

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	135,943	154,468	1,576	20,101	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	150	158	18	26	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	8,995	9,246	58	309	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	19,674	28,556	1,386	10,268	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	2,698	792	1,891	(15)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	855	882	4	31	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Florida	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	26	0	10	(16)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	20,335	25,709	2,352	7,726	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.
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	2,354	593	147	(1,614)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	2,788	2,824	12	48	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	592	316	84	(192)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,107	1,040	258	191	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	217	442	5	230	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Army	CAMP GRAYLING ARMY AIRFIELD	1,318	14	67	(1,237)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	4,381	5,248	84	951	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	CAMP MACKALL	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	2,990	3,324	116	450	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	259	208	50	(1)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	CARLISLE BARRACKS	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	4,543	4,319	106	(118)	No explanation required.
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	1,190	5,475	15	4,300	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	39,973	54,776	4,807	19,610	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Nebraska	Army	CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	27,655	40,899	805	14,049	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,550	10,215	1,427	3,092	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	10,275	11,029	204	958	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	59,017	66,672	4,725	12,380	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	777	3,179	284	2,686	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	102,485	100,144	6,335	3,994	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	66,209	66,628	728	1,147	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	14,144	13,284	437	(423)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	39	1,050	12	1,023	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	29,315	31,745	2,359	4,789	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	28,617	10,808	747	(17,062)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	30,006	34,413	224	4,631	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.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	5,774	5,561	485	272	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	12,796	10,414	225	(2,157)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	5,084	5,645	198	759	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	19,493	29,237	2,160	11,904	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,176	1,477	108	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).
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE MANEUVER TRAINING CTR	462	695	67	300	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	7,456	14,527	1,359	8,430	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	10,046	14,138	3,422	7,514	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 contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	28,415	34,903	1,320	7,808	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	1,988	1,657	293	(38)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	5,646	17,647	514	12,515	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	13,888	7,664	414	(5,810)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	FORT HAMILTON	921	3,205	81	2,365	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	FORT HOOD	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	2,116	2,461	8,747	9,092	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 contract or contract method.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	1,452	1,530	1,295	1,373	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	48,204	52,723	2,617	7,136	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	3,686	4,127	154	595	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.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,872	2,364	1,301	1,793	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	1,822	2,312	284	774	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	37,401	45,769	2,558	10,926	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	50,264	50,166	751	653	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	5,738	6,326	588	1,176	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Army	FORT MCCOY	311	3,143	12	2,844	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	5	11	20	26	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	16,276	15,408	531	(337)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	11,965	17,911	74	6,020	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	FORT ORD	306,248	311,975	11,359	17,086	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	464	619	221	376	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	7,499	4,786	1,198	(1,515)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	33,782	39,598	630	6,446	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.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	5,625	6,323	118	816	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	9,777	10,485	502	1,210	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	2,342	3,375	118	1,151	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. 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.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	8,290	8,387	1,387	1,484	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Oklahoma	Army	FORT SILL	502	1,258	68	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.
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	7,293	13,258	833	6,798	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	70,503	78,394	4,089	11,980	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – 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. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	140,581	313,838	5,254	178,511	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Utah	Army	GREEN RIVER TEST SITE	0	0	7	7	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	24,089	29,295	296	5,502	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	1,218	1,069	7	(142)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	68,660	87,275	3,877	22,492	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	HELEMANO RAD REC STATION	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	11,103	11,832	329	1,058	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	19,886	11,041	373	(8,472)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	76,611	99,910	2,037	25,336	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.
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	34,515	38,214	1,798	5,497	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	3,408	11,703	445	8,740	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	0	0	25	25	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
Ohio	Army	JFHQ OH ARNG	14,251	17,468	751	3,968	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	8,527	9,901	7	1,381	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	1,280	209	24	(1,047)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	30,080	37,216	5,146	12,282	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	223	3,674	30	3,481	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	25,896	26,808	638	1,550	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	1,663	1,527	71	(65)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KILAUEA MILITARY RESERVATION	0	0	12	12	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KUNIA FIELD STATION	728	1,579	36	887	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Missouri	Army	LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	109,867	37,544	4,609	(67,714)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	5,393	13,028	1,142	8,777	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	892	872	21	1	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,594	4,649	288	343	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	81,522	83,843	7,339	9,660	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.
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,711	10,899	798	8,986	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Army	LTA - MARION ENGR DEPOT EAST	59	59	143	143	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	956	772	219	35	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	6,867	7,187	189	509	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	25,167	26,674	1,408	2,915	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	98,314	128,235	2,810	32,731	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.
Wisconsin	Army	MILWAUKEE USARC/AMSA#49	0	0	435	435	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	3,577	3,482	22	(73)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	3,659	1,199	7	(2,453)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	6,739	6,782	483	526	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.
