

Defense Environmental Programs

Annual Report to Congress

for FY 2017



August 2018

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense
for Acquisition and Sustainment

The estimated cost of this report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$44,000 in Fiscal Years 2017 - 2018. This includes \$32,000 in expenses and \$11,000 in DoD labor.

Generated on 2018Jul16

RefID: 3-861D660

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLES	ii
APPENDICES.....	ii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	3
Environmental Restoration Goals	3
IRP Site Status and Funding	4
MRS Status and Funding	7
BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding	8
III. EQ PROGRAMS	10
Compliance.....	10
Overall Trend Analysis	11
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	11
Natural and Cultural Resources.....	11
Overall Trend Analysis.....	12
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	12
Pollution Prevention.....	13
Overall Trend Analysis.....	13
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts	13
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.....	15
Overall Trend Analysis	15
Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts.....	16
Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals	16
V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES.....	18
Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana	18
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.....	18
Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, California.....	18
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California.....	18
Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.....	18
VI. FY 2017 FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES AND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2016.....	19

TABLES

Table 1: Overall DoD Environmental Program Funding.....	2
Table 2: RC Goals and Progress	4
Table 3: IRP Site Status	5
Table 4: IRP Funding.....	6
Table 5: MRS Status	7
Table 6: MMRP Funding.....	8
Table 7: BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding.....	8
Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout	9
Table 9: Compliance Program Funding.....	10
Table 10: Natural and Cultural Resources Funding.....	12
Table 11: Pollution Prevention Program Funding	13
Table 12: Environmental Technology Program Funding	15

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

I. INTRODUCTION

This Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 contains information to satisfy the following requirements:

- The funding invested in and progress of the Department of Defense's (DoD) environmental programs – Environmental Restoration, Environmental Quality (EQ), and Environmental Technology – in accordance with title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), section 2711 (Sections II-IV);
- The Department's ongoing decontamination activities on withdrawn or reserved lands in accordance with section 2916(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66) (Section V); and
- A list of DoD installations and Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) properties where DoD obligated funding for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017, as well as reasons for increases in cleanup cost estimates since FY 2016, in accordance with language in House Report 113-113, accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014 (Section VI, Appendix A, and Appendix B).

The Department's priorities for its environmental programs are: (1) protect the environment to ensure that DoD has the land, water, and airspace needed for military readiness; (2) protect the health of the military and civilian personnel and their families who live and work on DoD bases; (3) ensure DoD operations do not adversely affect the health or environment of surrounding communities; and (4) preserve resources for future generations. To achieve these objectives, DoD is committed to continuous improvement, greater efficiency, and the use of new technology where feasible. In FY 2017, DoD obligated approximately \$3.6 billion for its environmental programs. This includes \$1.4 billion for environmental restoration activities, \$2.0 billion for EQ activities, and \$183 million for environmental technology activities. In the President's FY 2019 budget, DoD is requesting about \$3.4 billion for its environmental programs to continue ensuring the protection of human health and the environment, and to sustain the resources required to support the readiness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Table 1 summarizes the overall DoD environmental program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Environmental Restoration							
Active Installations and FUDS	\$1,352.6	\$1,286.5	\$1,221.0	\$1,161.1	\$1,082.3	\$1,221.9	\$1,050.8
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Locations*	\$472.9	\$697.5	\$609.6	\$415.5	\$347.0	\$274.4**	\$244.9**
Restoration Total	\$1,825.5	\$1,984.0	\$1,830.6	\$1,576.6	\$1,429.3	\$1,496.3	\$1,295.7
EQ							
Compliance	\$1,347.3	\$1,379.5	\$1,306.0	\$1,271.8	\$1,511.8	\$1,442.0	\$1,475.5
Natural and Cultural Resources	\$384.3	\$444.6	\$377.2	\$443.4	\$429.0	\$440.7	\$419.4
Pollution Prevention	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$72.5	\$74.5
EQ Total	\$1,797.1	\$1,921.3	\$1,777.5	\$1,802.3	\$2,008.0	\$1,995.2	\$1,969.4
Environmental Technology							
Technology Total	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$231.8	\$172.2
DoD Total***	\$3,817.7	\$4,108.5	\$3,792.6	\$3,568.3	\$3,620.3	\$3,683.3	\$3,437.3

* Includes all applicable congressional funding additions for FY 2013 through FY 2018.

† BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. Omits Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) actuals.

** Excludes \$113.9 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

** Excludes \$49.4 million of planned obligations from prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

*** Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

For more information on DoD's environmental programs, please visit:
<http://www.denix.osd.mil>.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

The Department began environmental restoration in 1975 under its Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The IRP addresses contamination from hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations in the United States. In 2001, DoD established its Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) to address former defense sites known or suspected to contain unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents (i.e., closed military ranges). These sites are referred to as munitions response sites (MRSs). Through these programs, DoD complies with the federal cleanup law, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), also known as Superfund.

