FY 2015 DEP ARC Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

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

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	ABERDEEN PROVING	milation (\$600)	(\$000)	(4000)	(\$000)		1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Maryland	Army	GROUND	94,388	108,232	4,867	18,711		changes in schedule. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	10,021	11,152	51	1,182		in contract or contract method.
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	78%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,783	2,037	518	772		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,138	1,338	86	286		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

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

ject
operation
Inrelated to
dology or
e-level
, increased athway such
oD), change
ditional risk,
antional mon,
e-level
, increased
athway such
oD), change
ditional risk,
e-level
, increased
athway such oD), change
ditional risk,
ultional risk,
e – Actual
the prior
y changes
ject
operation
o a nowly
e.g., newly sions of the
sions of the
erty reuse,
ampling). 3)
e – Change
(e is pe

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	4,628	6,483	23,222	25,077	542%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	5,313		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	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	EODT HUNTED LIGGETT	4 224	4 106	651	512	120/	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	4,334	4,196	651	513	12%	document review or approval). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Pennsylvania	Army	TRAINING SITE	940	1,261	825	1,146	122%	additional sampling).
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	970	837	237	104	11%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
	1.	F0DT F5						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	1,649	416	2,218	985		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Alahama	Δ *******	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	4.007	1 0 1 7	4 205	4.005		in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARING	1,067	1,047	1,285	1,265	119%	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
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1.620	2,137	3.898	4,415		changes in schedule.
3			.,,,,	_,	3,000	1,110		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	0	30	522	552	N/A	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	12,396	13,116	527	1,247		contract method.
virgina	Гинну	I OKT WONKOL	12,390	13,110	527	1,247	10%	contract method.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	9,912	11,845	2,427	4,360	44%	by changes in schedule. 1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
				47.005		0.450	9994	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
Alabama Hawaii	Army	FORT RUCKER FORT SHAFTER	14,541			3, 33		in schedule. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
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).

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	D-D							
01-1-	DoD	In a fall of an Alama	Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	D (a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
0	A	FORT OTENA RT	4.054	2.025	440	0.400	0.400/	in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	1,251	3,935	418	3,102	248%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		FORT WILLIAM HENRY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Montana	Army	HARRISON	0	10	335	345	NI/A	additional sampling).
IVIOITIAITA	Allily	HARRISON	0	10	333	343	IN/A	
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
		FORT WINGATE DEPOT						required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
New Mexico	Armv	ACTIVITY	151,248	75,378	138,833	62,963	42%	site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			101,210	7 0,07 0	100,000	02,000	1270	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.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	0	2,451	2,357	4,808	N/A	technology was ineffective).
-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	Funds Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	102,999	133,672	5,785	36,458		additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Iowa		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		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,366	1,341	2,380	2,355	173%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
\/a====a=t	A	JFHQ VT ARNG	700	373	400	87	400/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	Army	JERQ VI ARNG	722	3/3	436	87	12%	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
		JOINT BASE LEWIS-						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or
Washington	Army	MCCHORD	26,676	52,252	1,895	27,471	103%	contract method.
								A) Desirat Conna. Added alarma alarma alarma
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
		KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION						required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
Kansas		PLANT	2,845	4,992	5,851	7,998	281%	site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
			,,,,,,	,,,,,,	-,20	, , , , ,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	94	732	2,210	2,848	3014%	added to project scope).

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

	DoD		FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State		Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
			(+)	(,,,,,	(*****)	(+ /	,	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
A11		NO CAVIONICA ADMODV	4 400	4 774	404	700	500/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Army	NG SAVOONGA ARMORY PAPAGO MILITARY	1,190	1,771	121	702	59%	additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Arizona	Army	RESERVATION	221	1,538	653	1,970	880%	in cost estimate Change Officiated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alizona	Ailily	RESERVATION	221	1,536	000	1,970	00970	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		PARKS RESERVE FORCES						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	Army	TRAINING AREA	3,528	9,643	405	6,520	185%	additional sampling).
New Jersey Arkansas	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	26,925 23,544					1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	102,975	124,291	20,956	42,272	41%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		RADFORD ARMY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Virginia	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	13.877	15.163	66	1.352	10%	additional sampling).
viigiina	7 tilliy	7.44.11.014.1.2.44.1	10,077	10,100	- 00	1,002	1070	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
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	13,204	20,338	342	7,476	57%	be caused by changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
								required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	470,205	935,715	18,184	483,694	103%	site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		RIVERBANK ARMY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	5,739	20,431	3,490	18,182		additional sampling).
					·			, ,,
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy
								or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	196,787	210,538	11,370	25,121		the costs included in the CTC.
		2 21 11 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
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,019	2,516	665	1,162	58%	in schedule.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Cost	FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	23,468	29,491	912	6,935	30%	in schedule.
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change
								in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	14,049	19,094	435	5,480	39%	CTC.
								A) Bestevi Conserva A He Love Second at the feedback to the
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property 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
		SUNFLOWER ARMY						the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by
Kansas	Army	AMMUNITION PLANT	49,055	35,511	23,364	9,820	20%	changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	40,349	38,529	5,706	3,886	10%	approval).
								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)
		l	_			l		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	9,413	46,786	1,337	38,710	411%	in contract or contract method.
		LICADO NIA CADA FALLO						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Now York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS	0	70	44	110	NI/A	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
New York	Army	(AMSA 5)	1 0	78	41	119	IN/A	added to project scope).