Florida	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2,927	1,404	20	(1,503)	No explanation required.
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	4,310	4,776	125	591	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	37,741	29,526	1,333	(6,882)	No explanation required.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	445	1,414	43	1,012	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	2,175	1,741	1,860	1,426	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	7,078	1,077	509	(5,492)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	PHILIP H SHERIDAN RESERVE CTR	0	0	816	816	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	2,012	2,056	69	113	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	140,977	142,456	8,353	9,832	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	31,931	31,565	4,105	3,739	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.
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	35,444	38,805	8,680	12,041	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 contract or contract method.
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,631	1,633	264	266	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	204,550	542,390	4,666	342,506	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) 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.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	8,270	8,809	491	1,030	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	34,568	30,843	7,462	3,737	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	32,062	40,588	813	9,339	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	608,283	598,150	37,691	27,558	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in 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.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	24,200	36,216	1,725	13,741	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).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	10,607	14,355	4,853	8,601	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost 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.
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	224,747	223,079	10,135	8,467	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	6,332	3,414	337	(2,581)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	28,342	39,192	468	11,318	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	12,211	10,099	1,305	(807)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	22,534	24,542	6	2,014	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	21,361	24,210	610	3,459	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	6,414	6,074	429	89	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	5,636	5,768	164	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).
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	1,170	941	91	(138)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	51,617	73,797	24,760	46,940	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
North Carolina	Army	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	99	98	20	19	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	12,049	12,629	307	887	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.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	56,622	78,226	831	22,435	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 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.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	112,463	106,533	256	(5,674)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	954	1,702	49	797	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	15,013	12,791	782	(1,440)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	26,396	43,350	8,390	25,344	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	53,699	114,205	1,015	61,521	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	Army	USARC DURHAM	0	378	392	770	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.
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	7,623	7,010	270	(343)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	75	78	11	14	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,266	7,399	575	6,708	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Tennessee	Army	VOLUNTEER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	19,773	18,730	650	(393)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	0	0	42	42	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAUUA AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	785	860	11	86	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
District of Columbia	Army	WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	588	89	322	(177)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	4,226	5,775	135	1,684	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	Army	WELDON SPRING TRAINING AREA	2,789	3,288	43	542	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	65,601	67,652	1,021	3,072	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	804	880	30	106	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	2,954	4,469	871	2,386	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,377	2,788	383	794	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	15,955	16,795	5,328	6,168	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) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	75,623	56,659	13,861	(5,103)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	4,851	3,752	308	(791)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	43,591	39,158	5,344	911	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,315	13,000	902	1,587	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	58,571	57,991	3,641	3,061	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	48,065	47,038	73	(954)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	17,576	16,999	148	(429)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	416	418	89	91	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	2,447	2,479	463	495	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	12,863	10,572	2,988	697	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	144,917	151,515	6,103	12,701	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	7,326	9,657	817	3,148	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	4,554	3,849	750	45	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	47,244	47,023	509	288	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	28,893	28,170	695	(28)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	22,251	38,522	1,459	17,730	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	493,166	510,513	22,181	39,528	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	34,056	46,056	2,641	14,641	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) 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.
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	16,642	16,377	4,577	4,312	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Navy	CAMP H.M. SMITH OAHU	2,020	2,193	2	175	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	136,013	138,629	13,773	16,389	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	46,849	38,710	6,597	(1,542)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,550	6,829	927	(3,794)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	4,708	4,356	61	(291)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	7,583	5,885	145	(1,553)	No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	CHASE FIELD NAS	4,559	5,066	10	517	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	84,495	82,182	2,917	604	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,776	2,495	897	616	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	750	731	672	653	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	CHINA LAKE NAWS	128,621	140,874	5,883	18,136	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	52,655	52,389	1,009	743	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	65,515	68,278	8,295	11,058	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CORONA NOC NWAD	276	101	406	231	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	3,130	4,081	154	1,105	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	27,241	25,865	1,075	(301)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	27,853	22,784	1,231	(3,838)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	7,182	6,996	413	227	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	1,543	776	675	(92)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	11,909	6,590	3,603	(1,716)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	21,533	19,312	1,148	(1,073)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	23,424	22,256	1,186	18	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAM NECK FCTC	9,119	9,918	1,015	1,814	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	29,868	27,971	1,514	(383)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	DIXON NRTF	938	943	42	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).
