Defense Environmental Programs

Annual Report to Congress

for FY 2016



CLEARED For Open Publication

Jul 31, 2018

Department of Defense OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW

June 2018

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment

The estimated cost of this report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$46,000 in Fiscal Years 2016 - 2017. This includes \$33,000 in expenses and \$12,000 in DoD labor. Generated on 2018Jan17 ReflD: 1-8536ED5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i
TABLESii
APPENDICESii
I. INTRODUCTION
II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM
Environmental Restoration Goals
IRP Site Status and Funding
MRS Status and Funding7
BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding
III. EQ PROGRAMS 10
Compliance
Overall Trend Analysis
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts11
Natural and Cultural Resources11
Overall Trend Analysis 12
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts12
Pollution Prevention
Overall Trend Analysis
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts14
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS 15
Overall Trend Analysis
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts16
Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals16
V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES 18
Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana 18
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 18
Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range (CMAGR), California 18
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, California 18
Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS), China Lake, California
VI. FY 2016 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUNDING AND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2015

TABLES

Table 1:	Overall DoD Environmental Program Funding	2
Table 2:	Environmental Restoration Goals and Progress	4
Table 3:	IRP Site Status	5
Table 4:	IRP Funding	6
Table 5:	MRS Status	7
Table 6:	MMRP Funding	8
Table 7:	BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding	8
Table 8:	BRAC Funding Breakout	9
Table 9:	Compliance Program Funding 1	.1
Table 10	: Natural and Cultural Resources Funding 1	3
Table 11	: Pollution Prevention Program Funding1	.4
Table 12	: Environmental Technology Program Funding 1	6

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2016 Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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.

	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

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

 * 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.

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%)

Table 2:	RC	Goals	and	Progress*
----------	----	-------	-----	------------------

* 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.

			RIP		RC			
	Total IRP Inventory (FY 2016)	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	

Table 3: IRP Site Status

* 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.

	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			

Table 4: IRP Funding* (millions of dollars)

* 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.

the second backward 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.

			RIP			RC	
	Total MRS Inventory (FY 2016)	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

Table 5: MRS Status

* 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.

	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested
Active Installations		1					
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						
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

Table 6: MMRP Funding (millions of dollars)*

* 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.

	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

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

* 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.

FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Requested*
\$15.1	\$21.5	\$43.1
\$69.7	\$29.0	\$20.4
\$88.5	\$52.4	\$27.8
\$173.4	\$102.9	\$91.4
\$151.3	\$144.6	\$131.6
\$10.6	\$6.6	\$0.0
\$0.0	\$10.0	\$0.0
\$161.9	\$161.2	\$131.6
\$51.9	\$50.4	\$45.6
\$28.1	\$32.3	\$0.0
\$0.4	\$0.1	\$0.1
\$80.3	\$82.8	\$45.6
\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.2
\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.2
\$218.3	\$216.5	\$220.3
\$110.3	\$70.4	\$22.5
\$88.9	\$62.5	\$27.9
\$417.5***	\$349.4***	\$270.8***
	Actual \$15.1 \$69.7 \$88.5 \$173.4 \$151.3 \$10.6 \$0.0 \$161.9 \$51.9 \$28.1 \$0.4 \$80.3 \$0.4 \$80.3 \$0.0 \$2.0 \$2.0 \$0.0 \$2.0 \$2.0 \$0.0 \$2.0 \$2.0 \$0.0 \$2.0 \$2.0 \$0.0 \$2.0	Actual Actual \$15.1 \$21.5 \$69.7 \$29.0 \$88.5 \$52.4 \$173.4 \$102.9 \$151.3 \$144.6 \$10.6 \$6.6 \$0.0 \$10.0 \$161.9 \$161.2 \$51.9 \$50.4 \$28.1 \$32.3 \$0.4 \$0.1 \$80.3 \$82.8 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$2.0 \$2.5 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$218.3 \$216.5 \$110.3 \$70.4 \$88.9 \$62.5

 Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout (millions of dollars)

* 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.

	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

Table 9: Compliance Program Funding (millions of dollars)

* 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.

	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

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

* 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.

	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

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

* 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.

	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

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

* 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:

- 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

FY 2016 Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress

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.

el project
hysical
s vapor
future propert
sampling).
orogresses
o project
Scope –
t Estimate
ost for prior or
tional cost may
hange in cost
5
A change in
.g., new
ct scope, dela
progresses
o project
Scope –
Coope
ctual contract
mate. This
le.
el project
hysical
s vapor
future propert
sampling).
na le. el bhy s v fu

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maryland	Army	FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1,197	estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	2,070		67		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kentucky	Army	LEXINGTON FACILITY	320				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,359				No explanation required.
Texas	Army		161	0			No explanation required.
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	17,843	12,237	1,762	(3,844)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
inicoodin .	,y	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY	001			101	
Michigan	Army	AIRFIELD	1,759	1,203	127	(429)	No explanation required.
							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
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,350				in regulatory document review or approval).
Arizona	Army		6,758		50		No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN CHARLES MELVIN PRICE	384	272	32	(80)	No explanation required.
Illinoio	A #2001 /	SUPPORT CENTER	0.504	0.501	02	02	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP	2,501	2,501	93	93	estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oregon	Army	WITHYCOMBE	69	34	986	051	estimating methodology or model.
Oregon		COLD REGIONS RESEARCH	69		900	301	
		AND ENGINEERING					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New Hampshire	Army		6 455	6.524	5,736	5,805	
			0,100	0,021	5,100	0,000	
Nebraska	Army		56.363	53,357	3,122	116	
New Hampshire Nebraska	Army Army	LABORATORY CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	6,455 56,363				estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in c estimating methodology or model.

					FY 2016	Cost	
	DeD		Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
				(****)	(+••••)	(****)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
T	0	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	0.400	0.074	704		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT	8,406	8,074	781	449	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	OGDEN UTAH	10,406	9,571	443	(202)	No explanation required.
Otan	Anny	OGDEN OTAH	10,400	9,571	443	(392)	
		DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN					
California	Army	JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	138,243	44,835	7,374	(86.034)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	1,402	600			No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
	0	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING	00.004	40.405	0 700	0.004	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Massachusetts	Army	FACILITY	39,934	43,495	2,703	6,264	in regulatory document review or approval).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	79,917	38,722	12	(11 183)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	144,322	143,116			No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	31,316	23,365			No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	161	61	54		No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost
	0		45.050	40.544	4 600		Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	15,959	16,544	1,838	2,423	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	IFY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
olulo	Component		(¢000)	(\$000)	(\$555)	(#000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	17,493	40,089	2,715	25.311	by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	40,296		147		No explanation required.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	9,005	6,091	154		No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,436	6,249	396	209	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
							greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
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
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	12,266	11,199	1,138	71	estimating methodology or model.
00101200	P VIIII Y		12,200	11,139	1,130	11	estimating methodology of model.

	T		FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
State	component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019	1,508	108	597	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	15,079	6,499			No explanation required.
Maryland	, uniy		10,010	0,100		(0,100)	
							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
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236	698	2,173	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	53,982	29,426		(23,141)	No explanation required.
					.,	(, · · · ·)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6,587	5,473	5,171	4,057	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	Í		,	· · · ·	,		1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	FORT HAMILTON	130		•=		No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	2,210	1,889	245		No explanation required.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	4,263	2,044	136	(2,083)	No explanation required.
		FORT INDIANTOWN GAP					
Pennsylvania	Army	TRAINING SITE	1,281	274			No explanation required.
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	10,331	6,045			No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	5,027	4,842	147	(38)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1,168	95	413	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							(1) Opert Federate Ober an Unrelated to Ober and 's Operation Ob
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
) (in a in in	A		100	40.4	705	700	cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793	Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570				Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	11,504	9,577	327	(1,600)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,064	1,018	131	85	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wisconsin	Army	FORT MCCOY	230	205			No explanation required.
District of	, any		200	200	0	(10)	
Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	161	116	4	(41)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional 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
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	2,171	1,377			additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Montana New Jersey	Army Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	30 29,039	5 15,317			No explanation required. No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	13,326	9,404	2,450		No explanation required.
virginia	Anny	FORT MOINROE	13,320	9,404	904	(2,950)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003	15,071		in regulatory document review or approval).
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	0		694	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	12,035	6,259	1,273	(4,503)	No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component		Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	•	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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). Standards or Regulations – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland Alabama	Army	FORT RITCHIE FORT RUCKER	2,232 17,297	<u>3,177</u> 9.936	19 396	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). No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,478	3,433	528	2,483	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	8,229				No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	3,998	11,625	466	8,093	 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	40,127	57,812	4,378	22,063	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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 Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
		FORT WILLIAM HENRY		10			
Montana	Army	HARRISON FORT WINGATE DEPOT	10	10	20	20	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	ACTIVITY	76,584	64,915	9,115	(2,554)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	GERSTLE RIVER TEST SITE	0		243		No explanation required.
Alaska		HAINES PIPELINE	2,490				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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
				(+)	(+)	(+)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,433	9,081	203	7,851	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Iowa	Army	PLANT	46,669	45,961	7,179	6,471	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		JEFFERSON PROVING					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	Army	GROUND	5,494	3,608			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	7,816	14			No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,362	1,320			No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	0	210		No explanation required.
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	85,999	18,773			No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	284	122			No explanation required.
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	379	91	69	(219)	No explanation required.
		JOINT BASE LEWIS-	50.000	40.007	0.505	(0.550)	
Washington	Army	MCCHORD JOINT BASE MYER-	53,088	43,967	2,565	(6,556)	No explanation required.
Virginio	A	HENDERSON HALL	62		4.000	4 000	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1,002	contract or contract method. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Armv	JOLIET AAP	20.656	20.762	1,644	1 750	estimating methodology or model.
11111015	Anny	JOLIET AAF	20,030	20,702	1,044	1,750	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	Army	PLANT	5,072	10,208	590	5,726	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho		KIMAMA TS RUPERT	744	270			No explanation required.
		KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE				(100)	
Hawaii	Army	SITE	0	0	441	441	No explanation required.
Hawaii		KUNIA FIELD STATION	801	622	19		No explanation required.
		LAKE CITY ARMY					
Missouri	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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		LOMPOC BRANCH					
California	Army	DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS	1,608	1,032	476	(100)	No explanation required.
T			50.000	50 545	4 50 4	(4,000)	New york and the sum of the d
Texas	Army		56,888	53,545	1,534	(1,809)	No explanation required.
1			0.070	0.047	0.40	740	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	719	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Howoii	A rmail	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	0	747	124	071	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	0	/4/	124	871	Change in cost estimating methodology of model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		MCALESTER ARMY					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oklahoma	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825	1 0 1 1	estimating methodology or model.
Okianoma	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION	4,605	5,924	025	1,944	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Tennessee	Army	PLANT	32,509	31,438	1,217	1/6	estimating methodology or model.
1011103300		MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL	52,503	51,400	1,217	140	
California	Army	CONCORD	47,533	33,609	13,062	(862)	No explanation required.
	, any	MISSISSIPPI ARMY			10,002		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mississippi	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,513	2,465			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.
		MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Utah	Army	FED	473	282	4,721	4,530	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,885	2,866	100	81	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER					
California	Army	AND FORT IRWIN	16,861	13,520	,		No explanation required.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	18,686	15,398	314	(2,974)	No explanation required.
		PAPAGO MILITARY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION	1,563	1,340	681	458	estimating methodology or model.
		PARKS RESERVE FORCES					
California	Army	TRAINING AREA	9,797	280	8,505	(1,012)	No explanation required.
		PHOENIX MILITARY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland	Army	RESERVATION	767	1,096			contract or contract method.
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	87,822	23,614	1,057	(63,151)	No explanation required.
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
							cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing
							work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,813	30,171	860	218	caused by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	93,597	96,899	156	3,458	estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
			4				cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857	24,012	102,589	schedule.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	15,406	13,556	196	(1.654)	No explanation required.
virginia		RAVENNA ARMY	13,400	13,330	190	(1,034)	
Ohio	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	27,219	17,846	3,789	(5,584)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	20,663	,			 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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			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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777	8,388	323	1,934	
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	213,907	201,076	10,247	(2.584)	No explanation required.
00101000	, uniy		210,007	201,070	10,2-17	(2,001)	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
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,556				in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Army	SAGINAW	160		40		No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	72,527	60,966			
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS SENECA ARMY DEPOT	21,201	18,106	1,154	(1,941)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	ACTIVITY	8,009	5,399	601	(2 009)	No explanation required.
	, uniy		0,000	0,000	001	(2,000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	29,963	29,725	787	549	estimating methodology or model.
California	, uniy		20,000	20,720	101	010	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Now Jorsov	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	0	1 704	165	1 0/0	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDDERG USARC	0	1,784	100	1,949	neuse, site reopeneu to audress auditional risk, auditional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	19,400	18,516	189	(695)	No explanation required.
Nd'an and			1.000	4.000		470	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,066	1,036	209	179	estimating methodology or model.
			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
----------------	-----------	------------------------	-------------------	---------	---------	----------	--
						Estimate	
Chata	DoD	In stallation Name			•	Change	Bassary (a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	93	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	l í						
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)
Kanaga	A #1000.4	SUNFLOWER ARMY	26.070	20.025	E 074	5.020	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	Army		36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
North Carolina	Army	PLANT	170	1,049	335	1,214	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and 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
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,039	4,463	97	521	or model.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	39,145		1,484		No explanation required.
		TOOELE ARMY DEPOT					
Utah	Army	SOUTH	21,653	2,315	1,865	(17,473)	No explanation required.
		TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL					
Hawaii	Army	CENTER	1,946		22		No explanation required.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	15,630	13,666	78	(1,886)	No explanation required.