			EV 2014 Coot	EV 204 <i>E</i>	EV 2045	Coot	Cost	
			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Peason(s)
State	Component	mstanation Name	ililiation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(4000)		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		VIETNAM VET MEM USARC						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Illinois	Army	(SOUTH)	0	140	2	142	N/A	added to project scope).
	ĺ	,						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,091	1,250	6	165		in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
)	A	VOLKSTONE	F4	00	00	0.4	4000/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	51	26	89	64		additional sampling). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		WAIKAKALAUA AMMO						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Hawaii	Army	STORAGE TUNNELS	0	476	104	580	N/A	added to project scope).
riawan	7 tilly	01010102 10111220	<u> </u>	470	104	000	14/74	
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)
	1.	WEST POINT MIL	54.040	== 10=	4 000	0.400		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
New York	Army	RESERVATION	51,016	55,165	1,980	6,129	12%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
		WHITE SANDS MISSILE						required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
New Mexico	Army	RANGE	7,283	7,902	3,759	4,378	60%	site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\				,		in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	620	2,198	36	1,614	260%	additional sampling).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	93,544	. 89,873	13,635	9,964	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	6.434		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).
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	11,614	,				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.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	269	1,520	609	1,860	691%	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	848			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).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii		BARBERS POINT NAS	5,167	5,462		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.
Maine		BRUNSWICK NAS	21,800					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.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	600	780			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). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	36,915	103,740	4,499	71,324	193%	model.

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

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

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	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	КАΝЕОНЕ ВАҮ МСВ	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.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven 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
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	45,313	74,824	3,538	33,049	73%	estimating methodology or model. Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,613	3,872	112	371	10%	change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,700	3,638	802	740	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	17,648	19.075	1,605	3,032	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds		Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)		Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,182	2,448	129	395	18%	methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	539	751	114	326	60%	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	27%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	10,749	13,980	1,803	5,034	47%	model. Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,109	2,750	1,013	654	21%	technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	16,334	18,815	346	2,827	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,162	6,610	790	1,238	20%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	43,306	45,587	3,531	5,812	13%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) 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
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	34,710	44,149	277	9,716	28%	model.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	9,571	11,578	894	2,901	30%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	15,480	18,627	495	3,642	24%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	9,638	13,050	2,060	5,472	57%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY	9,298	7,897	3,137	1,736	19%	estimating methodology or model. 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
Florida	Navy	STATION	2,379	5,725	170	3,516	148%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,869	1,249	1,017	397	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	17,611	19,205				1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
Ctata	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	Baccan(a)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Machington		PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC	0.505	2.026	450	500	200/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Washington	Navy	DIV DET	2,565	2,936	152	523	20%	additional sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	10,719	10,444	1,454	1,179	11%	model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	100,754	106,096	9,969	15,311	15%	model.
California	Navy	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	1,638	1,759	208	329	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Gamornia	INAVY	0,121011 02,11201 11,1102	1,000	1,700	200	020	2070	in oost ostimating methodology of model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property 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
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,141	949	2,432	2,240	196%	be caused by changes in schedule. 1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost
								Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		0.11 DIF 0.0 NT 0	_ ,					estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	7,159	2,961	8,828	4,630	65%	in schedule.

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

			EV 0044 0 4	EV 0045	E)/ 00/E	• •		
			FY 2014 Cost		FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
. .	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		VIEQUES PUERTO RICO						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Puerto Rico	Navy	NASD	4,433	5,128	4,233	4,928	111%	additional sampling).
								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
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	42,304	41,560	7,412	6,668	16%	in schedule.
District of								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	53	53	39	39	74%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
District of								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	6,517	7,827	1,306	2,616	40%	additional sampling).
	1 1		,	,	,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
								estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	4.030	4.041	930	941	23%	in schedule.
	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
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	25,336	31,659	3,200	9,523	38%	by changes in schedule.
	1			01,000	-,	0,020	00,70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		WILLIAMSBURG FISC						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Virginia	Navy	CHEATHAM ANNEX	15,580	21,933	1,636	7,989	51%	additional sampling).
ga			.0,000	2:,000	.,000	.,000	0.70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
	1		1					physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
	1		1					as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
	1		1					additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change
	1		1					Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	42.340	51,408	3,834	12,902	30%	methodology or model.
v ii gii ii a	1.1447	1.0.44.04444440	72,040	51,700	0,004	12,002	30 /0	motiousity of mount