The Department remains focused on continuously improving its environmental restoration program by updating relevant policies, working with stakeholders, and developing and implementing new advanced technologies to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup. These initiatives help ensure that DoD makes the best use of available resources to steadily move sites through the cleanup process and achieve program goals while protecting human health, safety, and the environment. The Department measures cleanup progress against the Response Complete (RC) milestone, which occurs when the cleanup activities are complete (although DoD or a subsequent owner may continue to monitor the site). Of the 39,800 IRP sites and MRSs in the inventory, DoD has achieved the RC milestone at more than 33,200 sites (83 percent).

Environmental Restoration Goals

The Department uses environmental restoration goals to assist in driving cleanup progress toward achieving the RC milestone. The DoD Components prioritize resources to meet the goals listed in Table 2 in a cost-effective manner. The goals demonstrate progress in a streamlined and transparent fashion.

Table 2 lists the RC goals and summarizes the Department’s progress toward achieving these goals. The table presents the number of sites subject to these goals, the total number and percentage of sites that have achieved the goals from the beginning of the program through FY 2017, the number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals in FY 2018 and FY 2019, and the total number and percentage of sites projected to achieve the goals from the beginning of the program through FY 2019.

Table 2: RC Goals and Progress*

Goals	Number of Sites Subject to the Goals	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites that Achieved the Goals through FY 2017	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2018	Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals in FY 2019	Total Number (and Percentage) of Sites Projected to Achieve the Goals through FY 2019
Achieve RC at 90% and 95% of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations and IRP sites at FUDS properties by the end of FY 2018 and FY 2021, respectively	37,275	32,063 (86%)	507 (1%)	953 (3%)	33,523 (90%)

* Excludes FUDS MRSs; potentially responsible party sites, which are sites where DoD has identified that an individual or company is potentially responsible for contributing to the contamination; and sites where a DoD Component cannot obtain rights of entry to complete investigations.

Through FY 2017, the Department achieved RC at 86 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties. DoD is currently projecting that it will fall slightly short of the FY 2018 and FY 2021 RC goals; it anticipates achieving RC at 87 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties by the end of FY 2018, and at 93 percent of these sites by the end of FY 2021. These projections are based on the sites in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) inventory as of the end of FY 2017.

The Department’s newest environmental restoration goal, established in FY 2014, focuses on reducing the potential risk to human health and the environment posed by FUDS MRSs. The goal is to implement interim risk management or start a munitions response action at 90 percent of FUDS MRSs that have not achieved RC by the end of FY 2018. The Department began interim risk management activities in FY 2015. These activities include mailing letters that provide explosives safety education material to property owners and establishing a call center to answer questions.

Additional information about the status of DoD’s cleanup efforts and funding can be found on the DoD Cleanup Landing website at <http://www.denix.osd.mil/cleanup/>.

IRP Site Status and Funding

Table 3 summarizes the cleanup status of IRP sites at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations. The table presents the number of sites in the inventory, the

number of sites at Remedy In Place (RIP)¹ and RC through FY 2016 and FY 2017, and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2016 to FY 2017.

Table 3: IRP Site Status

	Total IRP Inventory (FY 2017)	RIP			RC		
		Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2016	Number of IRP Sites at RIP through FY 2017	Change in RIP Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2016	Number of IRP Sites at RC through FY 2017	Change in RC Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017
Active Installations							
Army	11,271	10,525	10,569	44	10,250	10,267	17
Department of the Navy (DON)*	4,079	3,739	3,756	17	3,473	3,506	33
Air Force	7,264	5,995	6,135	140	5,453	5,607	154
DLA	215	195	195	0	186	185	-1
Active Total	22,829	20,454	20,655	201	19,362	19,565	203
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	3,097	2,548	2,596	48	2,512	2,554	42
BRAC Locations							
Army	2,108	1,999	2,019	20	1,960	1,970	10
DON*	1,116	1,068	1,062	-6	907	928	21
Air Force	5,137	4,906	4,966	60	4,768	4,805	37
DLA	48	48	48	0	47	47	0
BRAC Total	8,409	8,021	8,095	74	7,682	7,750	68
DoD Total	34,335	31,023	31,346	323	29,556	29,869	313

* DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

¹ The Department measures the number of sites at RIP, which occurs when cleanup systems are constructed and operational.

Table 4 summarizes IRP funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

Table 4: IRP Funding* (millions of dollars)

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Estimated****	FY 2019 Requested
Active Installations							
Army	\$212.8	\$201.9	\$216.8	\$200.5	\$139.6	\$155.8	\$143.6
DON[†]	\$239.0	\$262.1	\$240.9	\$243.5	\$238.5	\$231.8	\$280.3
Air Force	\$431.2	\$403.4	\$398.2	\$352.9	\$333.1	\$264.9	\$245.6
Defense-wide**	\$10.7	\$11.0	\$7.9	\$5.8	\$6.6	\$8.3	\$8.6
Active Total	\$893.7	\$863.9	\$863.9	\$802.8	\$717.8	\$660.8	\$678.1
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	\$195.2	\$172.3	\$143.8	\$156.5	\$149.4	\$132.9	\$152.7
BRAC Locations**							
Army	\$86.5	\$207.2	\$106.1	\$66.7	\$43.9	\$60.4	\$28.3
DON[†]	\$164.9	\$119.2	\$181.1	\$149.9	\$148.9	\$112.9	\$133.9
Air Force	\$118.9	\$154.3	\$94.1	\$79.0	\$81.9	\$56.3	\$49.1
Defense-wide**	\$3.7	\$3.2	\$2.6	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.9	\$2.9
BRAC Total	\$374.0	\$483.8	\$384.0	\$297.7	\$277.2	\$232.5	\$214.2
DoD Total***	\$1,462.9	\$1,534.4	\$1,391.6	\$1,256.9	\$1,144.5	\$1,026.1	\$1,045.0

