



















































































































**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	33,868	44,544	5,552	16,228	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	16,245	35,902	820	20,477	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	86,246	49,674	3,967	(32,605)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	58,397	63,955	467	6,025	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	263,766	255,504	1,915	(6,347)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	12,576	8,747	128	(3,701)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	6,503	9,168	708	3,373	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	GEORGE	68,341	71,362	2,331	5,352	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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).
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,143	3,489	21	367	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	9,238	8,151	193	(894)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	7,000	18,394	294	11,688	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	7,167	8,226	172	1,231	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	13,752	20,293	1,015	7,556	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	3,901	4,300	65	464	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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	36,173	34,221	1,033	(919)	No explanation required.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	301,552	361,493	3,998	63,939	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	33,534	31,480	6,725	4,671	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	38,866	44,317	1,346	6,797	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,192	11,388	1,383	1,579	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	23,728	24,373	485	1,130	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	138,807	148,723	3,217	13,133	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	104,559	122,763	10,810	29,014	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	46,028	47,412	3,884	5,268	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	50,404	57,310	6,232	13,138	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	261,804	288,434	3,666	30,296	
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	68,759	57,685	2,867	(8,207)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	22,893	25,778	597	3,482	
							Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	16,763	17,124	189	550	
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	29,035	18,108	1,896	(9,031)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	41,527	34,001	5,852	(1,674)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	147,130	145,698	9,341	7,909	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	5,393	9,593	229	4,429	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	5,082	5,342	138	398	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	45,561	43,656	1,399	(506)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	10,563	14,249	95	3,781	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	936	1,070	19	153	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	14,170	15,360	52	1,242	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	9,286	5,418	269	(3,599)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	2,156	2,382	28	254	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	6,589	10,286	269	3,966	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	103,600	111,120	939	8,459	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	58,322	90,009	2,556	34,243	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	50,585	58,587	1,587	9,589	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	140,189	138,124	3,843	1,778	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	8,055	7,583	102	(370)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	6,467	6,678	99	310	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	28,164	31,827	599	4,262	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	26,552	26,744	555	747	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	Air Force	LORING	18,929	31,150	468	12,689	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	LOS ANGELES AIR FORCE BASE	0	0	58	58	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,668	8,053	262	1,647	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	25,231	18,694	1,730	(4,807)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	79,590	73,223	772	(5,595)	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	3,969	3,593	376	0	No explanation required.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	32,483	28,618	961	(2,904)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MARCH	125,885	131,004	7,131	12,250	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	MATHER	123,529	148,263	2,346	27,080	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alabama	Air Force	MAXWELL	31,220	29,842	2,734	1,356	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	90,283	110,386	2,519	22,622	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	43,151	31,830	3,341	(7,980)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	742	545	108	(89)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,228	2,581	39	392	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	15,414	17,836	672	3,094	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	12,761	58,387	1,055	46,681	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	45,027	43,706	2,155	834	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	5,367	4,358	173	(836)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	12,382	21,620	1,016	10,254	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	1,153	1,150	16	13	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	13,661	14,466	228	1,033	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	19,013	30,268	1,330	12,585	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	7,264	5,660	1,084	(520)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,856	7,862	96	2,102	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).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	9,315	9,698	833	1,216	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	16,175	14,656	1,842	323	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	9,004	8,895	392	283	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	NORTON	10,589	11,865	748	2,024	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	39,170	81,251	1,990	44,071	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	6,346	24,201	150	18,005	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	10,927	11,408	72	553	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	47,925	41,928	4,100	(1,897)	No explanation required.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	115,858	167,849	16,005	67,996	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	37	132,310	50,116	182,389	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	49,684	76,029	3,991	30,336	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	3,706	2,979	39	(688)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	2,378	2,533	44	199	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	4,122	18,108	124	14,110	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, additional sampling).