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
01010				(****)	(****)	(****)	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
		TWIN CITIES ARMY					Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Minnesota	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4.806	or model.
				,	.,	.,	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228	33.730	in regulatory document review or approval).
New Jersey	Army	USARC CAVEN POINT	0				No explanation required.
		USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA					
Ohio	Army	59)	268	140	119	(9)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	UŚARC LODI	48	47	21	20	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		USARC NIAGARA FALLS					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Army	(AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	,	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC					
Illinois	Army	(SOUTH)	142	0	92	(50)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509	5	244	in regulatory document review or approval).
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	26	1,509			No explanation required.
	, uniy	VOLUNTEER ARMY	20	0		(20)	
Tennessee	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	21,916	20,020	450	(1.446)	No explanation required.
	, uniy		21,010	20,020	-100	(1,110)	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO	Ĵ	100	10	.50	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1.351	estimating methodology or model.
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	5,711	3,601	196		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	-				Reason(s)
	· ·	WELDON SPRING TRAINING		·· /	<u> </u>	,,	
Missouri	Army	AREA	1,965	1,909	55	(1)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		WEST POINT MIL					New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New York	Army	RESERVATION	56,048	57,510	438	1,900	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	estimating methodology or model.
		WHITE SANDS MISSILE					
New Mexico	Army	RANGE	8,028	3,568	123	(4,337)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
W/achington	A #100.1 (0.000	2 4 9 5	250	202	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Army Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER YUMA PROVING GROUND	2,233 16,823	2,185 10,907	350 5,206		
Arizona Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	91,311	77,484	10,309		
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	7,154		464		
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	59,766		8,799		
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	15,027	12,723	412		No explanation required.
Ocorgia	INUVY		10,021	12,720	-12	(1,002)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	by changes in schedule.
			- ,	-,	, , , ,	, .	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
1							

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
District of							
Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	3,864	2,627	638	(599)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2.214	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).
ivial yland	Ινάνγ	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS	3,075	11,013	1	1,047	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	DAM FACILITY	1,239	607	1,044	/12	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	33,796				No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	76,166			4,259	 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	48,146	50,738	1,530	4,122	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		533		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for			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	 Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be 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 New York	Navy Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS CALVERTON NWIRP	<u>30,640</u> 21,729				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	121,437				 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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 Site. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
Oplifansia			54.070	00.077	0.000	45 400	ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	54,073	60,877	8,382	15,186	also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	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.

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)
			44.540	40.445	4 004		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
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,512	40,445	1,684		Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	60,950	59,721	4,397		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Inavy	COOS HEAD NAV OCEAN	00,930	59,721	4,397	3,100	
Oregon	Navy	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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component		Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620			also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	7,222	5,581	357		No explanation required.
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	3,368	3,377	11		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	 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	24,653	23,265	1,592	204	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							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.
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV					
California	Navy	DET	35,403	22,880	787	(11,736)	No explanation required.
							1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimate change
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	28,617	27,097	1,757	237	or model.
			- / -	,	, -		
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
-			0.005			4 004	estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB GREAT LAKES NTC	6,005 181,400				to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. No explanation required.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LARES NTC	101,400	175,000	007	(4,027)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
							estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated
							to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is
							greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500	6,184	by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90	151	18		contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,972	1,432	80	(460)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	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).
							 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 Slte. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	172,664	,			also be caused by changes in schedule.
Indiana	Navy	INDIANAPOLIS NAWC	905	762	150	7	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425	37,332	2,944		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			No explanation required.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,182	742			No explanation required.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	1,017	961	34		No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	76,021	77,590	976		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		No explanation required.
							 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,934	4,095	417	578	in regulatory document review or approval).

			FY 2015 Cost			Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Sidle	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	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
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393	estimating methodology or model.
							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
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	caused by changes in schedule.
							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
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	285,186	299,359	1,635	15 808	caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	INdvy		200,100	233,333	1,000	13,000	
							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
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3 003	Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Camornia	i va vy		0,000	11,120	20	0,000	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	763	681	132		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	4,784	1,800	87	(2,897)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
Hawaii		LUALUALEI NAVMAG	63,960	66,444	3,120		for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	Navy						 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,715				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				No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	6,752	675	711	 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746	1,682	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	46,316	,		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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

		FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
-	Installation Name					Reason(s)
Compensit			(\$555)	(\$555)	(\$000)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
						change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
						dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
						reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
						Standards or Regulations – 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
Navv	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42.167	41.994	1.913		Requirement).
		,	,	.,	.,	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
Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328	849		caused by changes in schedule.
Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	120	114	12		No explanation required.
						 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). New Site. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate
						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may
Nour		60 510	65 926	17.056	22 272	also be caused by changes in schedule.
						No explanation required.
		,				No explanation required.
		,	,			No explanation required.
	NOVATO DOD HOUSING		,	-,	(••••)	
Navy	FACILITY	1,079	704	26	(349)	No explanation required.
						1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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.
	Component Component Navy Navy Navy Navy Navy Navy Navy Navy	Component Installation Name Navy NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR Navy NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR Navy NEW LONDON NSB Navy NEW CORLEANS NAS Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS Navy NEWPORT NETC Navy NORFOLK COMNAVBASE Navy NORFOLK NSY Navy NORTH ISLAND NAS Navy FACILITY	Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) Navy NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR 42,167 Navy NEW LONDON NSB 11,794 Navy NEW LONDON NSB 11,794 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 Navy NEWPORT NETC 60,510 Navy NORFOLK COMNAVBASE 31,606 Navy NORFOLK NSY 10,709 Navy NORFOLK NSY 10,709 Navy NORTH ISLAND NAS 36,723 Navy FACILITY 1,079	ComponentInstallation NameInflation (\$000)(\$000)NavyNAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR42,16741,994NavyNEW LONDON NSB11,79419,328NavyNEW LONDON NSB11,79419,328NavyNEW ORLEANS NAS120114NavyNEW ORLEANS NAS120114NavyNEWPORT NETC60,51065,826NavyNORFOLK COMNAVBASE31,60619,150NavyNORFOLK NSY10,7099,843NavyNORTH ISLAND NAS86,72378,048NavyFACILITY1,079704	Component Installation Name Infration (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) Navy NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR 42,167 41,994 1,913 Navy NEW LONDON NSB 11,794 19,328 849 Navy NEW CONDON NSB 11,794 19,328 849 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 114 12 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 114 12 Navy NEWPORT NETC 60,510 65,826 17,956 Navy NORFOLK COMNAVBASE 31,606 19,150 1,640 Navy NORFOLK NSY 10,709 9,843 659 Navy NORTH ISLAND NAS 86,723 76,048 8,071 Navy FACILITY 1,079 704 26	Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) Navy NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR 42,167 41,994 1,913 1,740 Navy NEW LONDON NSB 11,794 19,328 849 8,383 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 114 12 6 Navy NEW ORLEANS NAS 120 114 12 6 Navy NEWPORT NETC 60,510 65,826 17,956 23,272 Navy NORFOLK COMNAVBASE 31,606 19,150 1,640 (10,816) Navy NORFOLK NSY 10,709 9,843 659 (207) Navy NORFOLK NSY 1,079 704 26 (349) Navy FACILITY 1,079 704 26 (349)

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	44,855	76,432	6,523	38,100	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.

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component				•	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland		PATUXENT RIVER NAS					 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii		PEARL HARBOR FISC	35,414				 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 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). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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		PEARL HARBOR NS	130,190		4,775		 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Scope – Actual 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		8		No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	8,023		1,057	\-/	No explanation required.

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							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
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	64,024	61,378	4,143	1,497	also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Florida	Navy	STATION	5,817	6.036	533	752	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	, in the second se						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,269	1,272	36	39	estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	462	329	130	(3)	No explanation required.
							Cast Estimate Change Unseleted to Change in Cases Actual contract
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	31,815	29,280	2,638	103	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	19,512	16,598	2,030		No explanation required.
California	Navy	POMONA NIROP	0	0			No explanation required.
				_			
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	Navas		0.000	0.007			intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Washington California	Navy	DIV DET PORT HUENEME NCBC	2,983	2,927 9,578	89 345		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). No explanation required.
Maine	Navy Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	10,611 13,315				No explanation required.
	INAVY	PUGET SOUND FISC	13,315	5,540	500	(7,409)	ויזט פראומוומנוטוו ופענווכע.
Washington	Navy	BREMERTON	3,427	3,342	83	(2)	No explanation required.
	inavy	BILLINEITION	5,427	0,0 1 2		(2)	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
		PUGET SOUND FISC					cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Washington	Navy	MANCHESTER	585	1,431	115		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS	21,063	20,407	238		No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	107,794	97,151			No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	121,786	106,458	8,075	(7,253)	No explanation required.
		ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
Puerto Rico	Nerver	GARCIA	11.010	40.500	200	4.070	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	GARCIA	14,310	18,590	399	4,679	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.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	293,111	308,855			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). 1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	40,099	40,262	837	1,000	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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							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
		SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926				additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	SPOKANE NMCRC ST INIGOES NISE EAST	402	0	374	(28)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	COAST DET	941	394	314	(233)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Now	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	0.170	Q 017	1 102	820	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 peeded, technology was ineffective).
Virginia			9,170				 needed, technology was ineffective). 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
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	schedule.

					FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for			Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name				(\$000)	Reason(s)
							 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) 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
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	270,211	218,615	60,622	0.026	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			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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Draiget Seene Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Denneydyrenia	Navas		40.005	40.005	0.040	0 400	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6,429	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
District of	Navas		E 4	0.14		004	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	54	241	44	231	needed, technology was ineffective). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
District of							estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18 267	schedule.
Columbia	i tavy		1,352	20,040	1,174	10,201	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
District of							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66,950	,			schedule.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4,106		237		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		
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,839	49,305	2,986		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		789		No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	52,231	52,455	2,441	2,665	by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change
							Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in 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
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	19,025	30,587	1,348	12,910	
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
		ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL					DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
Illinois	Air Force	AP	91	2,929	78	2,916	New Site.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
Colifornia			E 474	25 462	070	20.004	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171	35,462	373	30,664	estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,540	3,107	76	642	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Okianoma	AILLOICE	AIRTORCE FEARTS	2,340	3,107	70	043	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
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	23,762	34,788	2,748	13.774	or model.
	0.00		20,102	5 1,1 50			

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	66,673	49,347	1,784		No explanation required.
				· · · ·	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	862	876	24	38	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Coordia	A := F = = = =		75 700	404 400	0.045		prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
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
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	7,113	11,771	567	5,225	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	22,556	21,709	2,692		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	AILLOICE	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL	22,330	21,709	2,092	1,045	policy of directive that redefines the costs included in the OTO.
Michigan	Air Force	AIRPORT	5,717	3,922	88	(1,707)	No explanation required.
		-	-,	-,		,,,,,,,	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) 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
	I						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	45,453	70,556	1,201	26,304	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
_							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
Tennessee	Air Force		73,817	82,569			 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Cite
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN AVON PARK AIR FORCE	3,266				Site.
Florida	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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	IFY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name				(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							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
California	Air Force	BEALE	333,406	352,760	4,888	24,242	also be caused by changes in schedule.
		BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION BELLOWS AIR FORCE	764	991	10	237	estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	STATION	11,573	8,743	55	(2 775)	No explanation required.
Tawali			11,575	0,743		(2,113)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	10,032		180		New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	4,118	2,192	10	(1,916)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY					scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	10,194	11,703	255	1 764	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			10,134	11,705	200	1,704	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	627	1,908	36	1.317	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
				.,	50	,	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
		BLUE ASH AIR GUARD					change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Ohio	Air Force	STATION	209				
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	469	486	5	22	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DeD		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295				 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	841	227	511		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				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
	DoD					Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
State	component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) 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
		CAMP BLANDING MIL					Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	methodology or model.
Tionaa	7.111 0100	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD	120	125	50	001	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Washington	Air Force	STATION	515	1,050	84	619	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Washington	7 (11 1 0100		010	1,000	0-	015	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)
		CAMPION AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	14,266	14,503	316	553	estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	39,172	31,024	2,401		No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		CAPE CANAVERAL AIR					scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	FORCE STATION	109,326	254,209	4,771	149,654	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE LISBURNE LONG					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE NEWENHAM LONG					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1,469	estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE ROMANZOF LONG					
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	15,089	14,394			No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	5,377	4,368	94	· · · · · ·	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	75,624	70,688	1,832	(3,104)	No explanation required.
							Desired Coords Added as wineseets due to other site lowel as is t
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Colifornia			4 055	4 000	4 005	4 400	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,355 44,423	1,083 22,073			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	44,423	22,073	1,699	(20,651)	No explanation required.

					FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)
		CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
North Carolina	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238		
			2,011	10,102	200	11,200	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	estimating methodology or model.
		CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL				()	
Wyoming	Air Force	AIRPORT	10,139	6,134	26	(3,979)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	6,202	7,300	417	1,515	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alasha	A := [= = = = =	COLD BAY LONG RANGE	4.070	0.007	1 4 0	(4, 400)	No surface tion non-ined
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	4,278	2,697	143	(1,438)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,495	9,405	220		by changes in schedule.
		COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Oregon	Air Force	GUARD STATION	28	90	119	181	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

						Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
Chata	DoD	In stallation Name			•	Change	Desserv(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		COSTA MESA AIR GUARD					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Air Force	STATION	3,456	4,113	42	699	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	1,416	2,346	30	960	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
A		DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE	0.017	7.004	050		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	Air Force	BASE DES MOINES	2,917 518		356 30		estimating methodology or model.
lowa	Air Force	DES MOINES	010	0	30	(488)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1,152	2,239	Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alahama				0.40	50	000	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	26	242	52	268	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	70 705	100 065	1 400	58,949	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO	70,725	128,265	1,409	30,949	
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	9,348	7,917	528	(903)	No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,333	4,884	2,358	5,909	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		-	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
							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
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	444,018	607,907	12,027		by changes in schedule.
			,		,		
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7,595	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	171,185	,	,		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	ELLINGTON	944	0	144		No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE					policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
South Dakota	Air Force	BASE	23,196	31,199	1,936		
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	13,023	14,968	1 611		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
LUUISIAIIA	AIL FUICE		13,023	14,908	1,611	3,550	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016		Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
				(+)	(+)	(+)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	57,964	67,664	4,305	14,005	estimating methodology or model.
	A	500050	0.070	- 4		0 077	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Kansas Indiana	Air Force Air Force	FORBES FORT WAYNE	3,278 247	7,157 155			policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. No explanation required.
Indiana	All Force	FORT WATNE	247	100	1	(91)	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
		FRANCIS E WARREN AIR					change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Wyoming	Air Force	FORCE BASE	23,183	103,873	1,069	81,759	CTC.
							() Desired Ocean and the description of the test the effect of the second second
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		FRANCIS S. GABRESKI					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
New York	Air Force	(WEST HAMPTON)	666	1,109	940	1,383	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	279	671	315	707	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	145,709	224,975	22,249	101,515	

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
				(+)	(*)	(1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
							policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	7,085		473		
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	5,270	4,910	156	(204)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
O all'familia	A :	050005	00.404	05 004	4 770	0.045	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	Air Force	GEORGE	63,194	65,031	1,778	3,615	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							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
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,532	1,764	45	277	estimating methodology or model.
Anzona	AILLOICE		1,552	1,704	43	211	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
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635	by changes in schedule.
							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
		GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE					work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
North Dakota	Air Force	BASE	5,248	6,750	386		caused by changes in schedule.
		GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
01-1-1	DoD					Change	D escent(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		GREAT FALLS					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Montana	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960	
		GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alahama	A :=		0.404	0 5 47		4 00 4	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	71110100		0	10		117	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and 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
M			40	05.00			cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule
Demandum	A in Fanas			4 500		4 500	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1,500	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
--------------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------	----------	-----------	----------	---
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)		(\$000)	Reason(s)
		HAYWARD MUNICIPAL		(+)	(+)	(+ /	
California	Air Force	AIRPORT	919	604	202	(113)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	4,492	3,615	26		No explanation required.
							 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or opening work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7,317	440.000	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			 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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	668	6,152	420	5,904	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,622	10,907	374		No explanation required.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
		INDIAN MOUNTAIN		(+)	(+)	(+)	
Alaska	Air Force	RESEARCH	32,280	26,222	406	(5,652)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	109	288	89		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			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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
	A. E						
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	75,952	53,034	1,973	(20,945)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	138,829		3,731		estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	47,572	41,681	3,501		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		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		2,014		No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305	57,463	5,891		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
State	component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,833	3,770	252	180	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Телаз		JUSA-CAINI DOLLIS	5,000	5,770	252	103	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
Tawaa	A := [0.074	0.054	000	4 040	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1,212	schedule.
							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
-	l						work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	44,285	42,957	3,104	1,776	caused by changes in schedule.
							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
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	estimating methodology or model.
		JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Missouri	Air Force	GUARD STATION	471	5,032	262	4,823	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	606	882	16	292	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	3,209	3,390	62	243	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and 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
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1,510	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or
							national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly
Toyoo	Air Force	KELLY	11 502	77 026	1 404		promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Texas	All Force	KELL I	44,583	77,836	1,494	34,747	Requirement).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	150	2,281	68		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mishigan	Air Force		57.000	00.004	1 0 4 0		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Michigan	All Force	KI SAWYER	57,023	83,364	1,240	27,581	New Site.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	47,353	54,412	5,737		estimating methodology or model.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2)
				100.000			New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	105,002	108,390	24,857	28,245	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
			(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(*)	(* /		
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Orogon	Air Force	KLAMATH FALLS IAP (KINGSLEY FIELD)	10/	4 104	136	4 1 4 6	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Oregon		KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE	184	4,194	130	4,140	
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	10,710	7,548	250	(2,912)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	5,085	6,413	182	1,510	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		LAMBERT ST. LOUIS					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Missouri	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,160	17,255	843	14,938	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		LAPORTE AIR NATIONAL					
Texas	Air Force	GUARD STATION	419	0	40	(379)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional 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
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	14,800	35,292	545	21,037	Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
			,300	50,202	210	,	
Maharat		LINCOLN MUNICIPAL					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Nebraska	Air Force	AIRPORT	296	7,626	73	7,403	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
						Estimate	
01-1-1	DoD	In stallation Name			-	Change	Provente)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Arkansas	Air Force	BASE	20,315	25,890	236	5 811	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Aikalisas	AILLOICE	BAGE	20,313	23,090	230	3,011	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2,979	New Site.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5,435	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	2 0 2 2	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	All Force		1,270	4,040	255	3,023	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
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9,641	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Et a state	A		40.050	05 405	0.004	17 5 1 0	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
							change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	1,495	620	1,147	272	стс.

Dod State Dod Component Adjusted for Installation Name Estimate Inflation (\$000) Estimate (\$000) Obligated (\$000) Reason(s) State Component Installation Name Installation Name Installation State Installation Age Installation State Installation Age Insta				FY 2015 Cost Estimate			Cost Estimate	
Montana Air Force MALMSTROM AIR FORCE 21,124 24,658 1,499 5,033 additional cost regulations ~ Do 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 In Cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change In Cost estimational action operation added to project or cost estimational action operation added to project or cost estimate Change In Cost estest included In the CTC. (Cost est Estince Change In Cost estest	State		Installation Name	Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Passan/a)
Mantana Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 884 111,459 reduines - Dapies in Dop Dolicy or Directive - A change in Dop Dolicy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. California Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 884 111,459 reduines - Change in Cost Estimate Change in Scope - Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedules. Montana Air Force BASE 21,124 24,658 1,499 5,033 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedules. Montana Air Force BASE 21,124 24,658 1,499 5,033 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedules. Montana Air Force BASE 21,124 24,658 1,499 5,033 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedules. Montana Air Force BASE 21,124 24,658 1,499 5,033 additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedules. Montana Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 84 11,459 methodogy or model. 1,9,0,0,0,0,0,0,0	State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
California Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 884 11,459 methodology or directive a A change in CC. change (e.g., newly discovered contaminates, increased physica dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in future proper reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional asmpring). 3) California Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 884 111,459 methodology or oddel. Maryland Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive – A change in DDD policy or Directive – A change in DDD policy or directive – A change in DDD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Maryland Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive – A change in DDD polic	Montana	Air Force		21.124	24.658	1.499		(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
California Air Force MARCH 53,378 163,953 884 111,459 methodology or medial action operation added to project scope) Maryland Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the cTC. California Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. California Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. California Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Alabama Air Force MARTIN STATE AIRPORT 357 2,805 93 2,541 policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.	Montana	7.11 1 0100		21,124	21,000	1,400	0,000	
MarylandAir ForceMARTIN STATE AIRPORT3572,805932,541policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.CaliforniaAir ForceMATHER116,640103,7014,943(7,996)No explanation required.AlabamaAir ForceMAXWELL33,31731,6441,333(340)No explanation required.	California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Alabama Air Force MAXWELL 33,317 31,644 1,333 (340) No explanation required.								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
	Alabama California	Air Force Air Force	MAXWELL MCCLELLAN	33,317 106,556		1,333 5.600	(/	No explanation required. No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							 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
Kanaaa		MCCONNELL AIR FORCE	50.000	04.050	4 000		cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Kansas	Air Force	BASE MCCONNELL AIR FORCE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,95 <i>1</i>	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	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.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	2,179	7,219	398	5,438	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	423	641	20		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		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		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13,276	16,072	1,593		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. New Site. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
					.,		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGS	142	3,248	104		change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Georgia		MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	15,192	14,073			No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
_	DoD		-			Change	
State C	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) 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
		MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE					contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
Idaho A	Air Force	BASE	3,934	4,986	271		This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska A	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	1,838	2.915	149		estimating methodology or model.
			.,	_,			1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
South Carolina A	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	10,860	11,290	1,661		New Site.
	л:т Г атаа	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	820	074	10		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska A	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL	829	974	13		estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska A	Air Force	CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186		estimating methodology or model.
			0,004	11,003	100	5,571	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Tennessee A	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
1			10.111	40.040			
Nevada A	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3,386	Site.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,273	4,975	160	(138)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	7,909	9,450	927		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS IAP (ANG)	7,303	18			No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alasha	A := F = = = =	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY	11.000	44.500	140	0.000	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY	11,220	14,596	446	3,822	estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	7,725	5,918	1,061	(746)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	NORTON	17,342	8,815			No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional 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
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	16,844	35,500	1,187	19,843	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

					FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$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.
		ORANGE AIR GUARD	0,000	10,170		1,020	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Connecticut	Air Force	STATION	72	205	346	479	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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24,291	95,756	10,068	81,533	 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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). New Site.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	33	14	4,178		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	40,138	88,606	1,693		New Site.
		POINT ARENA AIR FORCE					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
California	Air Force	STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		POINT BARROW LONG					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	423	14,004	20	13,601	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY					scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	1,942	25		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Puerto Rico	Air Force	SITE	76	209	31	164	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Puerto Rico	Air Force	STATION	76	211	21	156	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52	1,438	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
otato	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14,657	20,911	320	6,574	
		RENO TAHOE	,		020	0,01 1	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Nevada	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117	5,683	98	5.664	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,948			,	New Site.
			_,0.0	.,		.,	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743	1,873	42	1,172	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ť							
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	265	168	414	317	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future 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
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	56,316				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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	327	314	- 25	12	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,488	3,400	300	212	estimating methodology or model.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	54	303	304	553	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		SAN DIEGO SPACE					
California	Air Force	SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,923	1,152	244	(527)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	89	1,810	52	1,773	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
0		SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL	0.007	1 000	504	(0.40)	New york and the second second
Georgia	Air Force	AIRPORT SCHENECTADY CO	3,387				No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,697	1,110	89	(498)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	EC 014	78,437	2,186	00 700	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
minois	All Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	56,914	78,437	2,180	23,709	needed, technology was menective).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575	8,971	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
monyan		SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD	12,301	20,777	575	0,971	
California	Air Force	STATION	Л	10	10	16	No explanation required.
Camornia			4	10	10	10	no explanation required.

				FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	10,659		607		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
lowa	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		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		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.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$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		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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				No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,541	2,720			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	3,841	11,579	61	7,799	
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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
F lavida	A := [400.000	400.400	47.044	404.075	cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	102,968	189,129	17,914		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366	11,636	143		policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Colorado	All Force		0,300	11,030	143	5,415	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	5,865	8,118	2,247	4,500	schedule.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – 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
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	181,370	268,186	28,472		greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
			101,370	200,100	20,472	113,200	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD					Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Wisconsin	Air Force	BASE	1,093	7,050	19	5,976	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

	DoD		Estimate	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	229	86		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 Massachusetts	Air Force Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM WESTOVER	<u>11,020</u> 3,729	19,074 2,852		8,254	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	3,641	5,973	231		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 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). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288		change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

					FY 2016	Cost	
	DeD		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
State	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893	in regulatory document review or approval).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	73,018	102,815	2,888	32,685	Requirement). 3) New Site. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	186	789	63	666	policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ŭ Ŭ							
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	2,927	1,592	2,618	1,283	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			IFY 2015 Cost	IFY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Otato	Component			(\$000)	(\$555)	(4000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
		DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	DLA	FACILITY	9,050	9,716	606	1,272	estimating methodology or model.
		DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW					
Pennsylvania	DLA	CUMBERLAND FAC.	7,488	5,431	334	(1,723)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,484				additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	2,377	1,515	20	(842)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
_ · ·			10.010	10.110	4 000	0.070	(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA DSC RICHMOND	42,642				needed, technology was ineffective).
Virginia	DLA		47,872	43,671	1,819	(2,382)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,628	6,662	424	458	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 13	20	,			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	3,889		48		No explanation required.
			1				
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		AF RADAR TRACKING					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maine	FUDS	STATION	4,170		330		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 18	1,034	949			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	AFPLT NO 68	22	0	5	(17)	No explanation required.
	FUE			-		(22-)	No. or where of the same freed
Hawaii	FUDS	RESERVATION	248				No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT #46	16				No explanation required.
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	63	41	5	(17)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	45	49	20	24	No explanation required.
		AIR-TO-GROUND GUN					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Florida	FUDS	RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	in regulatory document review or approval).
		ALMADEN AIR FORCE					
California	FUDS	STATION	1,285	936			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	12,428	10,952	149	(1,327)	No explanation required.
т			0.040	0.040		(0.044)	Ne contention required
Texas	FUDS FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	6,218 40				No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	39	3	2	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	681	643	57	10	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	1000		001	043	57	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
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984				estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	59,873	27,409	1,222		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	10,373				No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	6,090	2,947	41	(3,102)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Desired Occurs. Added and increasing the test of the still and test in the
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	1003	ATLAS MISSILE NO.5	1,195	1,210	129	152	i euse, site reopeneu to address additional fish, additional Sampling).
Texas	FUDS	(K06OK0407)	21,269	10,228	746	(10 295)	No explanation required.
10/03	1 003		21,209	10,220	740	(10,290)	