* This table includes funding for all program management requirements at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

† DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

** Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

†† BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 appropriated and FY 2019 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

*** Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

**** The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to IRP funding.

In recent years, the presence of perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in drinking water has become an emerging issue. PFOS and PFOA are part of a class of man-made chemicals used in many industrial and consumer products to make the products resist heat, stains, water, and grease. These substances are not uniquely attributable to DoD activities and are far more ubiquitous in consumer and industrial products. In the 1970s, DoD began using aqueous film forming foam (AFFF), which contains PFOS, and in some cases PFOA. AFFF is mission critical because it quickly extinguishes petroleum-based fires. As a result of AFFF use, PFOS and PFOA have been detected at a number of DoD installations.

On May 19, 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Lifetime Health Advisories (LHAs) recommending the individual or combined levels of PFOS and PFOA in drinking water be below 70 parts per trillion. While it is only guidance under the SDWA and is not a required or enforceable drinking water standard, DoD began taking actions to address impacted drinking water.

The Department followed a comprehensive approach to identify installations where DoD used AFFF containing PFOS or PFOA. As of August 2017, DoD has identified 401 active and BRAC installations with one or more areas where there is a known or suspected release of PFOS and/or PFOA. This list includes sites that DoD is currently addressing as part of its DERP, and new areas not currently included in the DERP (e.g., airplane crash sites, aircraft hangar

suppression systems). Now that DoD has an initial list of known and suspected release areas, the DoD Components are following the CERCLA process to investigate these areas to confirm if a release occurred. The DoD Components will continue collecting information on the nature and extent of the releases to determine if cleanup actions are necessary. The Department considers the EPA's health advisory information when addressing risk to human health under its cleanup program consistent with EPA risk assessment guidance. Throughout the CERCLA process, DoD will work in concert with regulatory agencies and communities and will share information in an open and transparent manner.

DoD expects that environmental cleanup costs will increase due to emerging contaminants, such as the investigation and cleanup of PFOS and PFOA. As additional information becomes available, DoD will include a best estimate of these costs in environmental cleanup costs.

MRS Status and Funding

Table 5 summarizes the cleanup status of MRSs at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations. The table presents the number of MRSs in the inventory; the number of MRSs at RIP and RC through FY 2016 and FY 2017; and the changes in RIP and RC status from FY 2016 to FY 2017.

Table 5: MRS Status

	Total MRS Inventory (FY 2017)	RIP			RC		
		Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2016	Number of MRSs at RIP through FY 2017	Change in RIP Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2016	Number of MRSs at RC through FY 2017	Change in RC Status from FY 2016 to FY 2017
Active Installations							
Army	1,344	1,131	1,130	-1	1,129	1,129	0
DON*	419	176	182	6	171	179	8
Air Force	1,045	748	768	20	743	765	22
DLA	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Active Total	2,815	2,055	2,080	25	2,043	2,073	30
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	2,289	1,001	1,014	13	1,001	1,014	13
BRAC Locations							
Army	178	126	131	5	126	130	4
DON*	40	18	20	2	18	19	1
Air Force	140	124	126	2	121	123	2
DLA ⁺	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BRAC Total	358	268	277	9	265	272	7
DoD Total	5,462	3,324	3,371	47	3,309	3,359	50

* DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

⁺ DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

Table 6 summarizes MMRP funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 at active installations, FUDS properties, and BRAC locations.

Table 6: MMRP Funding (millions of dollars)*

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Estimated ⁺⁺⁺	FY 2019 Requested
Active Installations							
Army	\$76.7	\$67.5	\$53.1	\$34.3	\$30.6	\$60.0	\$59.9
DON ⁺	\$48.2	\$53.9	\$45.4	\$56.2	\$50.8	\$49.7	\$48.9
Air Force	\$56.2	\$16.1	\$30.8	\$15.0	\$38.4	\$28.9	\$51.2
Defense-wide ^{**}	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$2.6	\$1.6	\$0.6	\$0.3
Active Total	\$181.5	\$137.6	\$129.3	\$108.2	\$121.3	\$139.1	\$160.3
FUDS Properties							
FUDS Total	\$82.0	\$98.2	\$84.1	\$93.7	\$93.6	\$75.8	\$59.7
BRAC Locations⁺⁺							
Army	\$38.6	\$129.9	\$181.8	\$42.1	\$48.2	\$55.1	\$21.4
DON ⁺	\$38.1	\$14.4	\$22.0	\$11.8	\$12.3	\$18.7	\$7.0
Air Force	\$0.3	\$5.0	\$2.6	\$1.1	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.0
Defense-wide ^{**}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BRAC Total	\$77.1	\$149.3	\$206.4	\$55.0	\$60.9	\$73.8	\$28.4
DoD Total^{***}	\$340.6	\$385.2	\$419.8	\$256.9	\$275.9	\$288.8	\$248.4

* This table does not include program management for the MMRP.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA. DLA does not have MRSs at BRAC locations.

