

FY 2015 DEP ARC

Appendix A

Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

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

This Appendix provides the amount of environmental restoration funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property in FY 2015; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2014 to FY 2015; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2015.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	94,388	108,232	4,867	18,711	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	10,021	11,152	51	1,182	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	74,927	20,319	748	(53,860)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	377	344	36	3	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	1,237	1,253	5	21	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	ARTHUR MACARTHUR USARC	0	0	16	16	No explanation required.
Florida	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	0	0	145	145	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	51,035	74,542	1,677	25,184	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	1,582	2,799	21	1,238	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,783	2,037	518	772	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	335	315	8	(12)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,138	1,338	86	286	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	145	158	36	49	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	18,073	17,562	4,840	4,329	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY AIRFIELD	0	1,731	36	1,767	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	2,467	2,313	133	(21)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	3,940	6,652	340	3,052	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	399	378	98	77	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	2,537	2,462	92	17	No explanation required.
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	9,187	68	110	(9,009)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,893	6,353	1,971	1,431	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	Army	CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	56,810	55,475	1,569	234	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	9,878	8,274	111	(1,493)	No explanation required.
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	8,828	10,242	429	1,843	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	127,310	136,066	2,286	11,042	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	1,473	1,380	840	747	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	44,592	39,305	7,524	2,237	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	84,459	78,658	88	(5,713)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	48,084	142,049	318	94,283	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	6,956	30,823	547	24,414	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	18	158	25	165	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	15,330	15,708	873	1,251	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	20,537	17,218	1,360	(1,959)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	46,114	39,661	747	(5,706)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	10,724	8,863	220	(1,641)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	3,301	6,335	253	3,287	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	7,120	8,012	781	1,673	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	44,440	12,073	4,635	(27,732)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	852	1,003	56	207	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	17,982	14,842	501	(2,639)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	6,952	2,718	464	(3,770)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	41,328	53,132	9,733	21,537	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	4,628	6,483	23,222	25,077	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	9,268	2,922	137	(6,209)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	5,313	6,534	1,782	3,003	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	0	2,175	1,006	3,181	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	4,334	4,196	651	513	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	940	1,261	825	1,146	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	13,768	10,168	120	(3,480)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	6,536	4,948	135	(1,453)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	970	837	237	104	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	1,649	416	2,218	985	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	10,512	6,467	1,742	(2,303)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	70,082	11,323	38,460	(20,299)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,067	1,047	1,285	1,265	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Army	FORT MCNAIR	158	158	4	4	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,620	2,137	3,898	4,415	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	0	30	522	552	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	59,794	28,582	115	(31,097)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	12,396	13,116	527	1,247	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
California	Army	FORT ORD	276,012	202,531	19,406	(54,075)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	0	65	65	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	9,912	11,845	2,427	4,360	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	19,784	12,435	1,786	(5,563)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	3,648	2,197	189	(1,262)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	14,541	17,025	669	3,153	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	1,336	1,455	170	289	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	12,037	8,099	7,531	3,593	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	1,251	3,935	418	3,102	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	82,538	39,495	3,354	(39,689)	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	0	10	335	345	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	151,248	75,378	138,833	62,963	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Army	GERSTLE RIVER TEST SITE	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	0	2,451	2,357	4,808	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	102,999	133,672	5,785	36,458	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	9,751	10,387	238	874	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,784	1,410	156	(218)	No explanation required.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	29,278	45,934	1,534	18,190	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	3,520	5,407	5,368	7,255	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	3,435	7,693	605	4,863	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,366	1,341	2,380	2,355	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	164	0	10	(154)	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	92,471	84,645	47	(7,779)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	2,752	280	943	(1,529)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	JFHQ RQ ARNG	0	0	41	41	No explanation required.
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	722	373	436	87	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	26,676	52,252	1,895	27,471	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Virginia	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	1,323	61	651	(611)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	22,776	20,331	1,323	(1,122)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,845	4,992	5,851	7,998	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	94	732	2,210	2,848	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE SITE	0	0	1,959	1,959	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	266,674	128,858	3,801	(134,015)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	29,127	28,004	6,072	4,949	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Texas	Army	LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,114	4,342	30	258	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	56,885	55,992	2,030	1,137	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	0	0	120	120	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	16,323	4,729	433	(11,161)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	47,104	31,997	1,193	(13,914)	No explanation required.
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	49,892	46,784	6,863	3,755	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,203	2,473	30	300	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	3,424	0	584	(2,840)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	12,151	3,505	304	(8,342)	No explanation required.
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	953	466	6,725	6,238	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,760	2,840	95	175	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	14,682	16,595	961	2,874	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Army	NG EMMONAK ARMORY	993	1,830	427	1,264	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Army	NG FORT YUKON ARMORY	303	0	427	124	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	NG GAMBELL ARMORY	0	0	121	121	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	NG KOTLIK ARMORY	1,060	1,413	427	780	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Army	NG SAVOONGA ARMORY	1,190	1,771	121	702	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	20,688	18,392	1,304	(992)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	221	1,538	653	1,970	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	3,528	9,643	405	6,520	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	833	755	99	21	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	26,925	86,439	2,392	61,906	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	23,544	30,328	5,886	12,670	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	87,871	92,123	45	4,297	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,042	1,062	33	53	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	102,975	124,291	20,956	42,272	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	13,877	15,163	66	1,352	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	46,597	26,790	13,219	(6,588)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	13,204	20,338	342	7,476	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	470,205	935,715	18,184	483,694	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	Army	RIVER ROAD TRAINING SITE	22	0	29	7	No explanation required.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	5,739	20,431	3,490	18,182	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	7,614	6,670	1,392	448	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	196,787	210,538	11,370	25,121	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,019	2,516	665	1,162	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	89,657	71,385	3,783	(14,489)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	31,159	20,867	17	(10,275)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	8,398	7,883	220	(295)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	23,468	29,491	912	6,935	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	70	0	9	(61)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	14,049	19,094	435	5,480	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,206	1,049	129	(28)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	1,467	923	330	(214)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	49,055	35,511	23,364	9,820	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Carolina	Army	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	167	167	17	17	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	5,420	3,975	65	(1,380)	No explanation required.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	40,349	38,529	5,706	3,886	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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).