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	34,526	39,126	735	5,335	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	REESE	22,923	195,734	4,120	176,931	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	2,931	11,065	156	8,290	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	1,750	7,132	133	5,515	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	88,013	81,059	3,240	(3,714)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	45,546	57,370	1,016	12,840	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,535	4,283	64	812	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	770	879	216	325	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	72,492	65,021	4,090	(3,381)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIIDGE	25,473	0	3,454	(22,019)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	14,581	16,335	616	2,370	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	73,563	75,459	1,246	3,142	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	8,656	9,496	340	1,180	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	4,346	4,936	156	746	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	2,930	3,179	156	405	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	14,550	27,178	444	13,072	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	67,939	89,863	4,311	26,235	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	97,477	113,924	3,898	20,345	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	165	106	121	62	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	195,886	209,056	6,529	19,699	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	11,015	12,628	150	1,763	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	9,535	20,431	1,112	12,008	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	228,010	208,172	21,465	1,627	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	9,820	35	1,679	(8,106)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	5,767	11,115	454	5,802	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,507	11,144	104	(259)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,596	2,877	26	307	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	5,425	8,992	254	3,821	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	19,832	38,704	811	19,683	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	4,050	3,092	290	(668)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	41,283	45,198	5,466	9,381	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	122,803	132,940	3,592	13,729	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	136,735	213,474	3,220	79,959	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,888	2,340	66	518	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	11,472	13,495	1,163	3,186	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW CUMBERLAND FAC.	5,594	795	59	(4,740)	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,285	3,360	67	142	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	0	67	67	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	1,951	1,897	136	82	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	776	745	20	(11)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	44,897	44,538	2,974	2,615	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	43,913	42,375	3,647	2,109	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Florida	FUDS	26-MILE BEND BOMB TARGET	2,176	2,147	19	(10)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	9,981	10,013	288	320	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	5,252	4,902	312	(38)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT #46	196	0	15	(181)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	65	69	20	24	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	42	29	35	22	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	226	116	32	(78)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ALLIGATOR BOMB TARGET	3,477	3,443	18	(16)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	108	109	26	27	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	AMAKNAK	10,585	10,558	36	9	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	AMCHITKA AF AUXILIARY FIELD	77,312	76,325	232	(755)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	236	222	2	(12)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	1,286	2,948	78	1,740	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	2,696	803	76	(1,817)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	14,697	8,036	202	(6,459)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	35,990	35,067	1,858	935	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	94	70	27	3	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	3,714	7,746	327	4,359	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	1,174	682	2	(490)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	669	1,630	217	1,178	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	10,892	5,197	43	(5,652)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,906	179,957	20	(3,929)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	27	7,667	41	7,681	New Site.