⁺⁺ BRAC FY 2013 through FY 2017 actuals include prior year funds and land sale revenue. FY 2018 appropriated and FY 2019 requested amounts also include prior year funds and anticipated land sale revenue.

^{***} Due to rounding, subtotals may not equal FY totals.

⁺⁺⁺ The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to MMRP funding.

BRAC Planning and Compliance Funding

Table 7 summarizes funding for planning and compliance projects, such as facility assessments and surveys, at BRAC locations from FY 2013 through FY 2019.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Estimated ^{***}	FY 2019 Requested
BRAC Locations							
Army	\$21.1	\$46.9	\$18.5	\$64.5	\$10.7	\$27.8	\$51.0
DON ⁺	\$0.2	\$0.7	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.6
Air Force	\$0.6	\$16.7	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
Defense-wide ^{**}	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DoD Total^{**}	\$21.9	\$64.3	\$19.2	\$64.9	\$11.2	\$27.8	\$51.6

* Includes prior year funding and land sale revenue.

⁺ DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

^{**} Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies and DLA.

⁺⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

^{***} The FY 2018 appropriation was made too late to identify the amounts allocated to Planning or Compliance funding.

Beginning in FY 2014, Congress consolidated the BRAC accounts, providing DoD with increased flexibility to use unobligated prior year funds across the BRAC cleanup inventory. The Department continues to use its remaining balances from prior years and its anticipated land sale revenue to supplement its annual appropriations and meet annual BRAC cleanup funding needs. Table 8 summarizes BRAC funding, including annual appropriations, prior year funds, and land sale revenue, from FY 2017 through FY 2019.

Table 8: BRAC Funding Breakout (millions of dollars)

	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army			
Annual Appropriation	\$21.5	\$43.1	\$54.2
Prior Year Funds	\$29.0	\$68.7	\$46.4
Land Sale Revenue	\$52.4	\$31.5	\$0.0
Army Total Funding*	\$102.9	\$143.3	\$100.6
DON[†]			
Annual Appropriation	\$144.6	\$185.7	\$141.5
Prior Year Funds	\$6.6	\$0.0	\$0.0
Land Sale Revenue	\$10.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DON Total Funding*	\$161.2	\$185.7	\$141.5
Air Force			
Annual Appropriation	\$50.4	\$45.7	\$49.1
Prior Year Funds	\$32.3	\$10.7	\$0.1
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.1
Air Force Total Funding*	\$82.8	\$56.4	\$49.2
DLA^{**}			
Annual Appropriation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Prior Year Funds	\$2.5	\$2.9	\$2.9
Land Sale Revenue	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DLA Total Funding*	\$2.5	\$2.9	\$2.9
DoD Total			
Annual Appropriation	\$216.5	\$274.4	\$244.9
Prior Year Funds	\$70.4	\$82.3	\$49.4
Land Sale Revenue	\$62.5	\$31.5	\$0.1
DoD Total Funding^{*,***}	\$347.0	\$388.2	\$291.3

* Due to rounding, subtotals and the DoD Total may not equal FY totals.

† DON includes Navy and Marine Corps; DON manages Navy and Marine Corps environmental restoration activities as a combined program.

** Funding is from a settlement DLA received from Sunoco to perform cleanup activities at the former Defense Supply Center Philadelphia.

*** Does not include DLA.

III. EQ PROGRAMS

The Department’s EQ Programs address compliance with environmental laws and regulations, protection of natural and cultural resources on DoD lands, and pollution prevention. In FY 2014, DoD updated its budget-reporting format for these programs to increase consistency in budget reports, and provide additional detail and insight into funding allocations. Because of the change in budget-reporting format, the DoD Components have shifted funding between programs and re-defined some of the funding. Therefore, it is not possible to compare FY 2017 obligations to FY 2013 actual funding below the program level (i.e., compliance, conservation, pollution prevention).

Compliance

The Department provides resources through its Compliance Program to comply with applicable requirements, such as Federal, State, and local environmental laws, regulations, and ordinances, for installations located in the United States. Additionally, the Compliance Program includes applicable environmental compliance, remediation, and planning requirements for installations located outside of the United States. Under this program, DoD activities include sampling and analyzing pollutant discharges to air and water, maintaining environmental permits for regulated activities, providing safe drinking water, and disposing of regulated waste. The Compliance Program also includes projects to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities and install air pollution controls to meet new regulatory standards. In FY 2017, the Department maintained a Clean Water Act permit compliance rate above 90 percent and a drinking water compliance rate almost equal to the 93 percent national average. In addition, DoD’s non-hazardous solid waste diversion rate was 62 percent in calendar year 2017, exceeding the FY 2016 goal of 60 percent.