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	28,595	24,992	3,020	(583)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	38,498	36,036	1,926	(536)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	24,094	24,019	2,583	2,508	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	26,581	24,379	6,471	4,269	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	32,993	31,524	1,776	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).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	8,913	9,014	1,427	1,528	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	185,719	168,548	835	(16,336)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	68,477	66,931	5,456	3,910	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	14,462	11,833	2,203	(426)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,483	1,504	48	69	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	1,940	2,191	2,039	2,290	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	14,683	11,686	5,460	2,463	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	15,057	14,712	378	33	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	193,876	186,330	2,652	(4,894)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	43,244	41,746	4,425	2,927	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	15,307	15,134	542	369	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	55,915	56,523	979	1,587	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	24,455	26,824	3,059	5,428	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).
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,877	4,314	57	494	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	26,613	27,393	1,236	2,016	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	356,722	363,665	1,400	8,343	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	980	1,001	592	613	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	10,495	10,439	1,085	1,029	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	LOS ANGELES NMCRC	611	513	18	(80)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	3,041	3,042	246	247	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	53,924	51,587	2,869	532	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,942	68,722	4,679	8,459	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	18,493	17,108	82	(1,303)	No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	MCGREGOR NWIRP	25,907	24,476	2,635	1,204	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Missouri	Navy	MCSA KANSAS CITY	1,717	1,226	38	(453)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	4,279	8,597	246	4,564	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	8,490	8,626	2,828	2,964	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	12,015	17,770	4,534	10,289	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	31,789	26,327	18,680	13,218	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	18,576	15,568	2,501	(507)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	31,279	46,065	4,204	18,990	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	14,048	14,017	714	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).
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	72,165	84,399	9,691	21,925	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	41,895	44,467	3,200	5,772	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	16,011	20,641	812	5,442	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	87,599	90,662	8,767	11,830	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	371	261	453	343	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	39,153	36,310	6,073	3,230	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	OAKLAND FISC ALAMEDA ANNEX	134	125	22	13	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	205,878	182,907	13,523	(9,448)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	12,111	13,358	786	2,033	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.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	11,793	9,631	135	(2,027)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	84,299	83,420	2,696	1,817	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	38,183	32,150	4,445	(1,588)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	17,056	19,355	337	2,636	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NS	110,703	91,131	11,111	(8,461)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	762	538	53	(171)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	6,550	6,824	655	929	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR PWC	40,943	41,444	751	1,252	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).
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	59,061	57,263	5,312	3,514	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTCC CORRY STATION	6,313	4,862	1,771	320	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	4,638	4,660	159	181	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	32,660	34,648	1,286	3,274	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	15,398	13,336	2,565	503	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	4,155	2,556	1,665	66	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	8,434	7,521	2,702	1,789	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,187	4,218	1,282	313	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,533	3,617	155	239	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	3,569	2,848	611	(110)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP BREMERTON	3,182	3,234	95	147	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	103,426	99,544	7,790	3,908	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	100,100	105,393	2,583	7,876	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Navy	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	10,460	8,959	1,324	(177)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	2,924	3,106	111	293	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	2,293	2,321	58	86	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	21,227	21,471	5,466	5,710	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	3,997	7,461	860	4,324	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	250,232	179,297	1,619	(69,316)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NSB	0	0	551	551	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	200	0	876	676	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,694	8,040	1,587	1,933	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	39,239	39,576	2,670	3,007	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	50,520	50,433	1,162	1,075	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	ST INIGOES NISE EAST COAST DET	399	1,444	169	1,214	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	15,636	21,343	1,018	6,725	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	35,117	47,780	7,761	20,424	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	253,628	221,779	19,881	(11,968)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	24,751	30,785	932	6,966	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	14,841	15,656	1,194	2,009	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	7,641	5,412	1,601	(628)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	265,072	263,131	29,805	27,864	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	8,306	3,339	22	(4,945)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	2,935	2,816	160	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).