Florida	FUDS	AVON PARK ARMY AIRFIELD	1,987	2,115	23	151	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	203	128	132	57	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	2,499	2,493	258	252	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	99	5,281	787	5,969	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	585	581	5	1	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	3,552	2,809	31	(712)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	11,035	9,466	1,537	(32)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL AC&W STATION	3,908	3,716	34	(158)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,751	6,367	21	2,637	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	12,483	12,340	59	(84)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	236,647	178,205	3,117	(55,325)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	3,625	4,454	702	1,531	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	31,001	29,991	129	(881)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	13,471	9,819	2,632	(1,020)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	BORREGO SPRINGS	92,695	92,904	94	303	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	12,503	12,206	86	(211)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	20,907	21,337	30	460	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	7,713	7,801	78	166	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BROOKSVILLE TURRET GUNNERY RANGE	896	580	24	(292)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	7,131	3,197	1,782	(2,152)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	752	655	22	(75)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,498	1,212	214	(72)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BURMA ROAD	20,503	20,417	9	(77)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	2,119	1,710	252	(157)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	24,131	29,345	453	5,667	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	153	223	17	87	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	168	131	56	19	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	5,863	5,757	137	31	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	14,958	14,857	91	(10)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	173,580	164,919	959	(7,702)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	89,198	88,502	35	(661)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	17,735	18,197	179	641	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	19,876	24,320	386	4,830	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	180	233	58	111	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING RANGE	6,269	4,662	12	(1,595)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	32,035	44,873	560	13,398	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	16,973	12,222	1,248	(3,503)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	18,568	20,082	109	1,623	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	2,509	2,296	32	(181)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	33	31	69	67	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	114,847	118,925	2,241	6,319	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP HOWZE (FELDERHOFF)	97,139	90,783	75	(6,281)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	1,888	2,354	249	715	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	25,539	25,194	191	(154)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,125	0	4	(1,121)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	2,556	1,956	179	(421)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	127,356	129,068	159	1,871	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	21,477	36,592	121	15,236	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER AREA	17,223	17,345	20	142	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	4,459	4,270	155	(34)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP STONEMAN	15	13,402	15	13,402	New Site.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	109,989	109,782	30	(177)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	6,351	29,372	116	23,137	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	464	449	17	2	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	17,261	15,911	143	(1,207)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	2,007	640	1,593	226	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAPE PROMINENCE AWS	2,068	2,020	61	13	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	2,876	2,769	37	(70)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKAK RADIO STA	13,618	13,403	49	(166)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	151	145	2	(4)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	46	0	3	(43)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	2,071	2,008	59	(4)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	326	586	7	267	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,412	1,554	44	186	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	6,387	6,400	36	49	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	21,010	23,215	1,745	3,950	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,892	3,796	1,958	1,862	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	36,263	35,132	3,358	2,227	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	283	488	431	636	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	FUDS	CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP TRAINING SITE	19,927	23,812	88	3,973	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	103	182	300	379	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	1,302	155	6	(1,141)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	10,171	6,798	256	(3,117)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	42,596	43,362	1,481	2,247	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	COLLINSON POINT DEW	90	70	20	0	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR STATION	2,987	4,650	3	1,666	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).
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	114	53	31	(30)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	15,439	15,619	82	262	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	1,157	1,434	18	295	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	1,226	1,325	39	138	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	213,831	200,705	117	(13,009)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	9,037	9,015	71	49	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	37,087	36,239	180	(668)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILMER	39	0	9	(30)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	53,915	52,437	26	(1,452)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,070	2,239	101	270	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	726	439	183	(104)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,715	1,232	94	(389)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	107,361	85,827	6,842	(14,692)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	114,888	110,953	4,016	81	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	1,336	0	48	(1,288)	No explanation required.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	1,596	631	89	(876)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	64	0	23	(41)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	9,138	9,452	45	359	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	9,236	10,521	321	1,606	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	8,195	6,838	1,720	363	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	2,178	2,180	95	97	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	9,840	9,753	67	(20)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	726	1,601	74	949	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	521	669	69	217	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	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,371	5,245	72	(54)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	55	41	33	19	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ELMIRA SUB DEPOT	13	0	10	(3)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	17	0	5	(12)	No explanation required.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	331	404	23	96	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	622	1,499	31	908	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	320	1,170	61	911	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	24,814	24,797	58	41	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	2,091	2,150	75	134	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	401	1,275	83	957	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13	320	0	51	(269)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	71,929	72,615	35	721	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	54,773	47,619	146	(7,008)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	139,592	149,295	465	10,168	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 contract or contract method.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	41	0	29	(12)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	320	1,282	55	1,017	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	15,352	12,158	37	(3,157)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	1,369	1,992	60	683	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	1,224	1,505	41	322	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	0	0	1	1	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	10,492	10,026	669	203	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	7,342	7,214	62	(66)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	1,194	99	44	(1,051)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,682	1,597	215	130	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,594	1,468	90	(36)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	684	538	53	(93)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,257	1,096	153	(8)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	532	522	21	11	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	FORMER CAMP CLAIBORNE	28,233	30,654	559	2,980	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	FORMER CAMP FANNIN	42,567	4,953	9,812	(27,802)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	145	131	25	11	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	4,247	4,066	170	(11)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	34,224	17,360	16	(16,848)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	14,897	14,803	918	824	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	1,243	5,180	52	3,989	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	1,768	710	56	(1,002)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	291,100	287,709	86	(3,305)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	6	0	5	(1)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FORT H G WRIGHT	18,691	19,634	297	1,240	New Site.