Table 9 summarizes Compliance Program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

Table 9: Compliance Program Funding (millions of dollars)

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$389.6	\$380.2	\$347.6	\$368.6	\$397.5	\$417.8	\$422.6
Navy	\$358.1	\$374.3	\$354.9	\$359.8	\$351.1	\$367.7	\$376.9
Air Force	\$298.5	\$293.9	\$283.5	\$302.2	\$358.6	\$340.1	\$316.2
Marine Corps	\$113.2	\$115.6	\$148.1	\$103.4	\$119.1	\$108.5	\$106.8
Defense-wide*	\$187.7	\$215.5	\$171.9	\$137.8	\$285.5	\$207.9	\$253.0
DoD Total⁺	\$1,347.1	\$1,379.5	\$1,306.0	\$1,271.8	\$1,511.8	\$1,442.0	\$1,475.5

* Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

Overall Trend Analysis

Overall DoD Compliance Program funding decreased from FY 2013 through FY 2016, in part because the Budget Control Act (BCA) led to a trend in reduced funding for overall compliance programs. For FY 2017, DoD total funding exceeded previous levels due to increased requests across most of the DoD Components to fund efforts that were delayed in previous FYs. For FY 2018, DoD appropriated funding decreases, partly due to completion of one-time military construction projects. For FY 2019, the total requested funding level remains relatively consistent with FY 2018.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Air Force funding increased 18.7 percent due to the increases in Manpower Cross Cutting Compliance Programs. The Marine Corps' 15.2 percent increase in funding was due to a \$12.8 million Clean Air Act project at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina, and increases in wastewater and storm water project funding. In addition, Defense-wide funding increased by 107.2 percent due to two DLA military construction projects to replace petroleum, oils, and lubricants (POL) storage facilities at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, and Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipated that Defense-wide funding would decrease (-27.2 percent) due to completion of one-time military construction projects and reductions in DLA's compliance related cleanup at POL sites.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, Defense-wide funding is expected to increase 21.7 percent due to military construction projects at Joint Base Langley-Eustis. In addition, there is compliance-related cleanup of POL facilities planned at three installations.

The Department is committed to ensuring safe drinking water for the people living and working on our installations. In response to an EPA LHA, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment directed in June 2016 that the Military Departments test for PFOS and PFOA worldwide where DoD supplies drinking water. Under this policy, DoD tested all of its 524 drinking water systems by the end of FY 2017. At the 24 systems where the test results were above the EPA LHA level, DoD followed the EPA advisory recommendations to bring the water below the EPA LHA level.

In addition, where DoD purchases drinking water, installations are encouraged to request that their suppliers test the drinking water. The Department identified 12 systems where DoD purchased water and where the results of these tests were above the EPA LHA level; the installation worked with the drinking water supplier to ensure the water consumed on base is now below the EPA LHA level.

Natural and Cultural Resources

The Department manages its natural and cultural resources and complies with existing laws (e.g., Endangered Species Act, Sikes Act, National Historic Preservation Act) to enable continued access to testing and training lands and ensure the long-term sustainability of our

Nation’s natural and cultural heritage. The Department manages approximately 25 million acres of land that contain high quality, unique habitats, and provide food and shelter for more than 550 species at-risk and almost 450 federally listed threatened or endangered species. Of these species, 63 listed species and 74 species at-risk are only found on DoD lands. The Department also manages and maintains cultural resources at 340 DoD installations that contain more than 132,000 archaeological sites.

Table 10 summarizes natural and cultural resources funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$182.0	\$174.6	\$182.2	\$187.3	\$209.2	\$187.2	\$183.9
Navy	\$59.3	\$75.0	\$57.2	\$65.6	\$60.5	\$69.5	\$72.0
Air Force	\$58.7	\$80.0	\$53.4	\$88.4	\$53.4	\$51.7	\$47.0
Marine Corps	\$34.8	\$46.1	\$27.3	\$26.8	\$36.8	\$37.4	\$37.1
Defense-wide*	\$49.5	\$68.9	\$57.1	\$75.3	\$69.1	\$94.9	\$79.4
DoD Total⁺	\$384.3	\$444.6	\$377.2	\$443.4	\$429.0	\$4440.7	\$419.4

* Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

+ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

Overall Trend Analysis

Funding for natural and cultural resources activities increased overall between FY 2013 and FY 2014. This increase was primarily due to congressional funding additions to support conservation on ranges and address threatened and endangered species requirements. Beginning in FY 2016, the DoD Components were able to increase the amount of funding for natural and cultural resources activities above FY 2013 levels, despite BCA controls. The Department continued to meet legal requirements and fund any items with FY 2017 deadlines that it needed to maintain military readiness in the year of execution. For FY 2018, total appropriated funding remains relatively consistent with FY 2017 levels. The decrease in FY 2019 natural and cultural resources Defense-wide funding is a result of a congressional add in FY 2018 for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI).

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding increased by 11.7 percent as listed and at-risk species funding grew. Air Force funding decreased 39.6 percent in miscellaneous natural resources and miscellaneous cultural resources; Air Force diverted funds to different non-environmental programs. Marine Corps funding increased 37.3 percent due to increases in integrated natural resource planning as well as threatened and endangered species management.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Army funding decreased 10.5 percent due to reduced costs for threatened and endangered species management and to update and implement Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans. Navy funding increased by 14.9 percent because of project management needs and challenges associated with managing

agricultural lands. Defense-wide funding increased by 37.3 percent mostly due to increases in REPI Program funding.

- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, DoD does not anticipate significant changes in funding amounts, other than the decrease caused by the FY 2018 congressional add to the REPI Program.

Pollution Prevention

The Department created the Pollution Prevention Program to reduce or eliminate the use of hazardous materials, minimize waste generation, prevent natural resources losses, and reduce air emissions from industrial processes and pollutant discharges to wastewater treatment systems. DoD also implements energy, water, and fuel efficiency measures that, while not funded with environmental dollars, further reduce pollution and better use existing resources. Together, these pollution prevention investments have the potential to reduce costs throughout DoD. The flexible framework for this program not only helps DoD prioritize cost-effective initiatives, but also ensures safe, uninterrupted operations, and sustains military readiness.

Table 11 summarizes Pollution Prevention Program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Defense-wide accounts.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army	\$23.9	\$31.6	\$36.2	\$27.4	\$21.2	\$22.1	\$20.8
Navy	\$6.6	\$7.4	\$4.1	\$8.3	\$4.2	\$4.3	\$4.3
Air Force	\$15.2	\$30.1	\$21.0	\$23.0	\$18.2	\$17.6	\$19.7
Marine Corps	\$15.8	\$21.2	\$20.7	\$13.4	\$12.9	\$15.5	\$16.2
Defense-wide*	\$4.0	\$6.9	\$12.3	\$15.0	\$10.7	\$13.0	\$13.5
DoD Total⁺	\$65.5	\$97.2	\$94.3	\$87.1	\$67.2	\$72.5	\$74.5

* Defense-wide accounts include DLA and other defense agencies.

⁺ Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

Overall Trend Analysis

Overall funding for the Pollution Prevention Program increased from FY 2013 through FY 2015; the lower FY 2013 funding was driven mostly by reductions resulting from the BCA. Additionally, the DoD Components reduced pollution prevention funding to preserve funding for other programs in years when funding decreases because Pollution Prevention is not directly linked to legal requirements.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding decreased (-22.6 percent) mostly due to previous efforts to reduce hazardous material use. Navy funding decreased by 49.4 percent due to the completion of the military construction project at Indian Island, Washington. Air Force funding decreased 20.9 percent due to completion of some

hazardous material reduction efforts. Defense-wide funding also decreased 28.7 percent due to fewer pollution prevention projects to address clean air and hazardous waste issues.

- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, Marine Corps funding is anticipated to increase 20.2 percent due to increases in manpower costs, while Defense-wide funding is expected to increase 21.5 percent, mostly due to anticipated increases in DLA's manpower costs and hazardous waste minimization efforts.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, DoD requested that Air Force funding will increase 11.9 percent mainly due to a focus on hazardous material/waste reduction and pollution prevention activities.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

The Office of the Secretary of Defense oversees the Military Departments' and Defense-wide environmental technology programs, and manages the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP). The mission of the environmental technology programs is to address high-priority environmental challenges. The DoD Components' environmental technology investments focus on unique Military Service requirements and complement other Defense-wide investments. SERDP, ESTCP, and the DoD Components work together to coordinate and leverage these investments.

Table 12 summarizes environmental technology program funding from FY 2013 through FY 2019 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense-wide accounts.

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

	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Appropriated	FY 2019 Requested
Army*							
Army Total	\$45.5	\$47.5	\$44.9	\$54.7	\$60.3	\$55.6	\$29.5
DON†							
DON Total	\$39.8	\$37.3	\$28.8	\$35.5	\$33.4	\$36.5	\$36.3
Air Force							
Air Force Total	\$9.3	\$10.6	\$9.3	\$8.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Defense-wide**							
SERDP**	\$58.6	\$62.3	\$56.4	\$54.3	\$65.1	\$71.8	\$76.5
ESTCP**	\$38.0	\$39.8	\$39.4	\$31.3	\$27.2	\$32.2	\$24.0
Deployed Warfighter Protection Program	\$3.9	\$5.6	\$5.7	\$5.3	\$4.9	\$5.1	\$5.9
Defense-wide Total	\$100.5	\$107.7	\$101.4	\$90.9	\$89.3	\$109.1	\$106.4
DoD Total***	\$195.1	\$203.1	\$184.5	\$189.4	\$183.0	\$201.2	\$172.2

* The National Defense Center for Energy and Environment is included in the Army Program line.

† DON includes Navy and Marine Corps.

** Defense-wide accounts include other defense agencies.

†† SERDP/ESTCP values are for environmental projects only and do not include energy projects.

*** Due to rounding, account subtotals may not equal FY totals.

Overall Trend Analysis

The Department's funding for environmental technology decreased from FY 2013 to FY 2015 due to congressional funding reductions to meet the BCA. Funding increased between FY 2015 and FY 2016, but decreased in FY 2017 because DoD progressively captured environmental technology requirements in other funding lines such as material substitution, production processes, operation and maintenance, and weapons system acquisition program elements. The Department anticipates that funding will increase in FY 2018 due to additional investment in Defense-wide environmental technology initiatives, including research and product

development to address replacing AFFF containing PFOS and PFOA. For FY 2019, DoD funding will decrease 14.4 percent, due to rephrasing of ESTCP funds into FY 2020 and FY 2021 based on execution delays in the program.