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	31,143	21,312	10,938	1,107	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	16,045	15,384	506	(155)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	152,554	37,248	646	(114,660)	No explanation required.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	9,413	46,786	1,337	38,710	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	419	264	117	(38)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	USARC LODI	85	47	48	10	No explanation required.
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	0	78	41	119	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	Army	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC (SOUTH)	0	140	2	142	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,091	1,250	6	165	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	51	26	89	64	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	VOLUNTEER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	25,087	21,571	728	(2,788)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	24	0	81	57	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAUWA AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	0	476	104	580	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	5,702	5,621	190	109	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	WELDON SPRING TRAINING AREA	1,839	1,934	35	130	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	51,016	55,165	1,980	6,129	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,605	1,439	132	(34)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	7,283	7,902	3,759	4,378	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	620	2,198	36	1,614	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	28,248	16,558	3,485	(8,205)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	93,544	89,873	13,635	9,964	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	6,434	7,041	25	632	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ALAMEDA NAS	71,888	58,825	8,317	(4,746)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NMCRC	0	0	4	4	No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	11,614	14,790	464	3,640	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	32,658	36,926	3,043	7,311	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
District of Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	3,922	3,803	289	170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	29,603	17,889	8,903	(2,811)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	269	1,520	609	1,860	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	848	1,219	156	527	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	7,959	33,264	196	25,501	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	71,433	74,967	3,064	6,598	1) New Site. 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.
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	5,167	5,462	680	975	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BARKING SANDS PMRF	3,052	2,751	180	(121)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	45,747	47,388	2,372	4,013	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	27,852	28,981	1,261	2,390	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	20,824	21,174	258	608	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	BETHESDA NAVMEDCOM NATCAPREG	659	310	131	(218)	No explanation required.
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	298,991	293,251	10,144	4,404	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	17,206	16,284	476	(446)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Navy	BRISTOL NWIRP	574	520	61	7	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	21,800	30,157	1,239	9,596	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	23,035	21,387	1,220	(428)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	127,567	119,525	9,033	991	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	61,225	53,221	9,519	1,515	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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).
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,403	10,317	1,446	360	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	600	780	303	483	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	3,145	3,145	15	15	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	98,616	94,091	3,793	(732)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	36,915	103,740	4,499	71,324	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	42,415	40,858	551	(1,006)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	63,482	59,990	9,716	6,224	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	3,791	2,807	922	(62)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	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 – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	15,006	18,128	1,284	4,406	
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	38,535	35,405	1,548	(1,582)	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.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	5,921	7,108	369	1,556	
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	4,140	3,315	509	(316)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	28,079	25,976	564	(1,539)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	17,365	20,086	508	3,229	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	15,423	17,565	1,218	3,360	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	26,999	33,539	557	7,097	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	DIXON NRTF	5,278	5,097	334	153	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	336	337	32	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	EL CENTRO NAF	25,610	24,265	3,023	1,678	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	54,193	43,075	4,402	(6,716)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	30,830	34,845	2,056	6,071	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	26,516	28,166	1,070	2,720	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	28,327	27,693	1,978	1,344	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	5,457	5,910	1,687	2,140	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	249,630	178,543	768	(70,319)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	55,825	54,267	1,882	324	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NCTAMS WESTPAC	4,856	4,856	6	6	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	231	89	15	(127)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAV Marianas	2,167	2,194	2,020	2,047	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	8,480	10,440	5,825	7,785	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	180,249	169,945	6,166	(4,138)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	27,612	32,899	2,297	7,584	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	9,343	11,686	3,398	5,741	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Navy	KANSAS CITY MO MCRCO	601	1,001	38	438	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	45,313	74,824	3,538	33,049	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	24,867	23,975	1,146	254	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).
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,613	3,872	112	371	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,700	3,638	802	740	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	17,648	19,075	1,605	3,032	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	282,180	280,695	860	(625)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,182	2,448	129	395	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	10,920	7,926	1,673	(1,321)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	539	751	114	326	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	3,108	4,709	159	1,760	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	51,298	62,953	2,150	13,805	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MARE ISLAND NSY	71,531	63,696	13,292	5,457	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	10,749	13,980	1,803	5,034	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	MCGREGOR NWIRP	27,538	26,467	799	(272)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,109	2,750	1,013	654	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	16,334	18,815	346	2,827	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,162	6,610	790	1,238	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	43,306	45,587	3,531	5,812	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	62,207	57,912	3,330	(965)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	39,816	46,896	9,372	16,452	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Hawaii	Navy	NAVFAC HAWAII P HARBOR	42,666	41,503	1,021	(142)	No explanation required.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	11,850	11,608	627	385	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	325	118	11	(196)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	76,320	59,557	30,352	13,589	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	31,109	31,108	1,222	1,221	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	49,048	85,357	7,126	43,435	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	1,194	1,062	172	40	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	63,643	41,973	5,592	(16,078)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	34,710	44,149	277	9,716	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	9,571	11,578	894	2,901	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,124	4,152	137	165	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	15,480	18,627	495	3,642	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	39,464	34,856	3,556	(1,052)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	9,638	13,050	2,060	5,472	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NS	124,115	128,140	4,300	8,325	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	450	338	22	(90)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	9,298	7,897	3,137	1,736	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	60,056	63,016	2,301	5,261	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	2,379	5,725	170	3,516	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,869	1,249	1,017	397	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	609	455	83	(71)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	30,887	31,314	1,331	1,758	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	17,611	19,205	994	2,588	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	2,565	2,936	152	523	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	10,719	10,444	1,454	1,179	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	17,460	13,105	2,059	(2,296)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,335	3,373	19	57	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP BREMERTON	1,588	1,591	37	40	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS	32,707	20,731	1,323	(10,653)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	100,754	106,096	9,969	15,311	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	134,783	119,868	4,618	(10,297)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	13,947	14,085	218	356	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	1,638	1,759	208	329	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,793	1,764	101	72	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO MCRD	0	0	22	22	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	4,073	4,068	99	94	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,141	949	2,432	2,240	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	291,287	288,495	42	(2,750)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NSB	302	0	365	63	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	7,159	2,961	8,828	4,630	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	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 in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate.