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	IFY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
				(****)	(****)	(****)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183.381	193,688	8,661	19 069	New Site.
American	1003		105,501	193,000	0,001	10,900	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,178	2,278	52	152	contract or contract method.
Samoa	1003		2,170	2,270	52	152	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Desired Ocean Added as a frequencies to describe a fits based and inst
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	NO. 8	132				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California		BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	83		24		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.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
							cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
			5,521	0,001	210	020	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1.066	1,456	125	515	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota		BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	13,635				No explanation required.
South Dakota	LOD2	DLAGK HILLS UKD DP1	13,635	9,436	221	(3,978)	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate			Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Nobrooko		BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION	254.002	246 205	0.004	444	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Nebraska	FUDS	DEPOT	254,962	246,395	8,681	114	estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	4,214				in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	FUDS	BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	5,182	52	33	(5,097)	No explanation required.
Oragan		BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	20.200	04.075	25		No explonation required
Oregon	FUDS	RANGE	30,269	24,375	35	(5,859)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	3,141	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	13,826	9,642	3		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,542				No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	31,888	18,923	62	(12,903)	No explanation required. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	FUDS	BROWNWOOD AAF	20		17		No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	
Virginio			740	707	400	100	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	36,732	20,226			No explanation required.
	1000		00,102	20,220	002	(10,021)	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
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	2,286	161	94		No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	6,425	6,780		391	estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	46,179	27,856	202	(18,121)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	155,782	158,915	871	4 00 4	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	155,762	156,915	071	4,004	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
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	69,254	72,688	28	3.462	methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	30,075	14,926			No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	27,570	14,875			No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	5,350	126			No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	39,932	26,846	1,937	(11,149)	No explanation required.
		CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING					
Michigan	FUDS	RANGE	11,428	9,151			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAMP EDWARDS	513	472	32	(9)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
				(+)	(, /	(****/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	25,511	27,076	116	1,681	estimating methodology or model.
		CAMP ELLIS MILITARY	· · ·	,			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	FUDS	RESERVATION	6,580	6,867	148	435	estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP FANNIN	64,387	61,390			
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	23,581	23,735	6	160	estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	17,381	199		(17,030)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	146,529	88,478	5,152	(52,899)	No explanation required.
		CAMP HOWZE					
Texas	FUDS	(FELDERHOFF)	90,506	86,210			No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	27,479	23,740			No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP LOCKETT	17,228	12,176	168	(4,884)	No explanation required.
							1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877			Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP MURPHY	599	0	49	(550)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	4,445	4,486	68	109	contract or contract method.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	99,114	90,978	236	(7,900)	No explanation required.
							Design of Courses . A shift of respective second a share to address side lowed music at
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2 474	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LOIS OBISFO	10,340	10,300	404	2,474	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CAMP SHELBY MANUVER					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1 254	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Micolooippi	1000	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY	12,101	14,017		1,204	
Ohio	FUDS	RANGE	9,308	7,397	1,477	(434)	No explanation required.
01110	1020		0,000	1,001	.,	(101)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	28,381	36,880	89	8,588	estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	22,276	6,843			No explanation required.
			, 0	5,510	120	(,	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,772	14,738	62	28	contract or contract method.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK		(+)	(+)	(+)	
Massachusetts	FUDS	BOMB TARGET SITE	1,690	1,414	289	13	No explanation required.
	1		· · ·	,			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	2,940	2,994	50	104	estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	7,800	7,802			No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100	63	126	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	3,396	3,265			No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	4,053	374			No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,503	560			No explanation required.
	1		· · ·				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567			New Site.
New Jersey	FUDS	CAVEN PT AR TER	1,457	78			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	20	0	19	(1)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,616	3,915	38	337	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CHENNAULT AFB	0	0			No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP					
Virginia	FUDS	TRAINING SITE	35,735	26,728	1,429	(7,578)	No explanation required.
		CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY					
Utah	FUDS	DEPOT	20	7	10	(3)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		CLINTON COUNTY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
0.10			552	1,400	1	002	. eace, eace response to address additional hold, additional sumpling).

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
				(+)		(+)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,971	7,110	888	27	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	38,347	44,785	2,557	8,995	New Site.
			,	,	,	,	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213	210	38		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	0	149			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		No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	575	568	13	6	No explanation required.
		CORRY ST USN TECH					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	TRAINING	780	830			estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	15,832	12,354			No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,376	22,922	31		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	21,338	13,222			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILMER	499	53			No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	32,200	29,620			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,514	1,640			No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,390	263	373	(754)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			.,510	.,			1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	108,533	105,857	4,521	1.845	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,218	3,001			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	1,359	78			No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		DELAND NAVAL TRAINING		(****)	(****)	(+•••)	
Florida	FUDS	CENTER	604	351	77	(176)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	2,372	1,450	113		No explanation required.
		DENTON NIKE (DFW NIKE	,	,			
Texas	FUDS	BAT 1)	20	0	8	(12)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,705	8,416	1,610	4,321	estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	74	1 0 2 0	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123	15,979	/4	1,930	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718	9,293	1,374	3 0/0	New Site.
	1020		0,710	0,200	1,074	0,010	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	92	157	99	164	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	DREW FIELD	10,040	5,466	21	(4,553)	No explanation required.
		DRY CANYON ARTILLERY					
California	FUDS	RANGE	9,961	7,135	86	(2,740)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	719	1,056	67	404	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
i tertir Garonna		DULUTH INTERNATIONAL	/13	1,000	07		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Minnesota	FUDS	AIRPORT	4,508	4,541	25	58	estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	DYESS AFB-NIKE DY10	0				No explanation required.
		EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA			1		
Alaska	FUDS	SITE	625	589	55	19	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate		FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
				(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(****)		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,978	5,895	281		dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 ELLSWORTH AFB NIKE	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	BATTERY E-70	1	0	-		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	410	170	42	(198)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119		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		Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
			5,.00		0,021		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
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	20,253	20,792	6		in regulatory document review or approval).

					FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Calara da			4 704	005	4.070	50.4	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	1,721	285	1,970	534	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.
			,				Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	55,876	56,411	73	608	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
vvyonning	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	55,670	50,411	13	000	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	58,573	63,796	182	5,405	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	0	0	14	14	No explanation required.
							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
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	3,035	289	2,870	124	in regulatory document review or approval).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	19,175	19,155	747	727	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
			10,110	. 0, 100		/	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,252	3,233	388	369	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	IFY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
otato	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		FIVE POINTS					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Texas	FUDS	OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	781	813	26	58	New Site.
		FLAMINGO PROPERTIES CO					
Texas	FUDS	(REV.)	20	0			No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	1,862	175	332	(1,355)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1 338	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ransas	1000		0,000	5,712	521	1,000	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,468	5,679	57	268	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,437	5,671	49	283	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Kanaga			400	70			intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04 FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	103 4,116				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORDES AFB ATLAS 5-05	4,110	1,470	307	(2,333)	ino explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,814	1,775	148	109	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
. tanodo	1000		1,014	1,775	140	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
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	D.D		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)		Change (\$000)	Beccer(c)
State	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,267	1,177	121	31	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		FOREST PARK RECREATION	,	,			
Missouri	FUDS	САМР	1,117	657	41	(419)	No explanation required.
) (invite to to a f							Desired Course Added also and also as the ansist an analysis (a.e.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS		525	700	1 4 7	444	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA FORT A.P. HILL	535	799 0			No explanation required.
virginia	FUDS	FORT A.F. HILL	0	0	214	214	
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		No explanation required.
		FORT CUSTER					
Michigan	FUDS	REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	23,525	19,973			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			No explanation required.
	. 000			001,040	13	(00,100)	
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 New Jersey	FUDS FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	51 31,062	40 19,509			Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). No explanation required.
INCW DEISEY	נייט ין		31,002	19,009	1/3	(11,300)	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	-	(\$000)	Reason(s)
				(+)	(*)	(****)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	FUDS	FORT MCDERMITT	53	41	2		No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	5,731	4,609	157	(965)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	7,843	19,851	2,263		estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	New Site.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	FUDO		0.004	47.400	07	0.445	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA FORT SAN JACINTO	9,084				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS FUDS	FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT	15 20		-		No explanation required. No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORT WORTH ARMIT DEPOT	20	0	0	(14)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,529	4,611	34	116	estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	16,925	7,060	377		No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	8,510				No explanation required.
Missouri	1000	I I OROWBER	0,010	0,113		(2,304)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	8,800	9,065	201	466	
		FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH	0,000	0,000	201	100	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Florida	FUDS	BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665	4.322	estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	GEIGER AIRFIELD	1	0	-		No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	GETTYSBURG WASTE AX	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.
	1						
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	137	86	37	(14)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnopoto	ELIDO	GOPHER ORD PLT	146	01	60	(2)	No exploration required
Minnesota	FUDS	ROSEMOUNT GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH	146	81	62	(3)	No explanation required.
Delaware	FUDS	CENTER	48	48	1	1	No explanation required.
		GREAT BEND A-GRND GNRY					
Kansas	FUDS FUDS	R GREAT SITKIN ISL	18,544	6,959 109,652		(11,557)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	116,177	109,652	61	(6,464)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	6,549	8,343	870	2 664	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Innorligan	1000	GUNTER AIR FORCE	0,010	0,010	0.0	2,001	
Alabama	FUDS	STATION	192	187	4	(1)	No explanation required.
Howaii	FUDS		2,214	2,226	62	74	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	2,214	2,220	02	74	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	11,255	13,516	3,015	5 076	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	HALEIWA LANDING FIELD	42				No explanation required.
				ľ		()	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	886	5,276	121	4,511	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

					FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
oluto	Component			(****)	(\$000)	(+++++)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	FUDO		100	100	0.14		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	133	108	241	216	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	7,339	1,880	50	(5,409)	No explanation required.
		HANCOCK CO. BOMBING &					Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	607	544	208		feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	1,564	401	142		No explanation required.
		HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Hawaii	FUDS		35,521	35,666	132		estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	598	296	11		No explanation required.
Kanaaa			0.47	504	404		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas Massachusetts	FUDS FUDS	HERINGTON AAF HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	647 19.322	561 17,012	134 150		estimating methodology or model. No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	26,788	,	130		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	31	32			No explanation required.
7110510	1000		51	52	3		
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Northern							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43	1,104	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386	3,372	891	877	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Cuam		IBANEZ/GUERRERO PROPERTIES	405	100	70	40	No evolution required
Guam	FUDS	PROPERTIES	185	123	78	16	No explanation required. 1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
							the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
							in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change
		IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB					Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology
Illinois	FUDS	ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466		or model.
					FY 2016	Cost	
-----------------	--------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------	----------------------	-------------------	--
	D.D		Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Sidle	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,548	1,460			No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	883	758	46	(79)	No explanation required.
Le d'anna		JEFFERSONVILLE	10			(10)	N Is a surface of the surface of
Indiana	FUDS	QUARTERMASTER DEPOT	13	0	1	(12)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	740	825	18	103	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		KENTUCKY ORDNANCE					
Kentucky	FUDS	WORKS	1,480	1,442		(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		No explanation required.
A == = = =		KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY	4 450	2,000	405		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizona	FUDS FUDS	RANGE KINGSLEY FIELD	1,459 120	3,999 21	165		estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIELD	120	21	1	(98)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	ANNEX	12,327	7,039	2	(5 286)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	7,027	6,717	332		No explanation required.
		KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB	.,				
New Mexico	FUDS	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.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Northern		KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY		40.05-			intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mariana Islands	FUDS	CENTER	11,824	12,607	100	883	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	IFY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	
State	-	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
				(+)	(+)	(+/	
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
							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
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914				in regulatory document review or approval).
Arizona	FUDS	KOFA NWR	33,563	32,598	84		No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	KOKEE STATE PARK	450	350	50	(50)	No explanation required.
		LAKE BRYANT BOMB &					
Florida	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	63,677	6,853	81	(56,743)	No explanation required.
		LAKE CHABOT MACHINE GUN					
California	FUDS	RANGE	147				No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	252	96	79	(77)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	WORKS	0.046	0 002	225	160	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	9,946 461	9,883 261	17		No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	5,098	-	66		No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	LARSON AIR FORCE BASE	5,098	4,027			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	10,227	7,709	338		No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	LIBERAL AAF	1,821	579			No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	218				No explanation required.
Nebraska	1000		210	110		(00)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,500	3,073	726	299	estimating methodology or model.
Hobraoka			0,000	0,070	120	200	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	24,879	23,362	1,642	125	contract or contract method.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	13,642				No explanation required.
				,		(***)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	5,920	6,023	145	248	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.