Explanation of Significant Changes in Funding Amounts

- From FY 2016 to FY 2017, Army funding increased (10.2 percent). The Air Force did not request nor did it receive environmental technology funding in FY 2017. There was a decrease in funding (-12.9 percent) for ESTCP and an increase of 19.9 percent for SERDP as a result of reductions and increases in Congressional funding, respectively.
- From FY 2017 to FY 2018, DoD anticipates that SERDP funding will increase 13.6 percent and ESTCP funding will increase 51.9 percent as a return to prior levels of funding. The Defense-wide total will increase 22.2 percent due to investment in Defense-wide environmental technology initiatives.
- From FY 2018 to FY 2019, Army funding will decrease (-46.9 percent) as funds were reprioritized to support Army modernization initiatives. The Deployed Warfighter Protection Program funding will increase 15.7 percent. Additionally, DoD anticipates that SERDP funding will increase 6.5 percent and ESTCP funding will decrease 25.5 percent due to DoD rephrasing funds to FY 2020 and FY 2021.

Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals

Advances in environmental technology have allowed the Department to be more cost-efficient when spending resources for environmental cleanup and compliance. For example, DoD is developing and using groundwater cleanup technologies across the Department and throughout the private sector. DoD anticipates that it will achieve RC at 93 percent of IRP sites and MRSs at active installations and BRAC locations, and IRP sites at FUDS properties, by the end of FY 2021. Through its environmental technology programs, DoD is currently improving its fundamental understanding of these sites and developing new technologies to manage or remediate them.

Another example of the Department transitioning technologies to reduce costs and increase efficiencies happened in FY 2016. DoD transitioned SERDP- and ESTCP-sponsored research on advanced geophysical classification, a process for determining whether a buried metal object is likely a military munition or harmless debris, to the contractor community. DoD accredited seven private firms in FY 2017, for a total of nine firms through calendar year 2017, through the DoD Advanced Geophysical Classification Accreditation Program (DAGCAP). The DAGCAP ensures that private-sector practitioners can collect high-quality data, and correctly analyze the data in support of DoD cleanup projects. These environmental technology program efforts benefit both the environment and the military mission.

Looking ahead, environmental technology investments will focus on DoD's evolving needs. SERDP solicited research into the fate, transport, and remediation of PFOS and PFOA shortly after the EPA released the 2009 Provisional Health Advisories for these compounds. Follow-on research, beginning in 2014, targeted developing several approaches for treating groundwater containing PFOS and PFOA. In 2017, ESTCP began demonstrating these groundwater treatment options for PFOS and PFOA, with additional demonstrations to begin in

2018. Further, projects investigating new in-situ and ex-situ treatment methods for groundwater and soil will begin in 2018. SERDP will continue two projects initiated in 2017 aimed at developing fluorine-free fire-fighting foams to replace AFFF containing PFOS and PFOA, and will start five more projects in 2018. ESTCP has also requested proposals to demonstrate and validate more environmentally sustainable firefighting AFFFs in 2019.

The Department will continue to invest in current initiatives and focus on future initiatives, including developing and demonstrating technologies to address munitions in the underwater environment; identifying the science and tools needed to meet DoD's obligations to adapt to a changing environment; and researching technologies to manage and treat chemicals of emerging concern. The Department is also continuing the critical work of reducing future liability and life-cycle costs by eliminating toxic and hazardous materials from the production, operation, and maintenance processes.

V. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION ACTIVITIES

In accordance with Section 2916(b) of the NDAA for FY 2014, the Department maintains “decontamination” programs to remove UXO resulting from Defense-related activities on withdrawn or reserved lands. Below are updates on DoD’s “decontamination” activities during FY 2017 at ranges identified in the NDAA for FY 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana

The Army conducted range clearance activities on approximately 7 acres of withdrawn land at the Limestone Hills Training Area.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

The Army did not conduct decontamination activities on the 5,100 acres of withdrawn land at White Sands Missile Range. It will conduct decontamination activities in the future, as needed.

Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, California

The Marine Corps did not conduct any decontamination activities on the withdrawn lands at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range.

Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California

The Marine Corps did not conduct any decontamination activities on the withdrawn lands at Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms.

Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California

The Navy conducted ongoing decontamination activities on 5,000 acres of withdrawn land at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, including surface clearance, trash removal, destroying UXO, venting operations, soil stabilization, and grading target sites.

VI. FY 2017 FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES AND REASONS FOR INCREASES IN COST ESTIMATES SINCE FY 2016

The House Report (House Report 113-113) accompanying H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2014, requests that the Secretary of Defense provide information regarding funds invested in the DERP and the cost to complete cleanup at environmental restoration sites (hereinafter referred to as the “cost estimate”). Specifically, the report must:

1. Provide the amount of funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2016 to FY 2017; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2017 (detailed in Appendix A); and
2. Account for any increase of 10 percent or more in an installation’s or property’s projected cost estimate over the prior year estimate (detailed in Appendix B).