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	5,665	7,793	594	2,722	This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	39,713	39,468	247	2	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 in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	17,918	17,644	1,531	1,257	
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	13,371	9,026	518	(3,827)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	36,566	21,610	30,774	15,818	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	296,762	265,956	43,273	12,467	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	22,761	20,066	1,014	(1,681)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	16,608	18,288	1,261	2,941	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	18,328	17,487	1,799	958	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	325,954	314,250	7,457	(4,247)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	4,433	5,128	4,233	4,928	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	12,975	3,945	5,157	(3,873)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,304	41,560	7,412	6,668	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	53	53	39	39	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	6,517	7,827	1,306	2,616	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	889	822	146	79	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	64,089	65,896	2,631	4,438	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4,030	4,041	930	941	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	25,336	31,659	3,200	9,523	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	15,580	21,933	1,636	7,989	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	65,096	50,038	11,879	(3,179)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	27,291	25,738	1,378	(175)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	42,340	51,408	3,834	12,902	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	20,928	18,725	2,914	711	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	228	90	55	(83)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	5,641	5,090	786	235	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	2,859	2,500	114	(245)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	13,220	23,388	360	10,528	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	76,164	65,623	2,578	(7,963)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	3,050	848	34	(2,168)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	40,423	74,576	2,129	36,282	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	3,701	7,001	588	3,888	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	10,845	22,201	1,067	12,423	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Air Force	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT	337	5,627	236	5,526	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	33,939	44,737	1,039	11,837	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	101,572	72,655	8,317	(20,600)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	12,545	3,215	56	(9,274)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	11,905	12,669	1,143	1,907	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	4,472	3,303	64	(1,105)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	Air Force	BANGOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	228	0	12	(216)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	13,475	52,419	3,105	42,049	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	348	53	8	(287)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	10,686	11,603	162	1,079	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	BEALE	105,455	328,156	6,613	229,314	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,911	752	58	(1,101)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAVER CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,687	16	60	(1,611)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	8,980	11,391	122	2,533	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	8,843	9,874	455	1,486	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BETHEL RANGE	5,720	4,053	177	(1,490)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	15,237	10,033	255	(4,949)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	729	617	209	97	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	455	206	509	260	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.
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	1,290	462	221	(607)	No explanation required.
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	1,575	290	862	(423)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS CITY-BASE	5,653	8,099	425	2,871	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	21,776	27,749	818	6,791	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	1,055	828	100	(127)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	0	729	110	839	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	9,797	13,817	299	4,319	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	0	9	4	13	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	82	123	39	80	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	85	507	40	462	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	14,525	14,041	1,106	622	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	12,961	38,555	4,194	29,788	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	79,308	107,604	8,217	36,513	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	7,008	5,168	120	(1,720)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	8,042	11,164	157	3,279	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	21,444	14,851	6,014	(579)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	5,229	5,292	115	178	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	CASTLE	62,297	74,433	327	12,463	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHANNEL ISLANDS	2,618	1,334	12	(1,272)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	33,695	43,723	1,726	11,754	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,734	2,015	43	(1,676)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	0	225	10	235	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	Air Force	CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	10,310	9,979	918	587	Project Scope – Added or removed requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	17,316	6,104	711	(10,501)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	3,252	4,211	120	1,079	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	6,066	6,393	203	530	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oregon	Air Force	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	1,799	28	163	(1,608)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	484	3,402	86	3,004	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	437	1,394	33	990	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	Air Force	CUDDEBACK RANGE	2,791	4	4	(2,783)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	3,975	2,871	1,295	191	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Iowa	Air Force	DES MOINES	508	510	12	14	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	5,183	7,295	65	2,177	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.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	609	26	209	(374)	No explanation required.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	36,256	69,611	6,553	39,908	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	5,922	9,201	3,368	6,647	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,491	1,312	421	(758)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	893	2,344	445	1,896	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	1,322	8,354	361	7,393	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	7,227	6,046	587	(594)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	66,309	77,062	4,841	15,594	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	460,712	437,026	15,802	(7,884)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	28,702	37,905	6,689	15,892	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	39,792	168,489	23,060	151,757	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	ELLINGTON	992	929	1,925	1,862	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	20,027	22,831	930	3,734	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	17,084	12,818	285	(3,981)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
West Virginia	Air Force	EWVRA SHEPHERD FIELD (MARTINSBURG)	0	0	4	4	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	41,249	57,051	4,459	20,261	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	83	3,226	41	3,184	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.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	2,959	0	60	(2,899)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	261	243	287	269	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Air Force	FOUR LAKES COMM AIR GUARD STATION	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	15,239	22,818	539	8,118	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	FRANCIS S. GABRESKI (WEST HAMPTON)	2,863	656	388	(1,819)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	254	275	24	45	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA FOL	176,556	143,414	1,894	(31,248)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	5,999	6,973	731	1,705	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	6,228	5,187	696	(345)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	GEORGE	50,597	62,199	3,100	14,702	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,010	1,508	41	(1,461)	