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	13,908	14,444	205	741	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	16,803	19,068	9	2,274	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	5,446	5,383	392	329	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Nevada	FUDS	FORT MCDERMITT	5	0	12	7	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	8,347	8,594	2	249	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	FUDS	FORT MILES MILITARY RESERVATION	17,996	17,718	77	(201)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	24,591	23,890	323	(378)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	14,648	13,725	305	(618)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	13,695	14,853	588	1,746	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	FORT TIDBALL/LONG ISLAND	945	414	259	(272)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	2,220	723	81	(1,416)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	1,357	1,152	230	25	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	FT BROOKE	11,326	11,364	10	48	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	6,677	6,661	23	7	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	10,941	10,925	14	(2)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT LAUDERDALE BOMB TARGET 1	2,144	2,116	10	(18)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT MYERS BOMB & GUN RANGE	10,558	6,579	1,296	(2,683)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	27,052	26,683	1,402	1,033	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	7,202	7,839	1,259	1,896	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	205	130	96	21	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	2,891	2,203	140	(548)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	403	351	99	47	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	63	65	40	42	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,794	1,754	1,029	989	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	26	39	7	20	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	GR SALT PL BOMB RGE	1,190	615	5	(570)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GRAND RAPIDS NGTR	6	0	37	31	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNR Y R	8,179	5,864	9	(2,306)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	103,969	100,603	29	(3,337)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	4,778	5,697	1,113	2,032	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	1,852	1,724	109	(19)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	12,983	13,683	1,168	1,868	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	3,229	3,135	443	349	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	276	292	192	208	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	3,995	3,762	77	(156)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	455	424	11	(20)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	137	0	92	(45)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	31,658	31,329	126	(203)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	62	0	26	(36)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	959	824	85	(50)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	14,487	14,465	358	336	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	16,601	16,507	422	328	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	HOONAH RRS	77	73	70	66	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,311	1,789	90	568	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,504	3,680	275	451	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	4,229	2,753	264	(1,212)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	113	0	39	(74)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	IONA ISLAND NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	15,956	13,792	1,437	(727)	No explanation required.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,444	1,642	18	216	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	664	668	24	28	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	1,340	3,018	160	1,838	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Florida	FUDS	KEYSTONE BOMB TARGET	7,422	7,375	17	(30)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	15,192	13,860	285	(1,047)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,555	1,588	156	189	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE ANNEX	3,773	1,511	865	(1,397)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	6,747	6,581	177	11	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	541	1,285	91	835	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	12,009	11,626	376	(7)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	54,666	53,026	1,070	(570)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	1,532	762	37	(733)	No explanation required.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	12,773	344	1,085	(11,344)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE PALESTINE TARGET	3,222	3,189	9	(24)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE WOODRUFF TARGET	2,225	2,197	7	(21)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKELAND AAF	79	0	24	(55)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	4,942	308	68	(4,566)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	2,817	1,708	255	(854)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	158	691	343	876	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	5,965	5,728	665	428	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	32,023	32,291	41	309	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	12,789	14,130	23	1,364	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	8,828	9,009	218	399	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	848	421	1,048	621	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	1,970	1,928	59	17	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	359	152	324	117	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	36,071	30,195	1,043	(4,833)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	3,790	3,616	80	(94)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	148	73	13	(62)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	6,757	6,532	242	17	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	17	32	9	24	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	68	302	24	258	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	69	336	29	296	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	5,244	4,847	22	(375)	No explanation required.