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	51,229	52,578	1,823	3,172	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	1,105	497	672	64	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	26,286	23,623	1,259	(1,404)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	1,201	508	272	(421)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	96,116	98,255	11,158	13,297	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	1,974	1,747	359	132	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	25,986	25,023	4,945	3,982	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	43,247	43,973	371	1,097	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	59,052	53,016	5,393	(643)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	28,431	27,804	907	280	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN NWS	66,978	65,294	2,674	990	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	18,207	19,932	1,759	3,484	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	42,482	81,030	740	39,288	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,153	8,328	180	5,355	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 contract or contract method.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	73,273	73,466	1,653	1,846	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	46,712	36,505	2,092	(8,115)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	694	352	67	(275)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	202,031	149,277	4,086	(48,668)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	11,734	13,082	344	1,692	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	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	19,192	19,512	477	797	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	73,767	52,458	1,574	(19,735)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	112,313	79,446	8,338	(24,529)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	5,108	9,704	180	4,776	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	6,423	5,482	234	(707)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	54,938	47,451	1,432	(6,055)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	7,589	5,701	356	(1,532)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	BEALE	205,474	227,198	17,961	39,685	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,257	968	40	(249)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	5,004	5,181	2,967	3,144	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.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	23,396	25,095	230	1,929	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	1,660	1,492	41	(127)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	17,917	5,869	48	(12,000)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	5,451	4,984	71	(396)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	60,060	44,583	8,708	(6,769)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	670	0	53	(617)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	12,673	12,000	109	(564)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	5,983	3,984	502	(1,497)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	24,406	14,692	2,762	(6,952)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	76,200	81,241	13,631	18,672	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	210,360	187,507	3,103	(19,750)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	2,992	2,412	58	(522)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	13,684	7,620	832	(5,232)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	40,653	13,978	7,690	(18,985)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	5,349	5,229	71	(49)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	77,933	69,068	1,531	(7,334)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	CAVALIER AIR FORCE STATION	0	2,744	2,648	5,392	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	57,915	45,722	627	(11,566)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	385	162	12	(211)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	9,497	9,067	371	(59)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	6,701	3,799	84	(2,818)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	11,274	13,999	1,593	4,318	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,945	7,345	54	4,454	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	11,139	14,186	6,912	9,959	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	10,415	26,913	1,939	18,437	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	125,160	148,838	7,799	31,477	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	6,591	5,113	148	(1,330)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,460	1,221	70	(1,169)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,107	991	15	(1,101)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	15,672	17,898	926	3,152	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	27,852	20,599	1,840	(5,413)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	123,200	61,163	7,294	(54,743)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	587,173	488,233	21,575	(77,365)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	63,888	64,216	8,009	8,337	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	490,277	311,477	20,118	(158,682)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	94,331	56,954	17,892	(19,485)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	37,644	32,862	406	(4,376)	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	101,956	84,329	9,400	(8,227)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	69,827	51,847	4,508	(13,472)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	220,661	167,348	5,893	(47,420)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	10,488	9,327	120	(1,041)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	9,870	9,038	228	(604)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	GEORGE	99,124	100,438	1,353	2,667	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).
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,606	3,562	24	(20)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	8,185	5,352	733	(2,100)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	18,876	15,929	1,318	(1,629)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	8,479	5,827	108	(2,544)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	22,694	21,611	1,516	433	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,304	2,820	60	(1,424)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	41,645	46,922	1,138	6,415	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	450,213	354,059	20,114	(76,040)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	29,804	24,207	3,281	(2,316)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	36,624	35,865	1,416	657	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	12,479	17,964	1,735	7,220	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	16,505	11,105	1,322	(4,078)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	141,983	158,291	3,221	19,529	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	56,917	28,526	5,236	(23,155)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	42,212	29,391	2,735	(10,086)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	51,501	38,306	3,030	(10,165)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	340,936	302,976	8,180	(29,780)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	96,167	86,404	3,311	(6,452)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	21,804	25,037	1,744	4,977	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	17,039	15,750	414	(875)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	21,895	15,308	3,602	(2,985)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	29,499	26,082	5,320	1,903	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	148,122	137,584	17,274	6,736	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	15,821	12,079	243	(3,499)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	5,423	10,058	108	4,743	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.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	47,498	38,547	1,225	(7,726)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	14,468	13,894	1,086	512	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	1,085	784	18	(283)	No explanation required.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	21,260	19,984	1,838	562	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	5,175	4,481	318	(376)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	2,438	1,828	98	(512)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	8,648	8,876	696	924	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	111,801	88,388	892	(22,521)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	68,516	74,234	1,379	7,097	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	56,829	41,194	3,303	(12,332)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	126,651	109,571	14,917	(2,163)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	7,743	5,578	129	(2,036)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	6,814	5,212	74	(1,528)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	36,661	30,026	790	(5,845)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	26,974	22,291	418	(4,265)	No explanation required.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	37,108	90,693	899	54,484	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	6,418	21,696	120	15,398	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	13,372	15,940	9,671	12,239	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	45,232	63,663	1,258	19,689	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). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	18,741	13,426	157	(5,158)	No explanation required.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	24,286	18,000	2,524	(3,762)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MARCH	123,611	125,368	7,149	8,906	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Air Force	MATHER	137,338	155,135	3,139	20,936	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	MAXWELL	35,208	15,427	556	(19,225)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	164,435	162,701	3,384	1,650	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	35,778	30,697	3,141	(1,940)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,683	1,770	36	(877)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	52,421	36,347	1,487	(14,587)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	65,604	54,598	4,366	(6,640)	No explanation required.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	47,245	43,699	3,716	170	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	MURPHY DOME	6,711	4,063	186	(2,462)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	31,202	29,468	1,057	(677)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	1,195	896	15	(284)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	7,859	10,554	1,386	4,081	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.