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	4,183	5,987	119	1,923	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	2,386	5,165	418	3,197	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	558	4,032	90	3,564	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	106	55	161	New Site.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	11,534	2,008	16	(9,510)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	13,373	14,066	2,112	2,805	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	601	104	447	(50)	
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	226	2,363	129	2,266	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	683	54	473	(156)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	11,458	16,337	844	5,723	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	1,366	63	157	(1,146)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	HAYWARD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	1,085	905	77	(103)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	11,440	4,421	11	(7,008)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	186,540	194,782	18,807	27,049	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	41,604	39,837	9,199	7,432	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	19,442	20,073	3,024	3,655	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	762	657	24	(81)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	9,380	11,439	1,718	3,777	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	34,281	31,772	338	(2,171)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	4,324	107	526	(3,691)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	3,246	2,426	162	(658)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	157,478	130,899	10,817	(15,762)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	106,453	100,764	7,282	1,593	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	19,804	31,376	3,959	15,531	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	68,646	74,756	8,804	14,914	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	117,404	136,643	7,888	27,127	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	36,886	46,823	5,945	15,882	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	15,990	23,439	4,318	11,767	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	12,950	15,762	989	3,801	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	68,375	30,705	2,159	(35,511)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	95,977	56,403	813	(38,761)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	235,541	114,978	3,981	(116,582)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	4,868	3,773	538	(557)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	993	2,337	40	1,384	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	56,996	43,588	1,886	(11,522)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	3,447	4,899	149	1,601	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	508	464	12	(32)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	319	596	16	293	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,918	7,501	40	(2,377)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	K.I. SAWYER	32,713	56,125	821	24,233	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	755	3,159	196	2,600	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	3,810	3,158	50	(602)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,259	3,517	123	381	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	27,476	43,881	298	16,703	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	1,592	148	504	(940)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	29,545	46,607	2,379	19,441	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	45,465	103,348	38,405	96,288	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oregon	Air Force	KLAMATH FALLS IAP (KINGSLEY FIELD)	3,723	181	120	(3,422)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	5,344	10,541	236	5,433	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	4,278	5,005	350	1,077	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,064	3,110	88	(866)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	LAPORTE AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	508	412	16	(80)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	7,129	14,567	1,653	9,091	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	83	291	31	239	New Site.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	13,890	19,995	627	6,732	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	55,895	30,682	1,415	(23,798)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	0	1,173	24	1,197	New Site.
Tennessee	Air Force	LOVELL FIELD	0	0	46	46	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	600	6,282	12	5,694	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,254	1,258	117	121	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	7,838	15,255	376	7,793	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	34,577	40,010	3,366	8,799	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	0	1,471	463	1,934	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	7,563	20,791	2,945	16,173	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	0	88	20	108	New Site.
California	Air Force	MARCH	60,709	52,537	4,941	(3,231)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	228	351	324	447	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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	MATHER	64,625	114,803	868	51,046	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	MAXWELL	47,089	32,792	2,069	(12,228)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	88,898	104,878	20,264	36,244	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	64,653	49,432	6,871	(8,350)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	2,922	1,605	120	(1,197)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	MCENTIRE AIR GUARD BASE	9,321	5,333	22	(3,966)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	4,015	2,145	60	(1,810)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	424	416	8	0	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	263	1,396	30	1,163	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	762	235	372	(155)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	5,698	13,067	431	7,800	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGTS	683	140	463	(80)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	10,992	14,953	2,507	6,468	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	1,617	3,872	794	3,049	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	490	1,809	134	1,453	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.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	14,837	10,689	1,298	(2,850)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	4,251	816	37	(3,398)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	6,465	8,370	240	2,145	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	0	8	8	16	No explanation required.
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	5,315	15,860	1,046	11,591	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	2,716	6,136	201	3,621	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	7,349	3,743	183	(3,423)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	4,717	5,190	372	845	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	4,855	7,784	871	3,800	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS IAP (ANG)	0	9	4	13	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	7,475	11,043	3,656	7,224	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	320	7,603	1,228	8,511	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	NORTON	11,777	17,069	369	5,661	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	25,421	16,579	1,345	(7,497)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	4,496	5,353	143	1,000	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	14,639	8,233	223	(6,183)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Connecticut	Air Force	ORANGE AIR GUARD STATION	600	71	34	(495)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	22,150	19,067	5,978	2,895	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	15,095	23,908	755	9,568	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,736	132	412	(1,192)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	4,206	32	1,383	(2,791)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	PITTSBURGH ANGB	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	26,021	39,506	454	13,939	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	1,642	1,923	395	676	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	5,803	4,151	1,075	(577)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	0	416	602	1,018	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	0	166	615	781	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	13,256	10,429	14,100	11,273	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	0	352	10	362	New Site.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	84	75	41	32	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	83	75	21	13	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	228	117	246	135	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.