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
						, , ,	Ì	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	13,220	23,388	360	10,528	80%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
								increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
								approval). 2) 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
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	40,423	74,576	2.129	36.282	00%	model.
Georgia	All I oice	AIR TORCE FLANT 0	40,423	74,370	2,129	30,202	90 /6	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	3,701	7,001	588	3,888	105%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
			-, -	,		-,		1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs
								included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	10,845	22,201	1,067	12,423	115%	model.
								4) Project Coope Added requirements due to other site level
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	Air Force	AIRPORT	337	5,627	236	5,526	1638%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
_								
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional 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
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	33,939	44,737	1,039	11,837	35%	methodology or model.
	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	DoD		Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	11,905	12,669	1,143	1,907	16%	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.
Tionda	711 1 0100	TOTAL	11,500	12,000	1,140	1,507	1070	cost may also be eaused by changes in scriedule.
Louisiana		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.
								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
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	10,686	11,603	162	1,079	10%	model.

	D-D		FY 2014 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate Change	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Estimate (\$000)	Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	_	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven 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
California	Air Force	BEALE	105,455	328,156	6.613	229,314	217%	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
		BELLOWS AIR FORCE	,	,	5,515	- , -		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change
Hawaii	Air Force	STATION	8,980	11,391	122	2,533	28%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tours	Air Fana	DEDOGEDOM	0.040	0.074	455	4.400	470/	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	8,843	9,874	455	1,486	17%	additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	729	617	209	97	13%	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		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). New Site.
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).

			Estimate	Cost	FY 2015 Funds		Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name			Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ottato			minute (vecs)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i crosinage)	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
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	21,776	27,749	818	6,791		in schedule.
Colorado	711110100	BOOKEET 711 B	21,770	21,145	010	0,731	3170	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	0	729	110	839	N/A	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		BURLINGTON						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Vermont	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	9,797	13,817	299	4,319		additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
	1	CAMP BLANDING MIL						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Florida	Air Force	RESERVATION	82	123	39	80		added to project scope). Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Washington	Air Force	STATION	85	507	40	462		added to project scope).
								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
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	12,961	38,555	4,194	29,788		cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
								1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
								Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual
								contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior
		CAPE CANAVERAL AIR						estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Florida	Air Force	FORCE STATION	79,308	107,604	8,217	36,513		in schedule.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
			(4)	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(+)	(,,,,,	,	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
		CAPE NEWENHAM LONG						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Alaska	Air Force	RANGE RADAR SITE	8,042	11,164	157	3,279	41%	model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	Air Force	CASTLE	62,297	74,433	327	12,463	20%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
l	l							in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	33,695	43,723	1,726	11,754		additional sampling).
		OUENIA DIVED				005		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska		CHENA RIVER COLD BAY LONG RANGE	0	225	10	235	N/A	in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaaka			2.050	4 044	100	4.070	220/	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	3,252	4,211	120	1,079	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
		COSTA MESA AIR GUARD						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	Air Force	STATION	484	3,402	86	3,004	621%	additional sampling).
Camorna	7 (11 1 0100	01/11/014	101	0,402	00	0,004	02170	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	437	1,394	33	990		added to project scope).
				,				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
1								approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or
								Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	5,183	7,295	65	2,177	42%	costs included in the CTC.
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	36,256	69,611	6,553	39,908	110%	in cost estimating methodology or model.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	imation (\$000)	(ψοσο)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(i ercentage)	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
		DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION	5,922	9,201	3,368	6,647	112%	in schedule.
	7 1 0.00		0,022	0,20.	0,000	0,0	/ 3	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
		DUNCAN CANAL RADIO						contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Alaska	Air Force	RELAY STATION (RRS)	893	2,344	445	1,896	212%	in schedule.
		, ,						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
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	1,322	8,354	361	7,393	559%	model.
			.,,	0,000		1,000	333,3	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
		EARECKSON AIR FORCE						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	BASE	66,309	77,062	4,841	15,594	24%	estimating methodology or model.
								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
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	28,702	37,905	6,689	15,892	55%	in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	39,792	168,489	23,060	151,757	381%	in cost estimating methodology or model.

