%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	4,137	6,138	532	2,533	61%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916	2,309	159	552	29%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	RED BLUFF AIR FORCE STATION	99	79	168	148	151%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444	136%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 25	15	67	14	66	431%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60	72%	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	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2,416	20	727	43%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,827	4,108	99	2,380	130%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	4,044	6,933	64	2,953	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).
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	16,346	33,106	7,467	24,227	148%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	559	2,764	34	2,239	401%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518	898	20	400	77%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	6,738	1,274	8,185	2,721	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 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation ($000)	FY 2016 Cost Estimate ($000)	FY 2016 Funds Obligated ($000)	Cost Estimate Change ($000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,681	17,699	3,980	1,998	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213,385	233,408	809	20,832	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).
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	100	255	73	228	229%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	757	1,132	4	379	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).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	434	421	154	141	33%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	1,767	2,462	72	767	43%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).