Texas	Air Force	REESE	13,385	14,426	1,281	2,322	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	Air Force	RENO TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	674	115	260	(299)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	4,956	2,902	530	(1,524)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	1,199	731	17	(451)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	4,741	887	2,909	(945)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	353	261	17	(75)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	59,698	55,429	1,710	(2,559)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	36,786	39,932	1,478	4,624	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	254	322	10	78	
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,589	3,433	222	66	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	360	53	158	(149)	
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,214	1,893	1,785	2,464	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTC	83	88	26	31	Project Scope – Added or removed requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,948	3,334	11	(1,603)	

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,125	1,670	599	1,144	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	36,983	56,018	2,046	21,081	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	16,953	12,186	1,406	(3,361)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD STATION	0	4	44	48	Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	5,087	10,491	1,248	6,652	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	77,413	54,197	9,966	(13,250)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	2,222	5,045	174	2,997	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Iowa	Air Force	SIOUX CTY APT ANG	254	458	8	212	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	Air Force	SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	2	323	325	New Site.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	455	108	278	(69)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	1,450	2,499	70	1,119	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	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	1,593	249	632	(712)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,720	4,063	102	(555)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	1,975	1,578	186	(211)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	19,815	23,730	2,900	6,815	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	1,186	12	1,198	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	43,192	46,056	2,330	5,194	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.
Ohio	Air Force	TOLEDO EXPRESS AIRPORT	455	0	29	(426)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	180,231	133,081	3,243	(43,907)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Air Force	TRUAX FIELD	683	0	40	(643)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	6,884	2,501	88	(4,295)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	7,638	3,781	5,452	1,595	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	TULSA	235	162	13	(60)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	95,210	101,346	5,208	11,344	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	4,196	6,266	880	2,950	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.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	7,748	5,773	1,969	(6)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	314,149	178,514	16,123	(119,512)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	3,221	1,076	1,000	(1,145)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	438	225	637	424	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	12,862	8,453	2,562	(1,847)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	663	10,846	1,467	11,650	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	WESTOVER	4,390	3,670	899	179	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	1,597	3,584	220	2,207	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	83	5,294	26	5,237	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	13,810	15,933	5,673	7,796	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,856	4,583	473	2,200	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,593	3,564	8,604	8,575	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	56,038	82,386	2,908	29,256	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	84,485	71,868	940	(11,677)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	2,276	183	411	(1,682)	No explanation required.
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	10,556	8,907	1,388	(261)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW CUMBERLAND FAC.	7,802	7,370	67	(365)	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	4,021	3,429	961	369	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	895	1,104	36	245	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	853	2,340	285	1,772	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	36,493	41,970	2,600	8,077	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	38,406	47,118	2,383	11,095	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	4,425	6,524	313	2,412	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 13	21	20	1	(0)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	3,744	3,828	325	409	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	4,011	4,104	304	397	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	AIEA MILITARY RESERVATION	380	244	40	(96)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	0	62	5	67	New Site.
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	45	44	15	14	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	565	518	5	(42)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	559	334	34	(191)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	34	1,265	10	1,241	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AMAKNAK	15,432	12,232	1,357	(1,843)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	5,924	6,120	63	259	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	ANGELES NATIONAL FOREST	3,696	0	1	(3,695)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	31	39	25	33	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ANNETTE ISL LAND FLD	9,359	10,581	2	1,224	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	2,063	670	677	(716)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	3,010	1,975	241	(794)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	71,024	58,930	3,282	(8,812)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	11,701	10,210	234	(1,257)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ATL BASIN IRON WORKS	133	0	21	(112)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	8,598	5,994	169	(2,435)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	537	598	32	93	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 4	1,729	0	15	(1,714)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,115	1,176	15	76	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	13,249	20,934	36	7,721	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	158,547	180,493	8,226	30,172	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.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,094	2,144	35	85	Need reason(s) from USACE
Georgia	FUDS	AUGUSTA ARSENAL DEPOT	75	56	6	(13)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	109	54	4	(51)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BARWELL ISLAND	74	0	55	(19)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	83	82	16	15	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	422	397	20	(5)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	904	800	66	(38)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,268	3,272	47	51	Need reason(s) from USACE
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	941	1,049	45	153	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	BETHLEHEM LOADING	52	2,128	84	2,160	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	23,068	13,420	352	(9,296)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BLACK POINT COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY ANNEX	52	0	12	(40)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	218,990	250,947	3,426	35,383	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	2,902	4,148	120	1,366	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	5,314	5,100	62	(152)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	28,303	29,792	143	1,632	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	13,181	13,608	39	466	Need reason(s) from USACE
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,242	3,486	74	318	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BRAZIL STREET DEPOT	10	5	7	2	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	33,577	31,386	116	(2,075)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	11,196	4,365	43	(6,788)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	BROOKSVILLE TURRET GUNNERY RANGE	536	559	12	35	Need reason(s) from USACE
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	26,333	2,014	12,488	(11,831)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	568	699	34	165	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	834	1,641	227	1,034	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	24,633	36,154	321	11,842	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	72	238	3	169	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	2,703	2,250	282	(171)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	6,210	6,324	63	177	New Site.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	CAMP ACOSTA	52	0	23	(29)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	51,923	45,452	1,792	(4,679)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	46,322	153,329	1,720	108,727	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	68,638	68,163	62	(413)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	27,178	27,136	58	16	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	5,705	5,266	34	(405)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	14,822	39,303	72	24,553	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING RANGE	11,206	11,248	60	102	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iowa	FUDS	CAMP DODGE	0	0	2	2	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAMP EDWARDS	798	505	65	(228)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	55,172	25,109	173	(29,890)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	4,504	6,476	229	2,201	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	CAMP FANNIN	45,144	63,373	62	18,291	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	CAMP FLINT	20	0	16	(4)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	136,180	27,286	774	(108,120)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP GRANT RIFLE RANGE	1,528	1,086	5	(437)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	22,899	23,210	13	324	Need reason(s) from USACE
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	16,345	17,107	58	820	Need reason(s) from USACE
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	130,615	144,221	2,915	16,521	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	CAMP HOWZE (FELDERHOFF)	88,163	89,081	890	1,808	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	31,664	27,046	5,062	444	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CAMP LOCKETT	17,058	16,957	130	29	Need reason(s) from USACE
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	14,027	14,030	67	70	Need reason(s) from USACE
Florida	FUDS	CAMP MURPHY	673	590	33	(50)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP NORRIE	80	0	4	(76)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	4,130	4,375	77	322	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	99,085	97,553	228	(1,304)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	15,146	16,089	200	1,143	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER AREA	13,350	12,595	49	(706)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	8,685	9,161	63	539	Need reason(s) from USACE
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	27,324	27,934	362	972	Need reason(s) from USACE
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	23,184	21,925	168	(1,091)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP WOLTERS	20,307	20,226	36	(45)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGUE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	4,230	1,663	9,412	6,845	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	3,171	2,894	55	(222)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	4,614	7,677	6	3,069	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	47	36	70	59	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	3,346	3,343	35	32	Need reason(s) from USACE
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	4,190	3,989	54	(147)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	4,506	277	80	(4,149)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	4,302	7,723	37	3,458	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	100	20	160	80	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,348	3,559	19	230	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).