State	DoD	In stallation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change	Passanta)
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	ELLINGTON	992	929	1,925	1,862	188%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
South Dakota		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.
			,	,		,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	41,249	57,051	4,459	20,261	49%	Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	83	3,226	41	3,184	3821%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). New Site.
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).
W. omin a		FRANCIS E WARREN AIR	45.000	22.040	500	0.440	F00/	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.
Wyoming	Air Force	FORCE BASE	15,239	22,818	539	8,118	53%	model. Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	254	275	24	45	18%	project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2015 Funds		Cost Estimate	
01-1-	DoD	Leadallad's a Name	Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	B ()
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	5,999	6,973	731	1,705	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colifornia		ocopor.	50.507	00.400	0.400	44.700	0004	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
California	Air Force	GEORGE	50,597	62,199	3,100	14,702	29%	the costs included in the CTC. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	4,183	5,987	119	1,923	46%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Толао	7111 1 0100	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE	4,100	0,007	110	1,020	1070	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
North Dakota	Air Force	BASE	2,386	5,165	418	3,197	134%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
		GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO	,	,		,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change
Alaska		RELAY STATION	558	4,032	90	3,564	639%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mandana		GREAT FALLS		400		404	NI/A	Now Oite
Montana	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT GRISSOM ARB	13,373					New Site. 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
					,	,		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	226	2,363	129	2,266	1005%	in contract or contract method.

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	11,458	16,337	844	5,723	50%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	186,540	194,782	18,807	27,049	15%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) 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		9,199			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			1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

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

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2015 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
						<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		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
Alaska Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF JBER-RICHARDSON	117,404 36,886	·	7,888 5,945	,		model. 1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope –
Virginia Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS JBLE-LANGLEY	15,990	,		11,767		Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
viigiiia	7.11 1 0100		,	ŕ	303	3,001		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	993	2,337	40	1,384	139%	be caused by changes in schedule. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE	3,447	4,899	149	1,601	46%	in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Mississippi	Air Force	CENTER	319	596	16	293	92%	in cost estimating methodology or model.

					FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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
Michigan	Air Force	K.I. SAWYER	32,713	56,125	821	24,233		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. 1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	3,259	3,517	123	381		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.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	29,545	46,607	2,379	,		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					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.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate	Cost	FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
			minumon (poos)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i ci comago)	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change
		KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE						in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Alaska	Air Force	RADAR SITE	5,344	10,541	236	5,433	102%	
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	4,278	5,005	350	1,077	25%	CTC.
riadita	711110100	Little Eddice	4,270	3,003	330	1,077	2570	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	7,129	14,567	1,653	9,091	128%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
		LINCOLN MUNICIPAL						
Nebraska	Air Force	AIRPORT	83	291	31	239	286%	New Site.
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
		LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimate Change onrelated to
Arkansas	Air Force	BASE	13,890	19,995	627	6,732	48%	model.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	0		24			New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	600	6.282	12	5.694	0/18%	additional sampling).
Colorado	All I olce	EGWITT	000	0,202	12	3,034	34070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	1,254	1,258	117	121		added to project scope). 2) New Site.
								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
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	7,838	15,255	376	7,793	99%	be caused by changes in schedule.
			,	,		,		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
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	34,577	40,010	3,366	8,799	25%	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
i ionua	7 MI I OIGE	IVII CODILL	54,577	40,010	5,300	0,799		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
	1							Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	0	1,471	463	1,934	N/A	model.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for				Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
								increases project scope, 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
		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE						Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be expected by
Montana	Air Force	BASE	7,563	20,791	2,945	16,173		the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	7,303	88		10,173		New Site.
01110	7 111 1 0100	1117 (1 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		- 55		100	1477	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	228	351	324	447		added to project scope). 2) New Site.
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.
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.