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	31,282	28,255	7,897	4,870	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	4,800	5,861	936	1,997	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	8,437	7,918	148	(371)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	10,767	12,212	556	2,001	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	16,835	12,375	1,222	(3,238)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Air Force	NORTH AUXILIARY AIRFIELD	0	1,965	934	2,899	New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	8,143	4,538	420	(3,185)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	NORTON	12,449	31,508	578	19,637	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).
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	70,235	53,742	9,971	(6,522)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	29,583	26,157	143	(3,283)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	11,576	10,943	89	(544)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	43,318	47,427	812	4,921	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	191,568	195,539	10,145	14,116	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	110,274	125,203	14,538	29,467	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	113,388	93,078	4,622	(15,688)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	2,908	1,959	36	(913)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	1,897	1,571	49	(277)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	27,349	61,411	109	34,171	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	36,947	19,579	553	(16,815)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	REESE	404,076	373,641	18,929	(11,506)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	12,863	11,587	120	(1,156)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	10,629	45,094	323	34,788	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	106,709	87,847	8,024	(10,838)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	49,767	52,406	2,373	5,012	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	4,305	4,466	53	214	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	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	763	944	190	371	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Air Force	SCHRIEVER AIR FORCE BASE	0	1,728	3,056	4,784	New Site.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	62,517	41,551	2,542	(18,424)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	15,975	11,696	709	(3,570)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	76,905	81,711	9,486	14,292	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	9,093	9,967	427	1,301	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	5,859	4,388	120	(1,351)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	2,330	2,031	112	(187)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	27,946	12,975	1,618	(13,353)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	106,019	77,274	6,943	(21,802)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	134,310	238,000	6,428	110,118	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	107	0	97	(10)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	157,604	112,379	16,340	(28,885)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	19,862	21,833	180	2,151	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	46,033	36,535	2,396	(7,102)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	201,120	165,252	11,551	(24,317)	No explanation required.
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	11,195	6,615	3,026	(1,554)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	10,692	5,263	200	(5,229)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,769	4,665	71	1,967	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	12,025	17,278	872	6,125	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 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.
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	59,286	65,708	3,511	9,933	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	3,032	2,901	89	(42)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	23,493	24,477	168	1,152	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	135,039	99,499	8,757	(26,783)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	241,537	244,211	17,347	20,021	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,973	5,492	264	1,783	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	12,472	11,724	1,657	909	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DLA	DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW CUMBERLAND FAC.	1,219	5,710	152	4,643	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	DLA	DLA ENERGY	2,536	2,291	166	(79)	No explanation required.
New Hampshire	DLA	DLA ENERGY	305	30	23	(252)	No explanation required.
New York	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	28	560	588	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	1,937	2,368	8	439	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	873	945	595	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).
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	54,282	52,471	2,207	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).
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	33,480	27,002	1,112	(5,366)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	10,340	11,737	355	1,752	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	6,950	7,978	348	1,376	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	14	14	6	6	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE IN BRONSON	1,706	1,734	10	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).
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	97	737	46	686	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	AKUTAN	202	996	96	890	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	17	0	11	(6)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	19,038	11,523	211	(7,304)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMCHITKA AF AUXILIARY FIELD	39,669	39,889	68	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).
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	227	380	2	155	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	4,836	12,326	1,525	9,015	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	219	732	88	601	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Guam	FUDS	AREA 101	20,408	16,620	366	(3,422)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	2,805	0	123	(2,682)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	58,035	48,506	654	(8,875)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	8,077	8,141	72	136	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,678	1,544	36	(98)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	1,097	960	35	(102)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	13,345	21,927	7,611	16,193	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Florida	FUDS	AVON PARK ARMY AIRFIELD	1,222	1,194	70	42	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	27	0	63	36	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	2,906	894	31	(1,981)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	14,583	13,615	709	(259)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of th	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	4,030	4,026	65	61	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	4,348	22,249	258	18,159	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	BETHEL ARPT	2,178	141	69	(1,968)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	10,926	28,405	2,085	19,564	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	178,933	179,162	5,850	6,079	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	3,614	5,958	86	2,430	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	22,606	22,814	130	338	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	17,753	16,521	4,213	2,981	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	BORREGO SPRINGS	42,010	42,171	169	330	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	9,548	8,589	96	(863)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	BOWLING GREEN GF ANX	388	63	62	(263)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	21,678	22,018	22	362	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	6,110	5,748	1,694	1,332	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	48,375	42,823	2,020	(3,532)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	1,011	732	46	(233)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	890	1,423	67	600	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,586	