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	10	20	8	18	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	CLEVELAND PLANT	40	0	35	(5)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	CLEVELAND TANK TESTING FARM	40	0	5	(35)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	1,255	917	85	(253)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,298	7,845	49	596	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	35,440	37,743	1,620	3,923	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	217	210	289	282	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	23,104	21,459	111	(1,534)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	585	566	1	(18)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	755	768	39	52	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	18,136	15,583	46	(2,507)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,530	23,008	53	(469)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	21,932	21,002	1,079	149	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	37,528	31,693	203	(5,632)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CRAIG ACS SITE	0	0	4	4	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,242	1,368	845	971	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,080	1,053	18	(9)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	90,526	106,824	1,384	17,682	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,197	3,167	42	12	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIDSON-S LANDING	37	0	14	(23)	No explanation required.
Montana	FUDS	DEL BONITA AFS	8,400	0	51	(8,349)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	673	594	75	(4)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	2,344	2,335	118	109	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,050	5,615	51	616	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	DODGE CITY AAF	3,579	3,306	70	(203)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	17,623	13,901	100	(3,622)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,550	6,612	22	84	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	199	91	96	(12)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	DREW FIELD	9,907	9,882	83	58	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	9,605	9,804	153	352	Need reason(s) from USACE

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	646	708	98	160	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	646	615	23	(8)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	3,716	5,884	1,497	3,665	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	487	404	595	512	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	2,865	637	190	(2,038)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	509	402	52	(55)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	FAIRCHILD ATLAS E S-9	1	0	2	1	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	866	595	73	(198)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	3,292	3,116	35	(141)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	19,385	19,934	1	550	Need reason(s) from USACE
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	1,781	1,694	34	(53)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	3,166	3,023	29	(114)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13	2,527	2,365	35	(127)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	56,043	54,996	45	(1,002)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	1,376	57,651	155	56,430	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	13,960	84,319	3,517	73,876	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	0	0	5	5	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	3,218	2,987	28	(203)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	18,439	18,873	336	770	Need reason(s) from USACE
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,217	3,201	72	56	Need reason(s) from USACE
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	1,732	769	60	(903)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	6,132	1,833	837	(3,462)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	19,136	8,755	5,371	(5,010)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,332	5,382	59	109	Need reason(s) from USACE
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,312	5,351	76	115	Need reason(s) from USACE
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	154	101	65	12	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	5,695	4,051	66	(1,578)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,809	1,785	178	154	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	154	391	261	498	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	925	1,247	127	449	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	1,160	1,099	21	(40)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	576	527	8	(41)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,248	2,734	50	536	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	163	111	37	(15)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,522	1,355	96	(71)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	27,275	23,155	51	(4,069)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	3,572	4,069	1,100	1,597	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	7,985	7,356	26	(603)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	434,104	429,288	48	(4,768)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	2,940	50	2,371	(519)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	23,346	30,573	518	7,745	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	7,269	7,008	53	(208)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	76	99	98	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 MCDOWELL	5,735	5,641	191	97	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 PIERCE	1,822	30	48	(1,744)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	FORT RODMAN	8,455	8,282	31	(142)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	9,685	8,941	104	(640)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FORT SLOCUM-NEPTUNE	135	0	8	(127)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT WAYNE	13	0	30	17	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	FORT WORDEN	1	0	1	(0)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	635	4,458	39	3,862	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	24,127	16,658	604	(6,865)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	8,569	8,376	35	(158)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	21,206	15,131	115	(5,960)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	GEO WRIGHT AIR FORCE BASE	2	0	2	(0)	No explanation required.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	6,079	5,870	13	(196)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	229	135	577	483	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,314	3,496	74	256	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	136	49	26	(61)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	34	144	91	201	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	49	47	5	3	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	GR SALT PL BOMB RGE	3,120	1,340	63	(1,717)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	GRAND CENTRAL AIR TERMINAL	10	0	4	(6)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GRAND RAPIDS NGTR	1,034	22	54	(958)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNRY R	18,321	18,252	249	180	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	119,709	114,347	250	(5,112)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	3,860	6,446	1,032	3,618	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	2,257	2,179	61	(17)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	10,049	11,078	1,302	2,331	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Hawaii	FUDS	HALEIWA LANDING FIELD	54	41	14	1	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	1,001	872	190	61	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	239	131	15	(93)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	8,504	7,223	2,385	1,104	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	1,640	1,539	31	(70)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	35,138	34,962	1,135	959	Need reason(s) from USACE
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	587	589	23	25	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	651	637	23	9	
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	19,011	19,018	495	502	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	25	31	4	10	
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	947	1,181	71	305	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	305	3,333	62	3,090	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Guam	FUDS	IBANEZ/GUERRERO PROPERTIES	174	182	40	48	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	3,518	4,238	534	1,254	
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	320	310	1	(9)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	2,964	1,524	30	(1,410)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	904	869	79	44	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	JET PROPULSION LAB	211	0	1	(210)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	JUNGLE WARFARE TEST TARGET	5,289	0	13	(5,276)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	KASIANA ISLS BASE STA	170	0	5	(165)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	707	728	63	84	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	661	1,457	53	849	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Hawaii	FUDS	KILAUEA RADAR STATION	765	598	44	(123)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	16,348	21,123	113	4,888	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,645	1,436	93	(116)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	KINGSBURY ORDNANCE PLANT	17,767	11,307	5	(6,455)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIELD	119	118	2	1	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	7,396	6,916	320	(160)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	2,095	2,140	249	294	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3	11,643	11,573	72	2	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	KOBLEK NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	8,127	11,638	134	3,645	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	29,412	42,238	547	13,373	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	FUDS	KOFA NWR	32,725	33,034	181	490	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	KOKEE STATE PARK	611	443	50	(118)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	61,257	62,674	259	1,676	Need reason(s) from USACE