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

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name			(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
			, , ,	, ,	. ,	, , ,	<u> </u>	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								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
Niana I Ianaa ahina	A	NEW BOSTON	0.740	0.400	004	0.004	4000/	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	2,716	6,136	201	3,621	133%	model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	4,717	5,190	372	845	18%	additional sampling).
			· ·	,				, 3,
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor 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
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	4.855	7,784	871	3.800	78%	methodology or model.
TYOW TOTAL	7 (11 1 0100	147.167.117.117.1216	4,000	7,704	071	0,000	7070	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
		NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	7,475	11,043	3,656	7,224	97%	model.
								1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A
								change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs
								included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
Alasta		NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY		7.000	4 000	6.54	005631	Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	320	7,603	1,228	8,511	2659%	moaei.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
ļ,	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
		NODTON						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California /	Air Force	NORTON	11,777	17,069	369	5,661	48%	model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	4,496	5,353	143	1,000	22%	additional sampling).
111111013	All I OICE	OTHICE	4,430	3,333	143	1,000	22 /0	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
Florida /	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	22,150	19,067	5,978	2,895	13%	changes in schedule.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Na Hananahina	A:- -	DEAGE	45.005	00.000	755	0.500	600/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	15,095	23,908	755	9,568	63%	additional sampling). 1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
								required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
								site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change
								in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	26,021	39,506	454	13,939	54%	стс.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds		Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		_		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
		POINT ARENA AIR FORCE						additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
California		ISTATION	1,642	1,923	395	676		model.
Calliornia	All Force	STATION	1,042	1,923	393	676		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	0	416	602	1,018		in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	All Torce	I GINT EXT	0	410	002	1,010		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	0	166	615	781		in cost estimating methodology or model.
ridorid	7 11 1 0100	I GIVE LOVICE DOWN		100	010	701	14/71	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
		PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY						Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost
Alaska	Air Force	STATION	13,256	10,429	14,100	11,273		estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	0	352	10	362		New Site.
								Project Scope – Added or removed cleanup phases as the
		PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR						project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action
Puerto Rico	Air Force	SITE	84	75	41	32	38%	operation added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	228	117	246	135	60%	added to project scope). 2) New Site.
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
								required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
Texas	Air Force	REESE	13,385	14,426	1,281	2,322		site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
10,40	7.11 1 0106	11.2.202	13,303	17,720	1,201	2,022	11/0	one responde to address additional risk, additional sampling).

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

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	36,983	56,018	2,046	21,081	57%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
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	131%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Toyas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	2.222	5,045	174	2,997	135%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SIOUX CTY APT ANG	2,222			, , , , ,		Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
A		SKY HARBOR			000	007	\$1/A	Now Cite
Arizona Alaska	Air Force Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	1,450		323 70			New Site. Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	19,815			,		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.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Cost	FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated		Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		TED STEVENS						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	Air Force	INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	1,186	12	1,198	N/A	additional sampling).
				,		,		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
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	43,192	46,056	2,330	5,194	12%	Change in contract or contract method.
Chianoma	7111 1 0100	THILL	40,102	40,000	2,000	0,104	1270	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		THE ELAKE OTHE BARAS						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	7,638	3,781	5,452	1,595	210/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	All Folce	SITE	7,036	3,701	5,452	1,595	2170	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional 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
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	95,210	101,346	5,208	11,344	12%	methodology or model.
								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
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	4,196	6,266	880	2,950	70%	redefines the costs included in the CTC.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	438	225	637	424	070/	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
πιαδιλα	All I OICE	WAINWINIGHT	430	223	037	424	9170	μαίωσα το ρτο <u>ί</u> σοι δουρσ <i>ί</i> .

			EV 004 4 Cast	EV 2045	EV 2045	04	Coot	
			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	•	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Poseon(e)
State	Component	Ilistaliation Name	iiiiatioii (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Fercentage)	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change
								in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	663	10.846	1.467	11.650	1756%	'
riadita	7 111 1 0100	WEST NOME TANKTAKWI	000	10,010	1,407	11,000	170070	010.
								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
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	1,597	3,584	220	2,207	138%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
	7 1 0.00		.,001	3,55		_,,	.0070	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Oklahoma	Air Force	WILL ROGERS WORLD	83	5,294	26	5,237		added to project scope).
				-, -	_			Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	13,810	15,933	5,673	7,796	56%	additional sampling).
		WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE						Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Pennsylvania	Air Force	RESERVE	2,856	4,583	473	2,200	77%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
L		l						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	3,593	3,564	8,604	8,575	239%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								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
Ohio	Air Force	WOLCHT DATTEDSON	EC 020	00.000	2.000	20.250	F20/	estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC	56,038	82,386	2,908	29,256	52%	in schedule. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	DLA	SURPLUS	895	1,104	36	245	270/	in cost estimating methodology or model.
Λιαοκα	DLA	JONE LOS	090	1,104	30	243	2170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	853	2.340	285	1.772	208%	additional sampling).
	ı – ·		000	_,510		,	_3070	