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	63	0	62	(1)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	MACH GATR	2,433	2,447	26	40	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	4,565	4,511	78	24	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE	5,258	5,450	4	196	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	5,144	7,427	89	2,372	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,787	6,704	458	375	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	163	225	16	78	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	5,053	5,731	1,216	1,894	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	484	852	41	409	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	47,624	42,999	166	(4,459)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	6,565	6,264	237	(64)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	206	0	40	(166)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MILL COVE BOMBING SITE	2,183	2,154	5	(24)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	157	28	102	(27)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	157	38	6	(113)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	64,105	69,111	143	5,149	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alabama	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AF STATION	163	38	9	(116)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AUX FLD #1	0	0	1	1	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	12	20	3	11	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	2,850	2,909	273	332	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE RANGE	15	142	15	142	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	315	5,549	100	5,334	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	374	309	11	(54)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	323	295	120	92	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	452	519	121	188	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,846	1,645	25	(176)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	34,906	34,679	81	(146)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORD NANCE DISPOSAL	4,451	4,251	101	(99)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	28,969	25,254	1,109	(2,606)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	301	279	18	(4)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	2,521	713	78	(1,730)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	5,456	6,008	40	592	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	171	0	111	(60)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	7,403	7,162	360	119	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	NAV HOSPITAL	420	0	2	(418)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	0	0	1	1	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	424	232	55	(137)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	10,359	9,318	293	(748)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	8,264	8,201	459	396	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	4,159	4,164	71	76	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	2,436	5,191	1,140	3,895	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	492	280	189	(23)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NAVY & MARINE CNTR #3	707	0	1	(706)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	1,098	44	130	(924)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	5,530	9,507	2,022	5,999	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	258,741	259,576	9,302	10,137	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	35,997	35,781	243	27	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	2,787	3,295	52	560	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NEW CUMBERLAND ARMY DEPOT	734	693	60	19	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	19	39	20	40	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	NEW YORK ORDNANCE WORKS	12,010	12,406	50	446	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	989	967	52	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).
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	128	127	69	68	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	150	95	2,362	2,307	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	3,322	3,826	23	527	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	5,811	4,081	52	(1,678)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,510	838	95	(1,577)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	372	510	42	180	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	3,243	20	44	(3,179)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,325	2,351	215	1,241	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	142	9	296	163	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	28	111	85	168	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	45	56	70	81	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	30	0	213	183	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	648	160	68	(420)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	6,800	7,840	434	1,474	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	2,697	2,939	937	1,179	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	132	69	54	(9)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,690	2,205	139	(346)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	878	1,018	72	212	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	99	105	204	210	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	1,333	1,382	239	288	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	4,174	4,372	182	380	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,435	1,522	79	166	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	1,657	1,978	80	401	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	106	70	97	61	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	6,480	3,741	128	(2,611)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	37	74	76	113	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	4,041	3,823	54	(164)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	242	4,087	596	4,441	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	12,771	11,941	4,704	3,874	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).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	8,719	4,803	7,140	3,224	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Ohio	FUDS	OHIO RUBBER COMPANY	2,861	2,429	716	284	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	996	958	119	81	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	1,050	953	43	(54)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,806	2,023	32	(751)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	ORDNANCE PLAN	12,123	22,115	6,190	16,182	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	ORLANDO RANGE AND CHEMICAL YARD	841	635	6	(200)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	3,606	3,985	82	461	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	4,185	4,779	4	598	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	1,657	0	2	(1,655)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PALI TRAINING CAMP	12,240	12,686	4	450	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	82	167	12	97	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	PAPOHAKU RANGLAND SUB	35,467	13,853	1,249	(20,365)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	16,463	8,171	231	(8,061)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	1,499	910	64	(525)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	77	73	4	0	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PETALUMA BOMBING TARGET	47	0	67	20	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	2,904	6,931	2,156	6,183	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURG OTR MK AUX	3	0	7	4	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-1	