California	FUDS	LAKE CHABOT MACHINE GUN RANGE	380	145	148	(87)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	227	248	14	35	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	17,373	9,789	324	(7,260)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	453	454	26	27	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	4,845	5,018	61	234	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	14,236	10,066	4,871	701	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	LIBERAL AAF	2,007	1,792	235	20	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	375	215	41	(119)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,903	3,445	375	(83)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-2	8	0	1	(7)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	24,601	24,487	51	(63)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-5	4	0	1	(3)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	12,675	13,427	79	831	Need reason(s) from USACE
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	6,264	5,827	64	(373)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	3,390	3,167	61	(162)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	5,054	3,775	612	(667)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	416	304	59	(53)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN COMM ANX #1	8	0	3	(5)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN RADIO BEACON ANX	4	0	3	(1)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	34,760	33,324	1,021	(415)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	109	51	58	0	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	2,447	3,023	155	731	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	462	51	24	(387)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	900	176	275	(449)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	700	959	35	294	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	2,077	3,854	813	2,590	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	491	514	120	143	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE	9,052	9,177	84	209	Need reason(s) from USACE
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	3,930	3,522	293	(115)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,609	6,900	375	666	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	178	280	3	105	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	3,929	2,751	186	(992)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	258	646	61	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	3,133	4,173	246	1,286	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).
West Virginia	FUDS	MARSHALL ARMY CHEMICAL PLANT	0	0	6	6	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	24,831	13,353	66	(11,412)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	MAYAGUEZ MISSILE ANNEX	125	61	47	(17)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	4,239	4,494	81	336	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	MILITARY OCEAN TER	2,795	0	10	(2,785)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MODOC AERIAL GUNNERY AND BOMBING RANGE	28,249	22,434	4	(5,811)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	66,826	72,548	68	5,790	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	10,875	13,967	75	3,167	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	3,401	2,705	199	(497)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	4,554	828	168	(3,558)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	83	101	13	31	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN RANGE	645	718	38	111	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	621	317	377	73	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,945	2,298	31	384	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,023	19,205	2,588	6,770	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	7,585	9,735	731	2,881	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	60,982	44,645	1,986	(14,351)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	9,425	489	100	(8,836)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	1,434	1,313	105	(16)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,935	1,859	732	656	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	6,235	489	97	(5,649)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	13,304	10,335	455	(2,514)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	145	115	24	(6)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	7,237	7,220	53	36	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	7,354	7,835	698	1,179	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	358	700	81	423	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION WATSONVILLE	25	47	18	40	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
West Virginia	FUDS	NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	0	486	53	539	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	2,853	3,246	72	465	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL RESERVE PLANT	5,922	72	10	(5,840)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NAVY BARRACKS BKLYN	371	0	2	(369)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	259	560	123	424	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	6,822	6,265	559	2	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	257,637	245,066	6,192	(6,379)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	2,223	1,961	46	(216)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NEW CUMBERLAND ARMY DEPOT	695	662	51	18	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	0	124	490	614	New Site.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,420	1,323	19	(78)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	2,942	2,938	176	172	Need reason(s) from USACE
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	320	581	34	295	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BAT NY 15 LAUNCH	92	51	16	(25)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 18	161	0	32	(129)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	3,757	2,506	1,430	179	Need reason(s) from USACE
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,129	5,807	174	1,852	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	1,585	1,982	58	455	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	322	297	26	1	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	874	1,746	736	1,608	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-48 - GARFIELD HEIGHTS	0	0	3	3	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-57/58 - NEWPORT	0	0	4	4	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13	166	11	164	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	693	51	219	(423)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY 88	388	51	42	(295)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE NY-73	0	0	3	3	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 41/43	136	3,309	39	3,212	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	184	555	39	410	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	3,025	139	100	(2,786)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	3,897	5,690	375	2,168	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,242	1,506	220	484	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	1,019	623	74	(322)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,787	2,493	142	(152)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,191	1,220	563	592	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	83	93	8	18	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	14,727	3,755	5,752	(5,220)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,123	3,393	339	609	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,325	1,808	340	823	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,028	2,364	34	370	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	584	648	490	554	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	2,577	2,706	90	219	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,476	2,383	55	(38)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT DETACHMENT HOUSING SITE	986	246	19	(721)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	4,220	4,423	1,174	1,377	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	370	187	40	(143)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	10,711	10,238	949	476	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	4,073	7,267	30	3,224	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	FUDS	OKLAHOMA ORDNANCE WORKS	2,512	5,163	23	2,674	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	1,278	276	142	(860)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	1,674	1,588	33	(53)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	115	72	11	(32)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	7,375	7,582	83	290	Need reason(s) from USACE
Texas	FUDS	ORANGE PORT OF NAV SHIP STOR	187	184	3	0	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ORLANDO RANGE AND CHEMICAL YARD	686	638	32	(16)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	954	917	39	2	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	8,038	8,021	152	135	Need reason(s) from USACE