4,187	730	3,331	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	22,383	10,389	507	(11,487)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	2,066	873	171	(1,022)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	71	12	9	(50)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPORT	4,659	4,664	260	265	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	56,193	63,748	130	7,685	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	100,821	99,228	293	(1,300)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	61,855	58,611	5,055	1,811	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	44,652	39,497	44	(5,111)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	79,041	75,040	1,385	(2,616)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	81	594	25	538	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAMP EDWARDS	650	452	22	(176)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	42,882	30,523	241	(12,118)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	9,334	12,505	312	3,483	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	12,738	953	37	(11,748)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	142,284	186,218	396	44,330	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	FUDS	CAMP HOWZE (FELDERHOFF)	218,706	229,681	157	11,132	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	2,462	1,036	37	(1,389)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	25,192	29,898	66	4,772	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS / FT BRADY TARGET RANGE	7,616	7,380	110	(126)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	37,629	26,319	5,719	(5,591)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	2,238	294	80	(1,864)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	133,352	128,368	1,127	(3,857)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	44,042	64,755	173	20,886	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	4,246	3,529	76	(641)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	77,560	80,308	95	2,843	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	299,008	250,595	115	(48,298)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	1,803	491	49	(1,263)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,805	15,658	2,034	2,887	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGG LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	2,373	1,964	681	272	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	70	69	1,273	1,272	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 SARICHEF	2,659	542	16	(2,101)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKAK RADIO STA	7,281	5,636	2,748	1,103	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	142	54	18	(70)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	CARRINGTON ISLAND PRECISION BOMBING RANGE	5,666	10,573	122	5,029	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CARRIZO IMPACT AREA	150,758	164,852	163	14,257	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	499	593	26	120	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	621	1,002	239	620	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHARLESTON AFS	7,044	1,520	822	(4,702)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	20,042	13,774	1,407	(4,861)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	5,091	3,796	60	(1,235)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	26,585	28,341	208	1,964	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	264	31	383	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).
Virginia	FUDS	CHOPAWAMSIK TROOP TRAINING SITE	51,796	54,832	53	3,089	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	37	82	259	304	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	4,504	4,518	514	528	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	26,141	23,414	342	(2,385)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	COLD SPRING FOUNDRY	6,772	6,826	210	264	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	50,437	9,565	34	(40,838)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	4,799	4,834	4	39	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	5,402	6,228	775	1,601	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	211,530	290,666	196	79,332	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	183,312	196,536	16,560	29,784	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	CP HERO	23,197	24,160	1,277	2,240	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	47,752	45,828	70	(1,854)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	1,092	983	74	(35)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	565	1,857	65	1,357	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,713	1,792	25	104	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	105,079	112,891	3,343	11,155	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	735	727	10	2	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	92,733	100,348	1,133	8,748	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	0	0	132	132	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	132	155	57	80	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	9,971	10,035	403	467	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	10,312	9,973	466	127	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,095	6,813	536	1,254	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	2,903	1,894	1,656	647	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	38,068	39,257	48	1,237	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	460	663	76	279	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	552	476	77	1	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,021	12,494	284	7,757	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	EL CENTRO ROCKET TARGET NO. 2 (#93)	10,215	10,159	784	728	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	31	0	18	(13)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	501	498	14	11	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	2,644	7,351	1,643	6,350	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	4,314	3,878	126	(310)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	28,325	25,303	3,676	654	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	2,099	5,210	760	3,871	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	3,170	4,938	101	1,869	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2	37,904	74,838	1,029	37,963	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 3	106,514	206,043	161	99,690	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	39,527	99,473	526	60,472	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	86	152	7	73	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	4,383	3,878	116	(389)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	13,114	13,940	84	910	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	2,474	9,388	37	6,951	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	1,471	1,479	53	61	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	8,405	7,938	399	(68)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	3,169	2,843	48	(278)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,526	13,183	77	11,734	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,390	1,648	218	476	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	531	60	407	(64)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,057	345	342	(370)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	541	537	11	7	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	FORMER CAMP CLAIBORNE	30,482	23,406	124	(6,952)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORMER CAMP FANNIN	4,268	4,328	634	694	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virgin Islands of th	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	126	98	41	13	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,948	3,055	78	185	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	18,218	26,203	451	8,436	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	5,567	8,322	89	2,844	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	FUDS	FORT DOUGLAS	7,596	7,609	153	166	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	5,079	7,918	45	2,884	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	249,112	251,816	815	3,519	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	FORT H G WRIGHT	16,615	16,948	106	439	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FORT HANCOCK	10,291	10,933	219	861	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	19,427	7,414	13,297	1,284	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	4,737	4,467	59	(211)	No explanation required.