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 (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope - Change
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	36,493	41,970	2,600	8,077	22%	in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
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		AF GAT	4,425		·	,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	3,744		325	,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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).
California		AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	0	62				New Site.
California		ALMADEN AIR FORCE	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).
		ANIAK ARPT	34	39		,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	LODO	ANIAN ANT I	31	39	25	33	103%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	FUDS	ANNETTE ISL LAND FLD	9,359	10,581	2	1,224	13%	in cost estimating methodology or model.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	537	598	32	93	17%	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		A T. A C A MOON T A LO T						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
T		ATLAS MISSILE NO.7	40.040	00.004		7 704	500/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Texas	FUDS	(K06OK0407)	13,249	20,934	36	7,721	58%	additional sampling).
								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
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	158,547	180,493	8.226	30.172	19%	redefines the costs included in the CTC.
riadita	. 050	ATTO TOLIMIL OTTEO	100,011	100,100	0,220	00,112	1070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	941	1,049	45	153	16%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Jersey	FUDS	BETHLEHEM LOADING	52	2,128	84	2,160	4169%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Nebraska	FUDS	DEPOT	218,990	250,947	3,426	35,383	160/	additional sampling).
INCUIASKA	1 003	DEFOI	210,990	250,947	3,420	30,303	10%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	2,902	4,148	120	1,366	47%	additional sampling).
			,,00	.,, , , ,		.,	,0	

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	_	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
			<u> </u>					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	3,242	3,486	74	318		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	568	699	34	165		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	834	1.641	227	1,034	10.40/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	LOD9	BOSHNELL ARWIT AIRFIELD	034	1,041	221	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). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	24,633	36,154	321	11,842		model.
			·					Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	72	238	3	169	234%	additional sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Onlife mail	FUDC	CAMBBEALE	40.000	450.000	4 700	400 707	0050/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	46,322	153,329	1,720	108,727	235%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	14,822	39,303	72	24,553		additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		CAMP ELLIS MILITARY						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Illinois	FUDS	RESERVATION	4,504	6,476	229	2,201		additional sampling).
111111015	FUDS	RESERVATION	4,504	0,470	229	2,201	4970	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Texas	FUDS	CAMP FANNIN	45,144	63,373	62	18,291	41%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
O a la va ala	FUDO	CAMBULALE	400.045	4.44.004	0.045	40.504		in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	130,615	144,221	2,915	16,521	13%	additional sampling). 1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in
								Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater
		CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK						than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused
Massachusetts	FUDS	BOMB TARGET SITE	4,230	1,663	9,412	6.845		by changes in schedule.
Maccachactac	. 626	56.M5 17.K62.1 6112	1,200	1,000	0,112	0,010	10270	by changes in concaus.
								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
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	4,614	7,677	6	3,069	67%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
l								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	47	36	70	59	127%	added to project scope).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Nanth Canalina	FUDO	CLIADI OTTE ADMY MIC DI	4.000	7 700	0.7	0.450	000/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	4,302	7,723	37	3,458	80%	additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New York	FUDS	CHARLOTTE CEN GFA	100	20	160	80	81%	additional sampling).
TOW TORK	1 000	01111120112 0211 0171	100	20	100		0170	additional camping).
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	35,440	37,743	1,620	3.923	11%	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska		COLLINSON POINT DEW	217			ŕ		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	1,242	1,368	845	971	78%	additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	90,526	106,824	1,384	17,682	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	5,050	5,615	51	616	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	646	708	98	160	25%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Estimate	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Otate	Component	Instanction Name	imation (4000)	(ψοσο)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(i crecinage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	3,716	5,884	1,497	3,665	99%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	487	404	595	512	105%	progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Tionua	1 000	LLETSONTILLE	407	404	393	312	10370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	1,376	57,651	155	56,430	4102%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	13,960	84,319	3,517	73,876	529%	additional sampling).
, sg				0.,0.0	0,0	,	5=573	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	154	391	261	498	322%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	925	1,247	127	449	49%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Alaska	FUDO	FORT RABOOOK OITKA	0.040	0.704	50	500	0.407	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,248	2,734	50	536	24%	additional sampling).

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State		Installation Name	•		(\$000)	(\$000)		Reason(s)
Claid	Component	motanation ranio	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(4000)	(i oroomago)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	3,572	4,069	1,100	1,597	45%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
N	EU 100	FORT HANGOOK	00.040	00.570	= 10		000/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	23,346	30,573	518	7,745	33%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	77	76	99	98	127%	additional sampling).
Gamorria	1 000	T CITT WINCOTT	, , , , , ,	70	33	30	121 /0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	635	4,458	39	3,862	608%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
0	FUDO		000	405		400	0440/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	229	135	577	483	211%	additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		GOPHER ORD PLT						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Minnesota	FUDS	ROSEMOUNT	34	144	91	201	601%	additional sampling).
	1		<u> </u>		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		22170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	3,860	6,446	1,032	3,618	94%	additional sampling).