Hawaii	FUDS	PALI TRAINING CAMP	35,366	35,427	115	176	Need reason(s) from USACE
Hawaii	FUDS	PALMYRA ISLAND	1,173	5	13	(1,155)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	264	265	19	20	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	4,966	4,871	72	(23)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	1,190	1,038	31	(121)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	30	38	72	80	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	PETALUMA BOMBING TARGET	93	12,057	14	11,978	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	14,962	14,300	228	(434)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	2,028	9,012	33	7,017	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	28,641	22,603	3,880	(2,158)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	41,603	41,943	54	394	Need reason(s) from USACE
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	4,917	5,421	83	587	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	31,975	30,186	17	(1,772)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	340	245	84	(11)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	8,627	8,678	54	105	Need reason(s) from USACE
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	15,347	19,557	168	4,378	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	920	1,080	32	192	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	3,648	4,072	48	472	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	334	294	474	434	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	17,708	20,196	286	2,774	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,547	1,886	632	971	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	9,617	9,366	59	(192)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	47,028	11,151	2,760	(33,117)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	10	56	10	56	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	720	713	250	243	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	ROSSFORD AD	7,033	23	1	(7,009)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	33,483	25,485	8,137	139	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 93	724	596	42	(86)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO TRANS-OCEANIC RECEIVER STATION SITE	20	0	6	(14)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	104	82	48	26	Need reason(s) from USACE
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,476	4,983	108	(385)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,805	1,682	60	(63)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,193	1,798	94	699	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	10	10	7	7	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	3,642	3,538	65	(39)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	2,351	442	109	(1,800)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,145	2,646	68	569	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	6,994	5,753	283	(958)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,445	5,576	143	274	Need reason(s) from USACE
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-11	426	435	1	10	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	5,485	3,788	46	(1,651)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	1,751	255	110	(1,386)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SCOTCH CAP	17,390	0	3	(17,387)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	4,109	3,980	55	(74)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	6,688	4,876	623	(1,189)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	6,588	6,379	182	(27)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	93	168	25	100	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	FUDS	SHUMAKER NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	131	131	4	4	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	52,685	27,048	1,696	(23,941)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SISKIYOU BOMBING RANGE	13,444	13,418	2	(24)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	103,856	95,642	514	(7,700)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	25,679	25,507	13	(159)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	18,118	16,089	3,532	1,503	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	622	550	70	(2)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	487	510	86	109	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	STERLING ENGINE CO	266	41	13	(212)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	STOCKTON ORDNANCE DEPOT	3	10	2	9	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	4,396	3,576	732	(88)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	85,042	94,668	32	9,658	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AAF	0	15	2	17	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	81,863	80,658	44	(1,161)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	10,919	10,001	2,340	1,422	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	4,344	6,632	178	2,466	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	23,767	18,017	259	(5,491)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	1,639	2,070	2,010	2,441	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 33	11	0	4	(7)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	665	500	2	(163)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRINIDAD BOMBING TARGET	996	47	12	(937)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	58	57	9	8	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TURLOCK BOMB LOADING PLANT	1,478	0	11	(1,467)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TURLOCK REHABILITATION CENTER	25	0	10	(15)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	16,185	13,631	3,375	821	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	16,050	17,342	217	1,509	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER	31	0	14	(17)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	15,535	19,371	44	3,880	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	203,754	210,025	414	6,685	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	8,567	8,550	278	261	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	UNIV OF CAL, SANTA BARBARA	267	28	55	(184)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	137	105	4	(28)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	USAF AVON PARK RANGE	20,809	21,166	46	403	Need reason(s) from USACE
Virginia	FUDS	USCG RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	312	0	21	(291)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	10	16	12	18	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	673	890	49	266	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	63,367	60,813	3,828	1,274	Need reason(s) from USACE
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	19,097	13,266	40	(5,791)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR STATION	306	308	19	21	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	47	98	55	106	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS	28	29	1	2	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VISALIA ARMY AIRFIELD	88	0	11	(77)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	31,203	20,891	2,842	(7,470)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	820,471	802,224	10,760	(7,487)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	8,332	7,743	82	(507)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	28,653	30,577	885	2,809	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,525	3,818	11	304	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iowa	FUDS	WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	108	156	35	83	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).
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,752	3,775	16	39	Need reason(s) from USACE
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	1,903	2,104	71	272	New Site.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER AIR FORCE AUXILIARY FIELD	2,697	2,576	41	(80)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	WENDOVER SPECIAL WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	80	492	14	426	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	85,442	84,685	1,970	1,213	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	WESTERN REMOUNT AREA & RECEPTION CENTER	0	663	4	667	New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	2,091	1,472	1,280	661	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	2,145	2,220	609	684	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	WILDWOOD AFS	3,679	4,115	145	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,181	745	29	(407)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	WILLI FD BOMB TAR RGE #12	700	0	20	(680)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	WILLI FD BOMB TAR RGE #4	700	0	28	(672)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	WILLIAMS FIED BOMB TAR RGE #10	700	0	25	(675)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	WILLIAMS FIED BOMB TAR RGE #9	700	0	23	(677)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WILLOW RUN AIRPORT	430	135	36	(259)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	6,374	6,123	41	(210)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	78,554	80,908	284	2,638	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	42,524	48,810	256	6,542	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2015

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	53	35	7	(11)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	YOLO COUNTY AIRPORT	0	98	5	103	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	412	427	67	82	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	2,405	1,739	335	(331)	No explanation required.