13	0	1	(12)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-10	13	0	3	(10)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-11	11	0	22	11	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-4	13	0	1	(12)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-5	13	0	32	19	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-9	14	0	5	(9)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	7,083	7,968	4,750	5,635	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL RESEARCH CENTER	18,114	18,018	395	299	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	20,200	17,750	123	(2,327)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	2,430	2,374	16	(40)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	30,027	24,739	137	(5,151)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	2,325	3,078	66	819	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	PORCUPINE RIVER DEW STAGING CAMP	5,866	5,872	36	42	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	3,067	1,688	127	(1,252)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	9,021	8,708	530	217	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 contract or contract method.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	309	225	15	(69)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	74	0	66	(8)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	6,321	3,066	60	(3,195)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	746	614	152	20	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	54,450	56,667	923	3,140	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	4,369	3,644	181	(544)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	6,598	6,459	38	(101)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,955	12,555	400	1,000	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	313	137	466	290	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
New York	FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	1,156	0	30	(1,126)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	20,842	20,425	192	(225)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	54	59	200	205	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 25	62	0	25	(37)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	84	0	88	4	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	7,554	7,348	91	(115)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	1,440	2,446	59	1,065	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	6	6	143	143	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	1,597	1,357	182	(58)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	119	0	35	(84)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	3,754	3,701	71	18	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	4,892	4,790	211	109	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 contract or contract method.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	6,509	6,389	139	19	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	1,918	1,829	50	(39)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	3,753	2,843	12	(898)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	1,859	1,980	29	150	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	33,154	24,785	98	(8,271)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUND	14,867	2,498	51	(12,318)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	7,111	16,069	119	9,077	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	34,860	34,296	25,204	24,640	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	156	53	58	(45)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	1,292	1,298	32	38	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	STEWART AFB	6,693	7,901	15	1,223	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	1,125	29	6	(1,090)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	7,868	8,038	4	174	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oregon	FUDS	SWAN ISLAND NAVAL-MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	95	63	12	(20)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	41,796	40,025	803	(968)	No explanation required.



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	266	648	63	445	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	TIGALDA ISLAND	352	128	277	53	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,962	768	2,403	1,209	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	16,788	4,752	6,610	(5,426)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	322	217	427	322	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	631	0	33	(598)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	55	64	4	13	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	15,932	9,105	636	(6,191)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	18,431	18,173	269	11	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	19,102	18,027	125	(950)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	188,434	199,447	425	11,438	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).



**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4,227	4,655	40	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.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALGA ISL NAV RADIO	14,811	12,227	2,592	8	
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	104	139	22	57	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN	712	0	1	(711)	
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	103	108	22	27	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	354	665	44	355	
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	13,401	12,103	37	(1,261)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	VERO BEACH TARGET 1	2,028	2,000	18	(10)	
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	62	0	17	(45)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	3,523	3,213	153	(157)	
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	642,961	280,956	11,369	(350,636)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,179	9,316	97	2,234	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	26,856	30,741	464	4,349	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	775	659	91	(25)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WAUGOSHANCE POINT TARGET	1,578	1,040	134	(404)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,236	3,181	45	(10)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	WEEKSVILLE NAV AIR FAC	157	30	2	(125)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	817	776	34	(7)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	64,214	68,716	2,084	6,586	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	7,250	7,698	1,451	1,899	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	3,065	3,099	47	81	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	1,543	1,359	90	(94)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,648	1,183	5	(460)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	WILLIAMS FIELD BOMB TARGET #6	22	0	2	(20)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	738	562	7	(169)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WOODBINE AIRPORT	17	0	2	(15)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	47,281	39,573	4,420	(3,288)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2018**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2017 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2018 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2018 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	9,681	5,351	5,183	853	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	FUDS	YELLOW JACKET TARGET AREA	24,078	23,496	147	(435)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	270	123	140	(7)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	2,693	4,081	62	1,450	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).