			FY 2014 Cost	FY 2015	FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for	Estimate	Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	707	728	63	84	12%	additional sampling).
								Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change
		KENTUCKY ORDNANCE						in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the
Kentucky	FUDS	WORKS	661	1,457	53	849	128%	CTC.
								1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-
								driven Change – A change in the project as a result of
		KINCHELOE AIR FORCE						negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	16,348	21,123	113	4,888	200/	by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Michigan	FUDS	BASE	10,340	21,123	113	4,000	30%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Mexico		RGE	2,095	2.140	249	294	14%	additional sampling).
								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
Northern		KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY						Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Mariana Islands	FUDS	CENTER	8,127	11,638	134	3,645	45%	model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to
								Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	29,412	42,238	547	13,373	45%	model.

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Florida	FUDS	LAKE CITY NAAS	227	248	14	35	16%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
								additional 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
		LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE						by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory
Ohio	FUDS	DEPOT	2,447	3,023	155	731	30%	document review or approval).
		LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX						Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Colorado	FUDS	1C)	700	959	35	294	12%	added to project scope).
Colorado	1 000		700	333		254	72 /0	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Colorado	FUDS	2C)	2,077	3,854	813	2,590	125%	added to project scope).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		LVAIDONIVII LE AID EODOE						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	491	514	120	143	200/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
VEIIIIOIIL	1 003	l l	491	514	120	143	29%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,609	6,900	375	666	10%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	178	280	3	105	59%	additional sampling).
1107til Galolilla	1. 555		170	200		100	3370	additional sampling).

			FY 2014 Cost		FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
	D . D		Estimate		Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
State	DoD Component	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Otate	Component	mstanation Name	πιιατίστι (ψοσσ)	(ψοσο)	(4000)	(ψοσο)	(i crecinage)	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
01.		MARION ENGINEER REPOR						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	258	646	61	449	174%	additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Northern								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	3,133	4,173	246	1,286	41%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	10,875	13,967	75	3,167	29%	additional sampling).
	. 020		10,070	10,001		0,107	2070	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A
								change in the project as a result of negotiations with the
								regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that
								increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGECUMBE/SITKA NOB	83	101	13	31	37%	approval).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		MULLET KEY BOMB & GUN						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Florida	FUDS	RANGE	645	718	38	111	17%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	621	317	377	73	12%	additional sampling).
Michigan	1 000	INICORECON ORD I LANT	021	317	311	73	12 /0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,945	2,298	31	384	20%	additional sampling).

	DoD		FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated	Cost Estimate Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	-	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	_	Reason(s)
				. ,	, ,	, ,	1	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Northern							.=	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE NAFTAN ORDNANCE	15,023	19,205	2,588	6,770	45%	additional sampling). Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Northern Mariana Islands	ELIDO	DISPOSAL	7 505	0.725	724	2 001	200/	in cost estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mariaria Islanus	FUDS	DISFOSAL	7,585	9,735	731	2,881	30%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,935	1,859	732	656	34%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	STATION	7,354	7,835	698	1,179	16%	additional sampling).
								1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is
								required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3)
California	FUDS	STATION SANTA ROSA	358	700	81	423	118%	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	STATION WATSONVILLE	25	47	18	40	156%	additional sampling).
								A) Project Coope. Added requirements due to other site level
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased)
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
West Virginia	FUDS	NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	0	486	53	539	N/A	additional sampling). 2) New Site.
			<u>. </u>	.30			,, .	

	DoD		FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for	Cost Estimate	FY 2015 Funds Obligated	Change	Cost Estimate Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	
Duanta Dias	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN IIIAN	2.052	2 240	72	465	100/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Puerto Rico	FUDS	NAVAL STATION SAN JUAN	2,853	3,246	12	400	16%	in cost estimating methodology or model. Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	259	560	123	424		in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iviassacriusells	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE	259	560	123	424	164%	additional sampling).
Virginia	FUDS	PLANT	0	124	490	614	N/A	New Site.
J								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		NUCE DA 20/04						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	320	581	34	295	02%	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
iviaryiaria	1 000	(TOLOTILOTER)	320	301	34	233	9270	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
la dia a a	FUDO	NULT C OO INDIANA DUNEC	4.400	5.007	474	4.050		in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,129	5,807	174	1,852	45%	additional sampling). Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	1,585	1,982	58	455	29%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	874	1,746	736	1,608		progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Offic	1 000	NIKE OD-10 - OXI ORD	074	1,740	730	1,000	10470	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND		4.5.5				in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	FUDS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13	166	11	164	1240%	additional sampling).