Delaware	FUDS	FORT MILES MILITARY RESERVATION	27,044	27,583	34	573	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	29,229	762	52	(28,415)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	22,387	10,995	179	(11,213)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	18,942	4,224	809	(13,909)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT TIDBALL/LONG ISLAND	426	346	2,731	2,651	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FORT WARD-BAINBRIDGE ISLAND AAA BATTERY 7	290	57	240	7	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	531	508	4	(19)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	1,244	1,475	140	371	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	6,166	6,241	26	101	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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	FT MYERS BOMB & GUN RANGE	2,570	2,767	95	292	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	19,888	17,722	120	(2,046)	No explanation required.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	7,952	8,560	26	634	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	248	0	54	(194)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	323	27	518	222	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	43	136	112	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,826	3,758	502	2,434	New Site.
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	53	69	4	20	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	GR SALT PL BOMB RGE	613	621	39	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).
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	93,145	115,490	3,686	26,031	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	6,096	7,207	523	1,634	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	GUSTINE BOMBING RANGE	2,693	1,772	1,069	148	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	15,537	18,469	1,728	4,660	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	29,363	29,283	933	853	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	11,134	12,803	29	1,698	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	1,926	492	35	(1,399)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	15,748	15,537	92	(119)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	795	713	90	8	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	14,817	14,379	300	(138)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	HOLTVILLE ROCKET TARGET 1R (#94)	25,918	26,364	952	1,398	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	7,253	7,288	95	130	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Northern Mariana	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	2,205	2,629	168	592	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	FUDS	HURRICANE MESA TEST SITE	9,804	9,630	1,793	1,619	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,589	9,606	75	6,092	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	3,399	2,967	193	(239)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	IONA ISLAND NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	4,794	6,694	173	2,073	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	IRVINE PARK- ARMY CAMP	17,610	15,561	2,984	935	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	511	499	5	(7)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	664	831	17	184	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	126	23	146	43	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	3,622	3,559	59	(4)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	15,623	8,825	510	(6,288)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	8,249	8,959	127	837	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE ANNEX	768	756	50	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).
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	6,678	6,383	134	(161)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	1,473	1,480	335	342	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	12,205	8,877	346	(2,982)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	41,048	37,961	1,831	(1,256)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	713	733	44	64	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	323	408	547	632	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	LAKE WILMINGTON TARGET	4,863	4,067	9	(787)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	332	325	4	(3)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	5,716	3,406	881	(1,429)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	2,181	3,072	66	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	8,360	9,147	547	1,334	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	33,752	35,304	1,694	3,246	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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-6	10,017	9,733	394	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	8,155	12,843	335	5,023	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	384	1,734	80	1,430	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	4,036	6,466	29	2,459	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	114	55	17	(42)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	21,752	17,336	2,323	(2,093)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	4,000	4,838	1,660	2,498	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Guam	FUDS	LONFIT PLANNING PROJECT	55,338	54,782	19	(537)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	2,415	133	72	(2,210)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	5,487	4,421	1,040	(26)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	478	3,187	64	2,773	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	1,523	2,208	52	738	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	4,281	12,499	58	8,276	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MACH GATR	2,518	3,068	3	553	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	5,285	4,589	99	(597)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	9,217	3,968	120	(5,129)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	8,704	8,534	631	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	1,153	841	194	(118)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	6,151	5,925	123	(103)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	785	726	42	(17)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	44,783	45,297	103	617	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	59,362	88,130	4,597	33,365	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	196	157	1	(38)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	1,568	1,590	692	714	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	2,032	2,393	101	462	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	868	868	52	52	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	1,148	321	30	(797)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	461	387	48	(26)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,024	1,523	46	545	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Northern Mariana	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	140,982	18,117	176	(122,689)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	4,913	5,156	183	426	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	17,333	19,092	1,887	3,646	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	892	1,153	33	294	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	654	0	40	(614)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	480	532	123	175	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	8,676	9,522	499	1,345	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION SANFORD	1,351	1,306	49	4	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	8,053	8,154	237	338	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	8,839	11,075	191	2,427	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	2,460	2,412	63	15	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	1,465	2,441	342	1,318	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	787	7,630	414	7,257	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	7,621	10,215	180	2,774	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	260,510	235,658	5,051	(19,801)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	50,834	50,159	217	(458)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	3,572	4,357	61	846	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	6	0	2	(4)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NEW YORK ORDNANCE WORKS	5,475	7,689	407	2,621	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).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	473	6,010	302	5,839	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	194	246	145	197	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	57	0	117	60	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	2,954	2,619	276	(59)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	5,141	1,856	331	(2,954)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	274	325	265	316	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	23	0	19	(4)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,881	3,300	639	2,058	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,757	1,413	2,056	(1,288)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	41	891	39	889	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	150	149	73	72	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	4,625	5,082	594	1,051	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	6,100	7,542	1,500	2,942	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	69	20	7	(42)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,409	5,030	134	2,755	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,434	951	87	(396)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	1,090	1,070	159	139	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,890	2,867	86	63	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	877	881	25	29	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	940	800	19	(121)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	1,771	2,716	108	1,053	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	53	406	26	379	New Site.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	3,867	6,200	62	2,395	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).