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
				. ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· · · /	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	3,835	3,902	60	127	contract or contract method.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	309	77	9	(223)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
		LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE					reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
Ohio	FUDS	BASE	33,857	34,526			New Site.
New York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	7,368	7,100	135	(133)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
	FUDO		50	50	70	70	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1 407	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	52	52			No explanation required.
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX					
Colorado	FUDS	1B)	179	141	33	(5)	No explanation required.
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX					
Colorado	FUDS	1C)	974	897	51	(26)	No explanation required.
		LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Colorado	FUDS	2C)	3,916	3,980	204	268	contract or contract method.
		LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE					
Vermont	FUDS	STA	522	84	358	(80)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
						_	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	37	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER					
Hawaii	FUDS	NAVY SALVAGE YARD	0	5,447	1,054	6,501	New Site.
		MAKANALUA BOMBING					
Hawaii	FUDS	RANGE	9,324	8,423	61	(840)	No explanation required.
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE					(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	3,578				needed, technology was ineffective).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER AAA SITE	1	0			No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	7,010				No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	284	279	4	(1)	No explanation required.
		MARIETTA AIR FORCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	FUDS	STATION	2,795	2,854	117	176	estimating methodology or model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	656	643	65	52	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Northern							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							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 –
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777			Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	MAYAGUEZ MISSILE ANNEX	62	0	ψ.		No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	4,566	3,780	54	(732)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Colifornia			405	040	07	450	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	195		-		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS		73,709	45,772	51	(27,886)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		MOORE AIRFORCE BASE	,			· /	
Texas	FUDS	(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.
		MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE					
California	FUDS	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.
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	New Site.
		MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN					
Florida	FUDS	RANGE	729	0	36	(693)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785	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		NAFTAN ORDNANCE					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Mariana Islands	FUDS	DISPOSAL	9,891	10,594	163	866	estimating methodology or model.
		NANSEMOND ORDNANCE					
Virginia	FUDS	DEPOT	45,359	34,153			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	497	392			No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	1,334	137			No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,889	1,596			No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	497	354	87	(56)	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	10,500	10,105		497	contract or contract method.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	584	0	5	(579)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AIR STATION					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	OAKLAND	117				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	12,934		2,026		No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	7,336	6,837	26	(473)	No explanation required.
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					
California	FUDS	STATION	7,960	4,987	873	(2,100)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION ARCATA	44	5,645	55	5,656	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Designed Coopers Added as a viscon and the to other site lower president
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR	/ 1 1	1,210	201	755	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	STATION VERNALIS	22	0	1	(21)	No explanation required.
California	1003			0	1	(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
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	3,298	0			No explanation required.
				Ŭ		(-,0)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
		NAVAL WEAPONS					dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		INDUSTRIAL RESERVE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Illinois	FUDS	PLANT	73	455	11	393	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE					
Alaska	FUDS	ISLAND)	6,365	5,531	805	(29)	No explanation required.
		NEBRASKA ORDNANCE					
Nebraska	FUDS	PLANT	248,987	239,771	5,312	(3,904)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	39,823	29,473			No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,992	1,299	195	(498)	No explanation required.
		NEW RIVER ORDNANCE					
Virginia	FUDS	PLANT	126	87	54	15	No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,344	1,347			estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	2,985	0	106	(2,879)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	590	2,058	120		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BATNY 15 LAUNCH	52	2,030			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE BAT NY 80	109	0			No explanation required.
New Gerocy	1000		100	0	,	(102)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219	766	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	5,900	4,409			No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-46 - MUNSTER	0	0			No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,014	2,232	344		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	302	153	8		No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	0	2,988	71	3,059	New Site.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
				(+)	(* <i> </i>	(****)	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the
							project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND					requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215		129	in regulatory document review or approval).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	52	52		17	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 88	52	0			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 93/94	465	0	-		No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY-73	0	0	9		No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 32	202	0	10	(192)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Alaaka	FUDO		4 500	4 545	10		intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,530	1,515	43	28	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			000	101	520	0,1	reader, elle reception le addreed additional noit, additional bamping).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	-	Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Olulo	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(#000)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,533	2,496	172	135	estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,240				No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	94	53			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	3,815	3,110			No explanation required.
		NORTHEASTERN					
New York	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,447	2,488			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,837	697			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,402	873	33	(1,496)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	658	622	6,429	6,393	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
							reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2)
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7,310	New Site.
0.117		OAKLAND MUNICIPAL	0.404			(0.000)	
California	FUDS		2,421	63			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	4,494	797			No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC 5-2	190	126	34	(30)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
lowo	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2 202	
lowa	FUDS	OFFOTT AFB AF FAC 3-3	10,402	9,717	2,907	2,302	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	7,383	8,306	133	1,056	
		OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE	7,500	0,000	100	1,000	
Oklahoma	FUDS	WORKS	5,246	0	45	(5,201)	No explanation required.
enanomu			0,240	0	40	(0,201)	re explanation required.

			IFY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State		Installation Name				(\$000)	Reason(s)
oluce	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	280	607	604	931	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Pennsylvania	FUDS	ANNEX)	1,613	1,631	18	36	estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	73	36			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	7,703	2,306			No explanation required.
		ORANGE PORT OF NAV SHIP	.,	_,		(-,)	
Texas	FUDS	STOR	187	48	2	(137)	No explanation required.
		ORLANDO RANGE AND					
Florida	FUDS	CHEMICAL YARD	648	0	42	(606)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		OROVILLE PRECISION					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		OYSTER POINT STORAGE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Virginia	FUDS	AREA	932	942			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	8,149	7,831	111	(207)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
N	FUE		100	0.05	10.1	50.4	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey Hawaii	FUDS FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	468 35,994	895 34,914	104 96		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). No explanation required.
	FUDS	PALITRAINING CAMP PALMYRA ISLAND	35,994	34,914			No explanation required.
Hawaii	1003	PALINTRA ISLAND	5	0	3	(2)	
Texas	FUDS	(TX TECH)	269	95	1	(172)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	4,949	95 1,115			No explanation required.
Gamorria		PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-	4,949	1,113	490	(3,344)	
Florida	FUDS	GROUND GUN	1,055	711	48	(296)	No explanation required.
i iuliua	1 000		1,000	111	40	(230)	

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

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		PORTERVILLE ARMY					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	AIRFIELD	201	110	265		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	4,137	6,138			estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	299	219			No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,519	20,341	131	(47)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916	2,309	159		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	9,516	7,379			No explanation required.
	1000		5,510	1,010	+3	(2,004)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,329	10,816	939		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		RED BLUFF AIR FORCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	STATION	99				reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	57	0	21	(36)	No explanation required.
Optificantia				_		(1-2)	
California	FUDS	STORAGE POIT	33				No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	724	432			No explanation required.
Ohio New York	FUDS	ROSSFORD AD	23 655	9 78	-		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	655	/8	95		No explanation required. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Arizono	ELIDO	SAHUARITA AFR	25 002	26 400	04		estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	FUDS	SARUAKITA AFK	25,893	26,488	21	010	esumating methodology of model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
		SAN FRANCISCO DEFENSE					
California	FUDS	AREA SITE 61-R	22	0	6	(16)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Destinat Occurs. Added as a first state to other site to set and the
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	15	67	14	66	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	1000	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE	10	07	14	00	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BATTERY 93	606	0	20	(586)	No explanation required.
						(000)	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
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60	in regulatory document review or approval).
							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
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,063	5,297	57	291	in regulatory document review or approval).
							(1) Desired Course Added also and a based on the president are present
							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 –
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2,416	20	727	
Tionda	1000		1,703	2,410	20	121	Change in cost countaing methodology of model.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,827	4,108			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.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	440	244	140	27	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUD3	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	449	344	142	37	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
otato				(\$000)	(+++++)	(4000)	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,688	2,637	130	79	estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	5,845				No explanation required.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,665	5,693	100		estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	3,849				No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	259	80	59	(120)	No explanation required.
		SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Washington	FUDS	DEPOT	4,044	,			reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	4,954				No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	6,481	4,490	66		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		642	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
lowa	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	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
							(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518	898	20	400	needed, technology was ineffective).
		STOCKTON ORDNANCE					
California	FUDS	DEPOT	10		11		No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	3,633		32		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,987	6,209	112		No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	96,183		1		No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AAF	15	0	3	(12)	No explanation required.
American		TAFUNA MILITARY					
Samoa	FUDS	RESERVATION	255		9		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).
		TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY					
Pennsylvania	FUDS	RANGE	18,305	17,261	393	(651)	No explanation required.
		TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY					
California	FUDS	10	2,103				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				No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,849	13,475			No explanation required.
00019.0						(100)	
California	FUDS	TWO ROCK RANCH STATION	112	0	77	(35)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	17,619	18,220	284		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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
							intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213,385	233,408	809	20,832	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Draiget Coope Added requirements due to other site lovel project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
Alaaka	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	8,687	9,209	92	614	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	UNIV OF CAL, SANTA	0,007	9,209	92	014	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BARBARA	28	0	30	2	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	107	106			No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	USAF AVON PARK RANGE	21,505	2,635			
	1000	USCG RESERVE TRAINING	21,000	2,000	00	(10,000)	
Virginia	FUDS	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.
							Draiget Coope Added requirements due to other site lovel project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP	61,786	64,561	347	3 1 2 2	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	VAN VLECK GAP FILLER	01,700		9		No explanation required.
	1000		3	0	Ű	Ű	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
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	13,478	14,138	61	721	in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
		VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR					
Florida	FUDS	STATION	313	52	18	(243)	No explanation required.
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
1							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
California	ELIDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY	100	055	70	220	intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	100	255	73	228	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS	29	29	18	18	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	29 21,225	4,896			No explanation required.
nawali	FUDS	WAIRANE TRAINING AREA	21,220	4,090	520	(15,601)	
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	815,060	843,761	5,985	34,686	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.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,879	3,894	45	60	estimating methodology or model.
		WAUGOSHANCE POINT					
Michigan	FUDS	TARGET	5,679	2,319			No explanation required.
lowa	FUDS	WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	158	0	51		No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,835	3,644	25		No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	2,138	1,130			No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WELLSBACH PLT NOBS 258	482	20	212	(250)	No explanation required.
l léa h	FUDO		0.047			(0.570)	Ne suplemention nonvincel
Utah	FUDS	AUXILIARY FIELD WENDOVER BOMBING	2,617	0	44	(2,573)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	RANGE	5,368	0	22	(5.040)	No evolution required
Utan	FUDS	RANGE	5,308	0	22	(5,340)	No explanation required.
		WENDOVER SPECIAL					
Utah	FUDS	WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	500	0	19	(481)	No explanation required.
Otan	1000		500	0	13	(401)	
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	86,040	68,006	3,089	(14,945)	No explanation required.
Troot Fightia		WESTERN REMOUNT AREA &	00,010	00,000	0,000	(11,010)	
California	FUDS	RECEPTION CENTER	674	25	71	(578)	No explanation required.
					1	(0.0)	
							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g.,
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,496	1,461	92	57	feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
		WHITEMAN					
		COMMUNICATIONS					
Missouri	FUDS	TRANSMITTER SITE	2,256	1,491			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	4,181	2,565	55	(1,561)	No explanation required.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Reason(s)
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		WILKINS AIR FORCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio		STATION	757	1,132	4	379	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		WILLIAMS FIELD BOMB TAR				()	
Arizona		RGE #6	838	568			No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WILLOW RUN AIRPORT	137	0	11	(126)	No explanation required.
The state	FUE		0.004	0.40		(5.407)	Nie sonderen Verene werden d
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	6,221	643	141	(5,437)	No explanation required.
	FUDO	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY	00.000	00.047	440	(40,470)	Nie werde verfangen werde
West Virginia	FUDS	SODS	82,203	,			No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS		49,591	7,379			No explanation required.
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	36	5	33	2	No explanation required.
							Droiget Seens Added requirements due to other site level project
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Pennsylvania	FUDS	PLANT	434	421	154		reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Fernisylvarila	FUDS	FLANT	404	421	154	141	reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
							change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
							dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC					intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	1,767	2,462	72		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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		1LT JOHN S TURNER						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Connecticut	Army	USARC	0	234	72	306	N/A	sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59	58	72	71	121%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change
								in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
								requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	11,330	12,869	410	1,949	17%	delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site.
			,	,		.,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
		ARMY RESEARCH						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		LABORATORY-						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Massachusetts	Army	WATERTOWN	350	551	98	299	86%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Virginia	Army	WOODBRIDGE	1,273	1,418	5	150	1.20/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
virginia	Anny	WOODBRIDGE	1,275	1,410	5	150	12 /0	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		BLOSSOM POINT						additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Maryland	Army	RESEARCH FACILITY	2,844	3,929	112	1,197	42%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kentucky	Army	LEXINGTON FACILITY	320	1,154	6	840	262%	sampling).
			320	1,134		0+0	20270	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	381	782	90	491	129%	schedule.
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
Name In			0.0-0	0.001		4 000		requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,350	3,284	286	1,220	52%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).

/inginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% (model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% (model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% (model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% (model.				FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
Bate Component Installation Name Inflation (3000) (5000) (5000) (6000) (escont) Reson(s) Coll SchMAMS/CAMMS 6 34 986 951 1376%, cost estimating methodology or model. Army COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING 6, 45 6, 524 5, 736 5, 805 9995 cost Estimating methodology or model. Lew Hampshile Army LABORATORY 6, 455 6, 524 5, 736 5, 805 9995 cost Estimating methodology or model. Lew Hampshile Army LABORATORY 6, 455 6, 524 5, 736 5, 805 9995 cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in Dyncal dimension of the clanup, additional risk, increased physical dimension of the clanup, additional risk, increased physical dimension of the clanup, additional risk, indrawa such as vapor intrusion (risk is required and initiated by Dc), change in the with the regulatory of cast and initiated by Dc), change in the with the regulatory of cast and initiate the well physical dimensions of the clanup, additional risk, increased physical dimensions of the clanup, additional risk, increased physical dimensions of the clanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (risk is required and initiated by Dc), change in the well physical dimensions of the clanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (risk is required and inititate by Dc), change in Scope -		DeD							
CLACKAMAS/CAMP Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Xergon Army WTHYCOMBE 69 34 986 951 1376% cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Vertex Lew Hampshire Army COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENSINEERING 6.455 6.524 5.736 5,805 90% cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Vertex Lew Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6.455 6.524 5,736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. Lew Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6.455 5,5736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. Lew Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6.455 5,5736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. Law Antiper Contrasting Change In Stope - Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly for DoD), change in Fluxer project sa satistions - Regulator. 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. (frai is required and initiate DDD), change in fluxer property reuse, lite reopened to address additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusin (frai is required and initiate DDD). 10	State	-	Installation Name			-	-	-	Reason(s)
Yregon Army WITHYCOMBE 69 34 986 951 1376% cost estimating methodology or model. New Hampshire Army COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND DENINEERING 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. New Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. New Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. Army LABORATORY 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% cost estimating methodology or model. 10 Project change (e.g., newy discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in thur user propert vaus, site result of negolitations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, eldelay in regulatory document review or hysical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in thur user property reus, site requered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in thur user property reus, site requend to the reture value of the reture value of thysical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as	State	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)	(Fercentage)	
COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change in Cost Estimating methodology or model. ew Hampshire Army LABORATORY 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% cost Estimating methodology or model. 1) Project Scope - Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional asamping). 2) Standards or Regulators - Regulators - ditiven Change - A change in the project as a result of negoliators with the regulator (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is regulator). Assachusetts Army TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 16% opports). Image: the regulator is the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulators - stoper reuse, site regulator and initiated by DOD, change in that project stope (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is regulators or Regulations - so the regulator and initiated by DD), change in thrue project stope (e.g., newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in thrue project reuse, site reopenet to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulators - DOP Policy or Directive - A change in DOD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CCT. 4) Cost Estimate Change U	Oregon	Army		69	34	986	951	1376%	5 5 1 5
AND ENGINEERING lever Hampshire AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimation denta for the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in the regulator. Amage Laboration and the regulator cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in the regulator cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in three pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in thruse project change (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in thruse project change (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in thruse project strange (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sisk, pathw	orogon	, uniy		00	01	000	001	10/0/0	
AND ENGINEERING lever Hampshire AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimating methodology or model. ever Hampshire Ammy LABORATORY 6,455 6,224 5,736 5,805 90% cost stimation denta for the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in the regulator. Amage Laboration and the regulator cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in the regulator cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in three pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in thruse project change (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in thruse project change (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DD), change in thruse project strange (a, a, newly discovered contaminatis, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sisk, pathw			COLD REGIONS RESEARCH						
ew Hampshire Amy LABORATORY 6,455 6,524 5,736 5,805 90% loss testimating methodology or model. Image of the site-level project score Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional six, additional six required and initiated by DOD, change in the regulator of the size. Alesachusetts Amy TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 119 Project Scope - Added requirements due to other site-level project shape, delay in regulatory document review or future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site required and initiated by DOD, change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site quired and initiated by DOD, change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site quired and initiated by DOD, change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site quired and initiated by DOD, change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site quired and initiated by DOD, change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional site quired and initisk, additional site quired and initisk, additional site									Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Assachusetts Amy DEVENS RESERVE Aassachusetts Amy DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2.703 6,264 18% approval. Massachusetts Amy FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 1% and 1,850 e assate the required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property rease, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site requerement impositional risk, additional fisk, ad	New Hampshire	Army		6.455	6.524	5.736	5.805		
Aassachusetts Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator of the regonator of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulatory document review or the time reases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or the time reases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or the time reases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulatory document review or the time reases project scope, added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, there added the physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, there are additional regulatory document review or britter property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulators - DoD Policy or intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in the response to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations - DoD Policy or intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in Cost estimate Change Unrelated to CD, and in the response of the device that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to project scope Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations - DoD Policy or interview or britery reuse, site response to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulating methodology or Direct/ve - A change in DOD policy or		,			- , -		-,		
Assachusetts Army DEVENS RESERVE 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 16%, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulators – Regulator driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations of the regulator test, and the regulator test, and test, and the regulator test, and test, and the regulator test, and test, and the regulator test, and test									project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
Assachusetts Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model.									
Aassachusetts Army EVENS RESERVE 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 10% approval. Aassachusetts Army TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 11% approval. Image: A regulator of the compact of the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or the interceases project scope. Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional asmpling). 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 Urrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost estimating methodology of Change in Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial actional pression operation addet to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional asmpling). 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 Urrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Scope – Change in Cost estimates due to other site-level physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional asmpling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Scope – Directive – A change in the cost included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Urrelated to Change in Scope – Change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, additional asisphysical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk,									vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Image: Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Image: Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Image: Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Image: Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model.									future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Amy DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 1% increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or that increases project scope - Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newy discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in is vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD). Do Policy or or Directive – A change in DD policy or directive that or equirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD).									
Army DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or 10% approval). Image: specific scope and specific specific scope and specific specific scope and specific scope and specific scope and specific scope and specific specific scope and specific specific scope and specific specific scop									driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations
Atassachusetts Army TRAINING FACILITY 39,934 43,495 2,703 6,264 16% approval). Description of the clanup, additional risk, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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 Change in Scope – Change in Cost estimating methodology or Other scope). 2) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to broject scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to broject scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project scope). 3) Standards or Regulational risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DDD), change in Scope – Change in Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost Tay into other site-level project scope – Actual contract cost for prior or orgoing work is greater than the prior estimate.									with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator
In the second			DEVENS RESERVE						that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Image: Arroy FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% </td <td>Massachusetts</td> <td>Army</td> <td>TRAINING FACILITY</td> <td>39,934</td> <td>43,495</td> <td>2,703</td> <td>6,264</td> <td>16%</td> <td></td>	Massachusetts	Army	TRAINING FACILITY	39,934	43,495	2,703	6,264	16%	
Image: service of the clean service of th									
vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional singling). virginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope - Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope - Added requirements due to other site-level									
/irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or Oracity ethy that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or Oracity ethylication operation added to project scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional asampling). 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 Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Scop									
/irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope) 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope) /inginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost may also be caused by changes in <									
/irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 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 /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increasee physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, particular project scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered 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) 6 Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or model. 7 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or model. 8 Interve – A change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or model. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or model. 9 Inture property reuse, site reopened to address									
Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. /irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 16,544 1,838									
Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. /iriginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. Image: Instant of the second seco									
/irginia Army FORT BELVOIR 15,959 16,544 1,838 2,423 15% model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DOD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – 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									
1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Cape – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in) (in a la in			45.050	10 5 4 4	4 000	0.400	450/	
(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property meuse, 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	Virginia	Army	FORTBELVOIR	15,959	16,544	1,838	2,423	15%	model.
(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property meuse, 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									1) Drainet Coope Added cleanup phones on the preint preserves
scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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) Diccy et estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in									
level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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									
physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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									
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									
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									
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									
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									
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									
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									
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									
Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in									
estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in									
	Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	17,493	40,089	2,715	25,311	145%	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	•	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – 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
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	8,140	9,628	363	1,851	23%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,019	1,508	108	597		sampling).
								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
			0.704	4 000		0.470		Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	2,761	4,236	698	2,173		model. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	6.587	5.473	5.171	4.057	62%	additional sampling).
Coorgia	<i>,</i> ,		0,001	0,0	0,	.,		1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,969	2,803	2,220	2,054		Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
				_,	,	_,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	6,639	8,574	521	2,456	37%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	850	1,168	95	413		sampling).
								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
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	423	431	785	793	188%	method.

						Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD					Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	6,570	26,255	667	20,352		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
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.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Army	FORT ORD	205,771	214,003	15,071	23,303	11%	approval).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	•	Reason(s)
								 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – Regulator- driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,634	12,756	1,171	1,293	10%	cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	2,232	3,177	19	964	43%	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	400%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
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 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.
lowo	A 1000 1	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION	40.000	45 004	7 470	6 474	4.407	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Iowa	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	46,669	45,961	2,987			cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
	Í	JOINT BASE MYER-			,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Virginia	Army	HENDERSON HALL	62	2	1,062	1,002	1617%	contract or contract method.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
	-							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		KANSAS ARMY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	5,072	10,208	590	5,726	113%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	71	1,581	47	1,557	2189%	scope).
		LOUISIANA ARMY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Louisiana	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	2,270	2,347	642	719	32%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								(1) Drainet Conne Added cleanur shapes as the project program
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		MAKUA MILITARY						scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Hawaii	Army	RESERVATION	0	747	124	871		Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
nawali	Army	RESERVATION	0	/4/	124	0/1	IN/A	
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		MCALESTER ARMY						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Oklahoma	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	4,805	5,924	825	1,944		in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								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
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,561	3,562	1,715	1,716	48%	method.
		MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Utah	Army	WEST FED	473	282	4,721	4,530	957%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		PAPAGO MILITARY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION	1,563	1,340	681	458	29%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		PHOENIX MILITARY						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland	Army	RESERVATION	767	1,096	106	435	57%	contract or contract method.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,079	1,476	202	599	56%	schedule.

			Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
.	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	126,280	204,857	24,012	102,589	81%	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		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 contract or contract method.
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	6,777		323			 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	Army	USARC	0	1,784	165	1,949	N/A	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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
							100/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	938	969	62	93	10%	schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		SUNFLOWER ARMY						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	36,079	36,025	5,074	5,020	14%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
North Carolina	A 1000 /	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE	170	1 0 4 0	225	1 01 4		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina	Army	PLANT	170	1,049	335	1,214	/ 10%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) 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
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,039	4,463	97	521	13%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change
								in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
								delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate
		TWIN CITIES ARMY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Minnesota	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	37,844	41,317	1,333	4,806		methodology or model.
			0.,011	11,017	1,000	1,000	.370	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		UMATILLA CHEMICAL						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Oregon	Army	DEPOT	47,535	40,037	41,228	33,730	71%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		USARC NIAGARA FALLS						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Army	(AMSA 5)	79	160	14	95	120%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) 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
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,270	1,509	5	244	19%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	438	15	453	N/A	scope).
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Hawaii	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	484	1,773	62	1,351	279%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,462	2,235	113	886	61%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,233	2,185	350	302	14%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost 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
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	37,517	38,005	4,286	4,774	13%	schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost		FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Change (\$000)	-	Reason(s)
			(****/	(****)	(****/	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
		AMCHITKA						DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Navy	FLTSURSPTDET1	37,722	42,751	2,030	7,059		 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Aldona	INDVY		51,122	42,101	2,000	7,000	1370	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,175	17,616	2,773	2,214	12%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		ANNAPOLIS US NAVAL						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maryland	Navy	ACADEMY	9,675	11,015	7	1,347		sampling).
		AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	Navy	DAM FACILITY	1,239	607	1,044	412	33%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater
								than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,549	7,655	793	2,899	52%	changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Nova		00 445	20.400	0 707	6 704	000/	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	29,445	32,499	3,707	6,761	23%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Maryland	Navy	NATCAPREG	315	504	297	486	154%	schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
				(4000)		(4000)		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
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	297,943	345,881	8,178	56,116		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.
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.
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.
			54,075	00,077	0,002	13,100	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	10,482	11,418	928	1,864	18%	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(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.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	105,400	106,436	9,699	10,735	10%	
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.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	35,971	37,620	2,979	4,628	13%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								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
California	N		40.704	45.044	0.740	4 700	440/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	43,764	45,844	2,719	4,799	11%	schedule. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,136	31,594	1,471	4,929	18%	schedule.
	litery		20,100	01,004	1,471	4,020	1070	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	6,005	7,451	415	1,861	31%	contract or contract method.
Cuem	Nous	GUAM FISC	00	454	10	77	050/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	90	151	16	77	85%	cost estimating methodology or model. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
								in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,135	56,819	4,500	6,184	11%	schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	90	151	18	79	87%	contract or contract method.
Cuem	News		0.000	0.040	405	070	400/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,229	2,313	195	279	13%	cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	10,607	13,675	4,255	7,323	60%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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).
California	Navy		10,607	13,075	4,200	7,323	69%	approval).
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	33,425	37,332	2.944	6.851	20%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract method. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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					 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – Regulator- driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
			3,001	.,				 Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,696	3,317	772	393	11%	 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	hand a lladia a blanca	Adjusted for	Estimate	-	Change	Change	Descenter
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								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
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	19,380	25,492	390	6,502	34%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								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
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,487	2,263	625	401	16%	schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Colifornio	Nove	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	0.050	11 100		2 002		scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Navy	PEDRO	8,053	11,123	23	3,093	38%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
								(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	2,794	3,431	88	725	26%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ferinsylvaria	INAVY	MECHANICSBORG SFCC	2,734	3,431	00	125	2078	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,716	6,752	675	711		changes in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	4,637	573	5,746	1,682	36%	schedule.
								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
Commontiout	News		44 70 4	40.000		0.000		ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,794	19,328	849	8,383	/1%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	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.
Virginia	INAVY	OCEANA NAS	44,000	70,432	0,525	30,100	00%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	11,763	15,065	775	4,077	35%	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%	 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
				FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
----------------	------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	-	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(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		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.
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		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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
	•							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	964	1,478	171	685	71%	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	INAVY	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	904	1,470	171	005	/1/0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,918	8,144	533	759	10%	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tionda	Navy		7,010	0,144	000	100	1070	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
			17.000	44.405	0.400	05 007	4.450/	the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,926	41,425	2,408	25,907	145%	changes in schedule.
								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
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	21,956	25,766	10,858	14,668	67%	caused by changes in schedule.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		TWENTYNINE PALMS						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
California	Navy	MCAGCC	17,767	22,792	875	5,900		in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	Í							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,210	5,775	10	575		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
	inavy		5,210	5,775	10	575	1170	
		WAHIAWA NCTAMS						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Hawaii	Navy	EASTPAC	4,008	6,762	290	3,044	76%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,225	42,335	6,319	6,429	15%	sampling).
								Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
District of		WASHINGTON DC						(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Columbia	Navy	NAVOBSY	54	241	44	231	429%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
								1) Draiget Seens Added requirements due to other site level
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
District of								cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	7,952	25,045	1,174	18,267		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
District of								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	835	763	289	217	26%	schedule.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – Regulator- driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66,950	70,115	3,526	6,691	10%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
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.
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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
		ABRAHAM LINCOLN						 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	CAPITAL AP	91	2,929	78	2,916		2) New Site.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,171					 Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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	2 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.
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					 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	45,453	70,556	1,201	26,304	58%	schedule.
Chlanoma			10,100	10,000	1,201	20,001	0070	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
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	73,817	82,569	5,859	14,611	20%	schedule.
				,	-,	,		
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	3,266	6,565	2,144	5,443	167%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
		BADLANDS BOMBING						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
South Dakota	Air Force	RANGE	3,356	4,061	95	800	24%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		BARNES MUNICIPAL						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Massachusetts	Air Force	AIRPORT	54	105	5	56	104%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	11,789	19,138	165	7,514	64%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
		BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY	,					Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	764	991	10	237	31%	cost estimating methodology or model.