			FY 2014 Cost		FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate		Funds		Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	_	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
. .		NII/E DI 44/40						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 41/43	136	3,309	39	3,212	2359%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
. .		NII/E DI SO						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	184	555	39	410	223%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
District of	FUE	NIIVE DD 70	0.00	5 000	075	0.400	500/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	3,897	5,690	375	2,168	56%	additional sampling).
Alaaka	FUDO	NIKE CITE DAY	4.040	4.500	000	404	200/	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,242	1,506	220	484	39%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,191	1,220	563	592		additional sampling).
Maryland	1 000	THILE W 44 (WILDOIN)	1,101	1,220	303	332	3070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		NORTHEASTERN						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New York	FUDS	INDUSTRIAL PARK	3,123	3,393	339	609	19%	additional sampling).
	1. 555		0,120	0,000	555	000	1370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1.325	1.808	340	823	62%	additional sampling).
	1. 5-0		1,020	.,500	3.0	. 320	3270	

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

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
State	DoD	Installation Name	Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)		Obligated (\$000)	Change (\$000)	Change (Percentage)	Person(s)
State	Component	Installation Name	imiation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). Project Scope – Added
		PETALUMA BOMBING						requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse,
California	FUDS	TARGET	93	12,057	14	11,978	12814%	site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
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).
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).
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	15,347	19,557	168	4,378		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
								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
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	920	1,080	32	192	21%	Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	3,648	4,072	48	472	13%	in cost estimating methodology or model.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	334	294	474	434	130%	additional sampling).

					=>/ / =			
			FY 2014 Cost		FY 2015	Cost	Cost	
			Estimate	Cost	Funds	Estimate	Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	17,708	20,196	286	2,774	16%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	1,547	1,886	632	971	63%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	REDDING ARMY AIRFIELD	10	56	10	56	550%	additional sampling).
	1							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	720	713	250	243	34%	additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	104	82	48			Need reason(s) from USACE
	1 020						2070	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven 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
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,193	1,798	94	699	59%	approval).
Mioriigan	1 000	CAGET OTE MARKE AND	1,100	1,700	01	000	0070	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,145	2,646	68	569	270/	additional sampling).
Nalisas	1 003	SCHILLING ALBATLAS 3-04	2,143	2,040	00	309	21 /0	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Now Varia	ELIDO	SHO BEA FIDE CON STA	00	400	25	400	4000/	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	93	168	25	100	106%	additional sampling).

			FY 2014 Cost Estimate		FY 2015 Funds	Cost Estimate	Cost Estimate	
	DoD		Adjusted for		Obligated	Change	Change	
State	Component	Installation Name	Inflation (\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	487	510	86	109		additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	407	510	00	109		Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change
Alaska	FUDS	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	85,042	94,668	32	9,658		in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	SUSTINA GUNNERT RING	65,042	94,000	32	9,000	1170	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
Northern								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Mariana Islands	ELIDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	10,919	10,001	2,340	1,422		additional sampling).
Mariaria Islarius	1 003	TANALAG LOLL LAKIVI	10,919	10,001	2,340	1,422	1370	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	4,344	6,632	178	2,466		additional sampling).
Massacriusetts	1 000	HOBORT GREATT GIVE	7,544	0,032	170	2,400	37 70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	10	1.639	2,070	2.010	2.441	149%	additional sampling).
	. 020		1,000	2,010	2,010	,		Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	15,535	19,371	44	3,880	25%	additional sampling).
			10,000	,		-,,,,,,		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
American								in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	673	890	49	266	40%	additional sampling).
			. 3.0				. 370	- · · I <i>U</i> /

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)		Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
California	FUDS	RESERVATION	47	98	55	106	227%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
								progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
								added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added
								requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly
								discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the
								cleanup, additional risk pathway 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
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	28,653	30,577	885	2,809		CTC. 4) New Site.
Virginia	1 000	WALLOT OT LIGHT TAGILITY	20,000	30,377	000	2,000	1070	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
Iowa	FUDS	WAVERLY AFS (Z-81)	108	156	35	83		Appropriate Requirement).
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	1,903	2,104	71	272	14%	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project
		WENDOVER SPECIAL						progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation
Utah	FUDS	WEAPONS BOMBING RANGE	80	492	14	426	530%	added to project scope).
		WESTERN REMOUNT AREA &						
California	FUDS	RECEPTION CENTER	0	663	4	667	N/A	New Site.
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased
								physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
								as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
	E1100	W.EG.TO. (ED. A.ED.		4 470	4 000	204	2004	in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	2,091	1,472	1,280	661	32%	additional sampling).
								Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level
								project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such
		WHITEMAN						as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change
		COMMUNICATIONS						in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk,
Missouri	FUDS	TRANSMITTER SITE	2,145	2,220	609	684	220/	additional sampling).
IVII35UUII	ניסטט	TRANSIVITIEN SITE	2,140	2,220	009	004	3270	additional sampling).

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2014 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	Cost	FY 2015 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Change	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	3,679	4,115	145	581	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	42.524					1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	YOLO COUNTY AIRPORT	42,324	98		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		YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	412	427		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).