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	21,178	17,742	194	(3,242)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	2,422	3,080	442	1,100	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	FUDS	OHIO RUBBER COMPANY	1,165	161	601	(403)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	843	781	66	4	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	875	850	40	15	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	740	713	15	(12)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana	FUDS	ORDNANCE PLAN	12,529	62,119	227	49,817	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	OSPREY BOMBING RANGE	1,829	853	1,122	146	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	4,081	4,430	50	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	4,964	4,943	25	4	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PALI TRAINING CAMP	10,768	10,950	17	199	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	PAPOHAKU RANCLAND SUB	14,076	13,205	234	(637)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	11,292	17,075	191	5,974	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	811	553	83	(175)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	224	109	1	(114)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	21,315	22,278	3,919	4,882	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	1,075	836	39	(200)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-6	104	9	3	(92)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	8,818	3,396	4,246	(1,176)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	28,117	7,163	269	(20,685)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	3,041	21,461	1,118	19,538	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	POINT VICENTE MIL RES FC SITES	2,371	1,113	59	(1,199)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	116,881	130,726	55	13,900	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	POPOKI TARGET AREA	3,211	1,856	5	(1,350)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	3,199	2,901	446	148	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	8,577	5,954	87	(2,536)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	233	237	9	13	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	3,898	3,925	354	381	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	1,124	1,331	202	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	67,207	61,698	4,622	(887)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	4,880	5,928	148	1,196	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).
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,148	15,988	864	5,704	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	251	446	29	224	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	3,715	3,802	166	253	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	32	0	40	8	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	4,851	2,390	327	(2,134)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SAND PT NAS-MAGNUSON PK	0	715	71	786	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	2,421	2,643	612	834	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	7	31	11	35	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	2,512	2,368	114	(30)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-02	1,973	48	219	(1,706)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	3,677	3,882	134	339	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	3,067	7,665	149	4,747	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,813	6,841	108	1,136	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	2,898	2,823	85	10	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	0	41	3	44	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	3,897	4,302	32	437	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	116	103	26	13	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	19,945	21,347	2,759	4,161	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SOLOMONS NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE	1,194	96	77	(1,021)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	688	745	25	82	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	15,842	15,612	108	(122)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	17,115	12,485	10,136	5,506	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	ST GEORGE ISLAND BOMB RANGE	8,953	8,778	6	(169)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	1,750	1,000	59	(691)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	STEAD AFB	173	24	15	(134)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	STEWART AFB	5,969	7,160	265	1,456	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SUFFOLK CO AAF&B&C RGE	13,613	13,673	851	911	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	7,533	8,159	9	635	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	SUSITNA GUNNERY RNG	8,371	9,151	280	1,060	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	SWAN ISLAND NAVAL-MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	33	14	6	(13)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	41,986	38,397	6,426	2,837	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	580	766	159	345	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	TEMECULA BOMB TARGET #107	4,587	5,041	96	550	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	TIGALDA ISLAND	97	1,796	127	1,826	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	881	544	91	(246)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	2,219	5,851	448	4,080	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). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	110	511	206	607	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	214	51	2	(161)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	63	86	1	24	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	2,189	5,387	79	3,277	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	1,227	1,023	141	(63)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	36	843	114	921	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	201,037	203,573	260	2,796	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4,366	5,495	106	1,235	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	UNALGA ISL NAV RADIO	8,725	11,256	34	2,565	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	129	129	6	6	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	113	414	32	333	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	62,944	65,458	199	2,713	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	VENICE BOMBING RANGE	2,845	1,685	1,056	(104)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	4,767	7,786	63	3,082	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	332,505	354,591	14,242	36,328	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	6,921	4,975	195	(1,751)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	28,703	33,455	499	5,251	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	WALTERBORO AAF	387	0	11	(376)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	893	936	21	64	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Michigan	FUDS	WAUGOSHANCE POINT TARGET	245	48	51	(146)	No explanation required.

**Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2020**

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2019 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2020 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2020 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	2,580	2,571	590	581	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	446	448	3	5	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	73,180	66,550	4,074	(2,556)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	8,081	8,481	161	561	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	2,563	15,307	46	12,790	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	561	1,185	166	790	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	752	0	23	(729)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	556	453	18	(85)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	32,519	29,237	101	(3,181)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	4,550	27,984	3,604	27,038	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.
Utah	FUDS	YELLOW JACKET TARGET AREA	8,444	14,307	97	5,960	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	92	68	77	53	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	4,902	515	222	(4,165)	No explanation required.