	DeD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	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%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
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%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	295		246	7,037	2388%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	741	848	674	781	105%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		CALUMET AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	Air Force	STATION	0	465	1,680	2,145	N/A	sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	9	11	43	45	491%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) 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
		CAMP BLANDING MIL						so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	125	729	93	697	558%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								· · ·
	A: E	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD		4.050		040	4000/	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Washington	Air Force	STATION	515	1,050	84	619	120%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		CAPE CANAVERAL AIR	(1070/	scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	FORCE STATION CAPE LISBURNE LONG	109,326	254,209	4,771	149,654	137%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	5,251	5,916	118	783	15%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		CAPE NEWENHAM LONG						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	11,343	12,687	125	1,469	13%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,355	1,083	1,695	1,423	105%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
		CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS						 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
North Carolina	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,047	16,102	238	14,293	698%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	229	334	10	115	50%	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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
		COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Oregon	Air Force	GUARD STATION	28	90	119	181	635%	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%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
a	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(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%	 Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	7,412	8,499	1.152	2,239	200/	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Ocorgia	AITTOICE		7,412	0,499	1,132	2,209	3076	
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	4400/	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		DUNCAN CANAL RADIO						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,382	8,098	435	6,151	258%	additional sampling).
7 1100100	7 (11 1 0100		2,002	0,000	400	0,101	20070	
								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
T	A := F = = = =	DVF00	0.400	44.044	474	0.007	000/	the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	8,488	11,344	171	3,027	36%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,143	6,325	705	887	14%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		EARECKSON AIR FORCE						scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	BASE	78,295	98,565	2,033	22,303	28%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Standarda ar Bagulationa – DaD Baliau ar Directivo – A change in
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								 Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
								cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change
								Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or
		EDWARDS AIR FORCE						ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost
California	Air Force	BASE	444,018	607,907	12,027	175,916	40%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	38,511	43,285	2,821	7,595	2004	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
i iuliua	AILFUICE		30,311	43,203	2,021	1,595	20%	

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	171,185	409,328	26,181	264,324	154%	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		4,305			1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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		1,069			 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost		Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate		Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
			(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(****)	(, /	(****)		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		FRANCIS S. GABRESKI						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
New York	Air Force	(WEST HAMPTON)	666	1,109	940	1,383		costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
A	A: =		070	074		707	0500/	Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	279	671	315	707		costs included in the CTC. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	145,709	224,975	22 249	101,515		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
7 1100110	AILLOICC		140,700	224,010	22,240	101,010	1070	
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	7,085	9,781	473	3,169	45%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
								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
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,532	1,764	45	277	18%	cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								4) Otan danda an Danidatiana - DaD Daliau an Dinastina - Alakan na in
								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
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	6,083	8,397	321	2,635	43%	may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								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
		GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE						prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This
North Dakota	Air Force	BASE	5,248	6,750	386	1,888	36%	additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO	0,210	0,100	000	1,000	0070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	4,097	6,480	90	2,473	60%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		GREAT FALLS						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Montana	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	108	20,244	130	20,266	18818%	costs included in the CTC.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	2,040	4,000	10	1,970	97%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	14,291	23,951	300	9,960	70%	costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
		GULFPORT BILOXI						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Mississippi	Air Force	REGIONAL AIRPORT	106	154	47	95	00%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i			100	134	47	35	3078	
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,401	3,547	88	1,234	51%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
0.0.0				(+)	(+)	(+)	(Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	0	15	99	114	N/A	scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	A			0.057		0.005		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	55	2,057	33	2,035		sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater
								than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	16,598	25,264	948	9,614	58%	changes in schedule
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	64	1,533	31	1.500		DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
			01	1,000	01	1,000	2010/0	
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	197,899	303,562	7,317	112,980	57%	caused by changes in schedule.

					FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
				00.740				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	20,394	26,746	5,560	11,912	58%	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).
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		484			 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

	DoD		Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State		Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	31,878	46,710	2,454	17,286		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		828			 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	57,305					 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD		•	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Poscon(s)
State	Component	Instanation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) 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 –
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	116,818	214,844	6,527	104,553	90%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	2,374	3,354	232	1,212	51%	schedule.
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
								DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
T	A in Eana		4 077	5 000	000	4 4 7 4	0.40/	2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	4,977	5,928	220	1,171	24%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Missouri	Air Force	GUARD STATION	471	5,032	262	4,823	1023%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	606	882	16	292	48%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
••								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	7,621	9,103	40	1,522	20%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	3,210	5,993	533	3,316	103%	scope).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	0 570	4 005	178	1 5 4 0	400/	Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Mississippi	Air Force	REESLER	3,573	4,905	178	1,510	42%	costs included in the CTC.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate		Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	-	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	44,583	77,836	1,494	34,747	78%	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					 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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		 Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	-	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		KLAMATH FALLS IAP						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Oregon	Air Force	(KINGSLEY FIELD)	184	4,194	136	4,146	2255%	costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	5,085	6,413	182	1,510	30%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
		LAMBERT ST. LOUIS						Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Missouri	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,160	17,255	843	14,938	473%	costs included in the CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	14,800	35,292	545	21,037	142%	model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL	296	7,626	73	7,403	250/10/	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
TEDIASKA			290	7,020	13	7,403	2304%	
		LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Arkansas	Air Force	BASE	20,315	25,890	236	5,811	29%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name		Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Peason(s)
State	Component			(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(i ercentage)	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,173	32,195	1,957	2,979	10%	future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Maine	AILLOICE		51,175	52,195	1,957	2,979	1076	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	1,192	6,415	212	5,435	456%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,383	7,979	156	1,752	27%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,278	4,846	255	3,823	299%	sampling).
								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
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	15,499	24,584	556	9,641	62%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Seene Added cleanup phases on the project programme
								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 –
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	40,650	85,105	3,061	47,516	117%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
		MAKAH AIR FORCE						change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in
Washington	Air Force	STATION	1,495	620	1,147	272	18%	the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		Change	
State		Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
01010				(+++++)	(****)	(****)	(. e. e e	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
		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Montana	Air Force	BASE	21,124	24,658	1,499	5,033	24%	schedule.
								1) Droiget Seene Added cleanup phones on the project program
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
O allifa maila	A: E		50.070	400.050		444 450	0000/	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California	Air Force	MARCH	53,378	163,953	884	111,459	209%	model. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	357	2,805	93	2,541	713%	costs included in the CTC.
								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
K	A. E	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE				45.00-		estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Kansas	Air Force	BASE	50,223	61,252	4,928	15,957	32%	schedule.

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		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. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL						(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
Minnesota	Air Force	MAP/IAP ANG	239	2,585	5 104	2,450	1026%	the CTC. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	13,276	16,072	1,593	4,389		(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%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	3,934	4,986	271	1,323	34%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	i 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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated		Change	
State	-	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	•		Reason(s)
				(*)	(+ /	(+)	(<u> </u>	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	10,860	11,290	1,661	2,091	19%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
		NAKNEK RECREATIONAL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	CAMP I	829	974	13	158	19%	cost estimating methodology or model.
		NAKNEK RECREATIONAL						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Alaska	Air Force	CAMP II	8,504	11,889	186	3,571	42%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	8	2,650	246	2,888	35530%	scope).
								4) Draiget Coope Added cleaning phones on the project program
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	16,114	18,846	654	3.386	21%	costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site.
						-,		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	3,803	5,910	291	2,398	63%	costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
						- 16-		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	7,909	9,450	927	2,468	31%	sampling).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(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		1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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%	 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 10 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proscope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclute the CTC. New Hampshire Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proce progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proce progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proce project change (e.g., newly discover				FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
State Component Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (Percentage) Reason(s) Image: State Image: Sta									
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. 3) New Hampshire New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. 3) New Hampshire New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. 3) New Hampshire New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. 3) New Hampshire New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW Astan 107 3,454 2575% (the CTC. Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., newly contamedial action operation added to progress (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., neasibility study or remedial action operation added t						-	-		
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or national change in required and initiated by Dobly, change in triated by Dobly, change in triated by Dobly, change in triated by Dobly, change in the cleanup, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulation field New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or national change in required and initiated by Dobly asses as the project prograte Requirement). 3) New Hampshire Air Force New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or national change in required and initiated by Dobly asses as the project prograte Requirement). 3) New Hampshire Air Force New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% the CTC. New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project prograss (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to prograss (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
New HampshireAir ForcePEASE24,29195,75610,06881,533336%Applicable or rational change in required and initiated by Dobl, change in Dob policy or medial action operation added to proceed to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase or modified mases as the project progress (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase or modified (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Dob Policy or Dob Policy or Dob Policy or Dob Policy or the costs inclus or project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Dob Policy or Dob Policy or Dob Policy or Dob Policy or project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Dob Policy or project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Dob Policy or project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- scope). 2) Standards or Regulation added to pro- scope). 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial									1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified action operation added to proscope - Added cleanup phases as the project prograve in DoD policy or clinective that redefines the costs inclute that redefines the costs include to proscope). New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2275% Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project prograve in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs include to proscope). New Hampshire Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% (scope). New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional asmpling). 2) New Site.									
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progrim (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proscope). New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% the CTC. PETERSON AIR FORCE PETERSON AIR FORCE Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase ophysical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk, pathway sugvapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DO), change i future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk, pathway sugvapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DO), change i future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.									physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) de impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified impacts multiple sites (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to provide the modified impacts multiple sites (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to provide change in DoD policy or Directive that redefines the costs incluse change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs incluse change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs incluse change in Poject Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to provide change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs incluse change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the cost incluse change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the cost incluse change in DoD policy or directive the register the cost incluse change in DoD policy or directive the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to prove the site of the project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., newly field the project scope) Colorado Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in</td>									vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 10 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progration added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclust scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclust scope). 2) Standards or Regulation operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project Change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway survey oritrusion (that is required and ini									
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to provide change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclust change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclust change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclust change in DoD policy or remedial action operation added to provide the cost operoperatin added to provide the cost operoperoperation added to pr									
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE 24,291 95,756 10,068 81,533 336% Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) New New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proceed that redefines the costs inclue scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclue scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs inclue scope). 2) Standards or remedial action operation added to proceed the project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proceed the project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proceed the project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to proceed the project BASE Colorado Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway sug vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change i future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.									
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% the CTC. PETERSON AIR FORCE PETERSON AIR FORCE PETERSON AIR FORCE Peterson added to project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation addet toprogress (e.g., feasibility study or project Scope – Added require	New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	24 291	95 756	10.068	81 533	336%	
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% (the CTC. Peiget PETERSON AIR FORCE PETERSON AIR FORCE Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (s.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to provide the costs included to provide the costs in	new namponire			24,201	00,700	10,000	01,000	00070	
New Hampshire Air Force PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% thange in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs include the CTC. New Hampshire Air Force PETERSON AIR FORCE PETERSON AIR FORCE Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to pro- project Scope). Colorado Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). Image: New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional sampling). 2) New Site.									(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
New Hampshire Air Force HAMPSHIRE 134 3,481 107 3,454 2575% the CTC. Petterson Air Force Petter									scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
Colorado Air Force PETERSON AIR FORCE Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to progress (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increase physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway success (e.g., newly discovered and initiated by DoD), change i future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
Colorado Air Force PETERSON AIR FORCE (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to produce the state of th	New Hampshire	Air Force	HAMPSHIRE	134	3,481	107	3,454	2575%	
Colorado Air Force BASE 33 14 4,178 4,159 12794% scope). Image: Colorado									
New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional sampling). 2) New Site.	Colorado	Air Force		33	14	4,178	4,159	12794%	
New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional sampling). 2) New Site.	Colorado					.,	.,		
New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional sampling). 2) New Site.									project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.									physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
New York Air Force PLATTSBURGH 40,138 88,606 1,693 50,161 125% additional sampling). 2) New Site.									
	Now York	Air Forco		10 139	88 606	1 603	50 161	125%	
	New TOIK	AILLOICE	FLATTSBORGIT	40,130	00,000	1,095	5 50,101	12370	
POINT ARENA AIR FORCE Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change			POINT ARENA AIR FORCE						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
California Air Force STATION 1,954 3,255 30 1,331 68% DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the	California	Air Force	STATION	1,954	3,255	30	1,331	68%	
									1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
									(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
									scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
									level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
									vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
POINT BARROW LONG future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,			POINT BARROW LONG						
Alaska Air Force RANGE RADAR 4,217 11,547 247 7,577 180% additional sampling).	Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR	4,217	11,547	247	7,577	180%	
									Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
									change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
									dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
									property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska Air Force POINT LAY 423 14,004 20 13,601 3218% sampling).	Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	423	14.004	20	13.601	3218%	

				FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	Passan(a)
State	Component	Installation Name	innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	169	39	213	83	49%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
		PORT HEIDEN RADIO						scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	10,596	15,023	456	4,883	46%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	358	1,942	25	1,609	450%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Puerto Rico	Air Force	SITE	76	209	31	164	215%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
		-						
		PUNTA SALINAS AIR						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Puerto Rico	Air Force	GUARD STATION	76	211	21	156	204%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	119	1,505	52	1,438	1210%	scope).
				1,000		1,100	121070	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Texas	Air Force	REESE	14.657	20,911	320	6,574	15%	future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Техаз	AILLOICE		14,037	20,911	320	0,374	4376	auditorial sampling). 2) New Site.
		RENO TAHOE						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Nevada	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	117			,		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.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	743	1,873	42	1,172	158%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	135%	
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	901	1,811	311	1,221	135%	sampling).

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	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 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				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).

		FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
oD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
omponent	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
							project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
							vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
							future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
							additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
_							Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
ir Force	SELFRIDGE	12,381	20,777	575	8,971	72%	costs included in the CTC.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
							(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope - Added requirements due to other site-
							level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
							physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
							future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
ir Force	FORCE BASE	10,659	13,604	607	3,552	33%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
							scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
							level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
							physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
ir Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	55,064	74,103	1,294	20,333	37%	model.
							1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
							DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
ir Force	SHEPPARD	5,126	7,470	340	2,684	52%	cost estimating methodology or model.
	SOUTH PORTLAND						Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
ir Force	FACILITY	110	532	42	464	423%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
ir Force	STATION	2,539	3,895	75	1,431	56%	cost estimating methodology or model.
							Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
		253	2.319	243	2.309	913%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
o ir ir ir	Force Force Force Force	Installation Name insprinstallating	Installation Name Inflation (\$000) Force SELFRIDGE 12,381 Force SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE 10,659 Force FORCE BASE 10,659 Force SHAW AIR FORCE BASE 55,064 Force SHAW AIR FORCE BASE 55,064 Force SHEPPARD 5,126 Force SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY 110 Force SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION 2,539 SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY 110	ImponentInstallation NameInflation (\$000)(\$000)ForceSELFRIDGE12,38120,777ForceSEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE10,65913,604ForceFORCE BASE10,65913,604ForceSHAW AIR FORCE BASE55,06474,103ForceSHAW AIR FORCE BASE51,1267,470ForceSHEPPARD5,1267,470ForceSOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY110532ForceSPARREVOHN AIR FORCE SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE2,5393,895SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEYSPRINGFIELD-BECKLEYSet State Stat	Imponent Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) Force SELFRIDGE 12,381 20,777 575 Force SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR 10,659 13,604 607 Force FORCE BASE 10,659 13,604 607 Force SHAW AIR FORCE BASE 55,064 74,103 1,294 Force SHAW AIR FORCE BASE 51,26 7,470 340 Force SHEPPARD 5,126 7,470 340 Force SOUTH PORTLAND 110 532 42 Force STATION 2,539 3,895 75 SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY SOUT SOUT SOUT	Installation NameInflation (\$000)(\$000)(\$000)(\$000)ForceSELFRIDGE12,38120,7775758,971ForceSEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE10,65913,6046073,552ForceFORCE BASE10,65913,6046073,552ForceSHAW AIR FORCE BASE55,06474,1031,29420,333ForceSHEPPARD5,1267,4703402,684ForceSOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY11053242464ForceSTATION2,5393,895751,431SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEYSPRINGFIELD-BECKLEYSOUTH10532751,431	Installation Name Inflation (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (\$000) (Percentage) Force SELFRIDGE 12,381 20,777 575 8,971 72% Force SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR 10,659 13,604 607 3,552 33% Force FORCE BASE 10,659 13,604 607 3,552 33% Force SHAW AIR FORCE BASE 55,064 74,103 1,294 20,333 37% Force SHEPPARD 5,126 7,470 340 2,684 52% Force SOUTH PORTLAND 110 532 42 464 423% Force STATION 2,539 3,895 75 1,431 56%

	DoD		FY 2015 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	FY 2016 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	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	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		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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				Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		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	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.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	6,366	11,636	143	5,413	85%	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.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	229	86	1,501	1,358	594%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
	-							Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,020	19,074	200	8,254	75%	scope).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator
								(e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE	3,641	5,973	231	2.563	70%	project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site.
IVIISSOUTI	All Force	DAGE	3,041	5,973	231	2,303	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
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	5,379	6,076	62	759	14%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	16,188	21,160	1,288	6,260	39%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		WILLOW GROVE AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	Air Force	FORCE RESERVE	4,656	5,620	315	1,279		sampling).
1 onnoyivania			1,000	0,020	010	1,210	2170	ouriping).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Poppeylyopic	Air Earas		2.004	E 202	404	4 000	E00/	that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,621	5,393	121	1,893	52%	approval).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	83,704	121,979	5,205	43,480		 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
West Virginia Maryland	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	2,927	1,592				DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	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. Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Florida	FUDS	RANGE PINELLAS	526	789	176	439	83%	scope).

				FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DeD		Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Slale	Component		innation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Fercentage)	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
								requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	339	996	20	677	100%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Λιάδκα	1005			330	20	011	13370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		ARDMORE AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Oklahoma	FUDS	BASE	2,007	5,399	2,211	5,603		sampling).
e li a l'e l'a			_,	0,000	_,	0,000		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	13,984	23,964	1,822	11,802	84%	cost estimating methodology or model.
					.,	,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	608	1,088	33	513	85%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,195	1,218	729	752	63%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,381	193,688	8,661	18,968	10%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Navy Marily	FUDO							property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	55	62	54	61		sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		BASIC TRAINING CENTER						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	NO. 8	132	153	58	79	60%	sampling).
Gamorria	1000		132	100		19	00 //	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	813	861	184	232	29%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,324	3,337	310	323	10%	schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Alaaka	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,066	1,456	125	515		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQK3	1,000	1,430	125	515	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
		BODEGA HEAD GUNNERY						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	RANGE	7,134	10,233	42	3,141		additional sampling).
			,	,				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	4,435	7,895	451	3,911	88%	scope). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	2,046	21,519	7,267	26,740	1307%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	710	707	106	103		(e.g., reasibility study of remedial action operation added to project scope).
virgina	1003	BOCKROE BEACH	710	101	100	103	14 /0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,696	1,597	1,066	967		sampling).
			,					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,667	1,408	769	510	31%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)		Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Otate	Component		innation (\$000)	(4000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(rereentage)	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,
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	242	241	29	28	12%	delay in regulatory document review or approval). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	27,723	31,789	154	4,220	15%	cost estimating methodology or model.
Tionaa	1000		21,120	51,705	104	4,220	1070	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,254	40,877	92	26,715	187%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	16,346	18,356	464	2,474		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
		CAMP SHELBY MANUVER						(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mississippi	FUDS	AREA	12,797	14,017	34	1,254	10%	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.
167422	1003		20,301	30,000	09	0,500	3078	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	607	545	261	199	33%	scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	37	100	63	126	346%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	281	7,567	62	7,348	2611%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
			201	1,001	02	1,010	2011/0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	34	500	37	503	150.20/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Callionlia	1.002		34	500	31	503	1502%	อลเทษแทย).
			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
------------------	--------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	---
Chata	DoD	Installation Nome	Adjusted for	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated	Change	Change	Passan (a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	932	1,493	1	562		change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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			1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska Kansas	FUDS FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	213 0		38 298			sampling). New Site.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH	780		38			Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,070	1,173	484			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	14,123		74			 Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,718					 Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	92	157	99	164	177%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	719	1,056	67	404	56%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	647	119	1,594	1,066	1650/	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
INEW FOIR	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	047	119	1,594	1,000	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
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	605	669	413	477	79%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Colorado	FUDS	11	1,721	285	1,970	534	310/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	1003		1,721	203	1,970	554	31/0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wyoming	FUDS	4	85,668	161,338	568	76,238	89%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,252	3,233	388	369	110/	sampling).
minitesula	טעט ין		5,252	5,233	300	209	1176	ອຸລແມ່ນແມ່ນ.

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,895	9,712	521	1,338	15%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	103	73	82	52	51%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	397	914	60	577	145%	sampling).
) (in all a la la carla da f								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	535	799	147	411	77%	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
uie 0.0.	1000		555	133	147	411	1170	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	FORT BAKER	113	2,073	8	1,968	1745%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Wyoming	FUDS	TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,474	5,946	3,357	1,829	24%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	102	104	631	633	623%	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
	. 000		102	104	031	000	02376	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	51	40	77	66	130%	scope).
Arizona	ELIDO		7 400	11 660	60	4 602	GE0/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,120	11,660	63	4,603	05%	cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	•	Reason(s)
	•							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	40	62	25	32%	sampling).
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	7,843		2,263	,		cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT PIERCE	30	7,418	16	7,404	24290%	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,084	17,132	67	8,115	89%	sampling).
		FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Florida	FUDS	BASE	15,373	17,030	2,665	4,322	28%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	FUDO		5 00 4	5 000		705	100/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,964	5,830	919	785	13%	sampling).
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	2 5 5 2	0 774	179	398	440/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,552	3,771	179	398	11%	cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	RECREATION AREA	50	345	342	637	12000/	sampling).
California	FUDS	RECREATION AREA	50	340	342	637	1200%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	51	6,549	8,343	870	2.664	41%	sampling).
monigan	1 000		0,549	0,040	070	2,004	+1/0	loamping).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate			Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		HAINES FAIRBANKS						additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change
Alaska	FUDS	PIPELINE	11,255	13,516	3,015	5,276	47%	in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	886	5,276	121	4,511		sampling).
	1000		000	0,210		1,011	00070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
			100					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	133	108	241	216	162%	sampling).
		HANCOCK CO. BOMBING &						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Mississippi	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	607	544	208	145		scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Northern			4.000					property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,200	2,261	43	1,104	92%	sampling). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,386	3,372	891	877		scope).
			0,000	0,012		0.1	2370	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
Illinois	FUDS	(CRAB ORCHARD)	4,306	9,205	466	5,365	125%	methodology or model.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Estimate Change	Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	-	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	315	158	339	182	58%	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		-						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	740	825	18	103	14%	sampling).
		KINGMAN G TO G					1050	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Arizona	FUDS	GUNNERY RANGE	1,459	3,999	165	2,705	185%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) 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
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	42,914	56,389	1,503	14,978	35%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Maina	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	52	52	79	79	1520/	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maine	FUDS		52	52	79	19	153%	sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	3,071	4,369	109	1,407		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
	FUDO						0000	property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	54	75	16	37	69%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
		MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE						
Hawaii	FUDS	YARD	0	5,447	1.054	6,501	N/A	New Site.
Tawali	1003	TAND	0	5,447	1,034	0,301	IN/A	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
		MANASSAS AIR FORCE						(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
Virginia	FUDS	COMM FACILITY	3,578	4,508	55	985	28%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
- inginica	1000		0,010	1,000	00	000	2070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Northern								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,240	4,498	221	479	11%	sampling).
								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 –
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	13,567	16,777	, 115	3,325	25%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
i lawan	1000		10,007	10,777	113	0,020	2370	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	195	310	37	152	78%	additional sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Alaaka	FUDO	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA	400	4 400		4 007		future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	NOB	103	1,422	8	1,327	1294%	additional sampling). 2) New Site. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	322	794	362	834	259%	sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	2,335	3,102	18	785	34%	DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AIR STATION						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	OAKLAND	117	95	383	361	309%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
California	FUDO	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR		5.045		5 050		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION ARCATA	44	5,645	55	5,656	12947%	sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	711	1,215	251	755		sampling).
California	1000		,,,	1,210	201	100	10070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE	48	280	30	262		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
		NAVAL WEAPONS						intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		INDUSTRIAL RESERVE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Illinois	FUDS	PLANT	73	455	11	393	537%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
						1		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	569	993	652	1,076	189%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		NIKE BA-30/31						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Maryland	FUDS	(TOLCHESTER)	590	2.058	120	1.588		sampling).
iviai ylattu	FUDS	(IOLONESIEK)	590	∠,058	120	1,568	209%	samping).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
	•							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,546	2,093	1,219	766	30%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,014	,			28%	sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	0	2,988	71	3,059	N/A	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,774	1,931	217	374	21%	sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND						requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	169	215	83	129	11%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
New Jorgov	FUDO		504		C04	100	4.00/	(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	564	62	604	102	18%	scope). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	141	137	74	70	49%	sampling).
i ennsylvania	1003		141	157	/4	10	4370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	5,781	6,212	310	741	13%	sampling).
		-						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
					1			change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
					1			dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	633	481	523	371	59%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost	FY 2016 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
		NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR						Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Alaska	FUDS	A	658	622	6,429	6,393	971%	sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,749	9,977	82	7,310	266%	project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
lowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,402	9,717	2,987	2,302	22%	sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	7.383	8,306	133	1,056	1 49/	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
		OLATHE NAVAL AIR						1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site- level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	STATION	280	607	604	931	332%	additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
California	FUDS	OROVILLE PRECISION BOMBING RANGE	45	75	42	72	162%	change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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).

D-D			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	mate Cost		Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in
								the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new
							070/	requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope,
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	39	64	12	37	97%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
Howeii	FUDS		240	1 274	42	1 1 6 9		property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	249	1,374	43	1,168	469%	sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		PORTERVILLE ARMY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	AIRFIELD	201	110	265	174		sampling).
California	1003	PUERTO RICO BOMB	201	110	203	1/4	00 /0	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RANGE	4,137	6,138	532	2,533	61%	cost estimating methodology or model.
	1000		4,107	0,100	002	2,000	0170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,916	2,309	159	552		sampling).
June			.,	_,				1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
		RED BLUFF AIR FORCE						future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	STATION	99	79	168	148	151%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BATTERY 08-09	327	405	366	444	136%	sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		SAN FRANCISCO NIKE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	BATTERY 25	15	67	14	66	431%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost	FY 2016	FY 2016	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								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,
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	83	84	59	60	72%	delay in regulatory document review or approval).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florido	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,709	2.416	20	727	420/	Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,708	2,410	20	121	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
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,827	4,108	99	2,380	130%	sampling).
			.,	.,		_,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Washington	FUDS	DEPOT	4,044	6,933	64	2,953	73%	sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as
District of								vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	16,346	33,106	7,467	24,227	1/00/	future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLET	10,340	33,100	7,407	24,227	140%	additional sampling). 3) New Site. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	559	2,764	34	2,239	401%	sampling).
-		-		_,		-,		Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology
								(e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	518	898	20	400	77%	remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
								property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	6,738	1,274	8,185	2,721	40%	sampling).

			FY 2015 Cost Estimate	FY 2016 Cost		Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)			Reason(s)
	-							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,681	17,699	3,980	1,998	10%	cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses
								(e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project
								scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-
								level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in
								future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	213.385	233,408	809	20,832		additional sampling).
/ lidolid	1020		210,000	200,100	000	20,002	1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	100	255	73	228		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		WILKINS AIR FORCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	STATION	757	1,132	4	379		sampling).
010	1020			1,102		010		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor
								intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Pennsylvania	FUDS	PLANT	434	421	154	141		sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project
								change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical
								dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future
		YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC						property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional
Ohio	FUDS	AIRPORT	1.767	2,462	72	767		sampling).
UNIO	1 000		1,707	2,402	12	101	+370	Bamping).