Appendix A lists the 562 DoD installations and 461 FUDS properties where DoD obligated funds for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017. It also compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2016 and FY 2017 to determine how much the Department reduced its liability at each location.² At 202 DoD installations and 237 FUDS properties, the cost estimates either decreased by the amount invested or decreased to zero, and therefore no explanation is needed. At the remaining 360 DoD installations and 224 FUDS properties, the cost estimates did not decrease by at least the amount invested for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017. Appendix A includes an explanation of why the liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested at each of these locations.³

Appendix B lists the 232 DoD installations and 189 FUDS properties where the FY 2017 cost estimates increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2016 estimates. It compares the cost estimates at the end of FY 2016 and FY 2017 to determine the dollar amount and percentage increases at each location.² Appendix B also includes the reason(s) the cost estimates increased between FY 2016 and FY 2017 at each location.⁴

² The FY 2016 cost estimates are adjusted for inflation and work completed in FY 2017 to compare the estimates more accurately.

³ If a location’s liability was not reduced by the amount of funding invested for environmental activities in FY 2017, but the cost estimate change was less than \$25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers \$25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.

⁴ If a location’s FY 2017 cost estimate increased by 10 percent or more over the FY 2016 estimate but the cost estimate change was less than \$25,000, DoD did not provide an explanation because it considers \$25,000 to be within the margin of error for that location.

FY 2017 DEP ARC

Appendix A

Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2017 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2016.

This Appendix provides the amount of funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property for environmental restoration activities in FY 2017; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2016 to FY 2017; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2017.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Army	1LT CHARLES L. WAPLES USARC	0	0	4	4	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	109,091	107,337	3,586	1,832	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.
New York	Army	AFRC ALBANY	59	0	19	(40)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	0	0	40	40	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	13,088	13,964	176	1,052	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	18,419	21,427	405	3,413	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	560	984	245	669	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).
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	1,442	1,420	89	67	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	0	197	8	205	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	43,227	16,727	709	(25,791)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	BLOSSOM POINT RESEARCH FACILITY	3,996	4,015	39	58	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,072	1,169	176	273	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	1,174	1,155	9	(10)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,236	1,150	15	(71)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	0	2,856	15	2,871	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	12,445	12,259	7,980	7,794	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	3,340	3,428	50	138	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	277	202	34	(41)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	2,544	2,594	88	138	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	35	317	62	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.
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,635	13,047	1,634	8,046	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX	0	480	1,474	1,954	New Site.
Nebraska	Army	CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	54,264	33,309	933	(20,022)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,211	7,496	1,801	1,086	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	9,734	10,049	564	879	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	45,597	48,666	2,076	5,145	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	610	334	84	(192)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	44,234	46,444	1,541	3,751	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	39,380	41,853	192	2,665	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	Army	FIRESTONE CSMS	145,549	148,824	6	3,281	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	23,762	23,337	228	(197)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	16,825	13,829	1,980	(1,016)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	40,771	28,124	953	(11,694)	No explanation required.
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	35,088	37,002	1,691	3,605	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	6,195	9,947	104	3,856	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.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,355	11,354	211	5,210	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	9,792	9,571	273	52	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	11,389	18,736	3,176	10,523	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.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,534	1,019	69	(446)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	6,609	5,921	1,074	386	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	4,308	5,585	2,173	3,450	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	29,926	30,276	1,043	1,393	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 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.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	5,566	5,861	187	482	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 GORDON	2,851	2,107	679	(65)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	1,921	1,516	130	(275)	No explanation required.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	2,079	1,908	120	(51)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	279	1,154	37	912	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	6,148	12,476	3,343	9,671	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.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	4,924	4,004	897	(23)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,188	2,086	395	1,293	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	438	403	1,297	1,262	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	26,701	26,544	209	52	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.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	9,740	9,656	2,010	1,926	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,035	4,551	119	3,635	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,400	1,410	154	164	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Montana	Army	FORT MISSOULA ARNG	5	0	35	30	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	15,577	13,682	104	(1,791)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	9,564	11,899	1,471	3,806	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	Army	FORT ORD	217,641	206,979	12,890	2,228	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Army	FORT PICKETT ARNG MTC	0	0	716	716	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	6,365	6,889	400	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 – 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,973	26,062	2,664	15,753	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).
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	3,231	3,285	66	120	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 RUCKER	10,105	11,697	321	1,913	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	3,491	2,186	348	(957)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	7,038	7,432	22	416	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 STEWART	11,823	9,540	867	(1,416)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	58,795	40,815	7,248	(10,732)	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	10	7,059	9	7,058	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	66,019	75,685	7,511	17,177	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,867	1,857	492	482	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	91,558	29,537	1,315	(60,706)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	10,415	12,502	81	2,168	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	9,235	3,417	154	(5,664)	No explanation required.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	46,742	64,146	1,161	18,565	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	3,669	14,275	1,572	12,178	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	14	3,293	3	3,282	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	1,342	1,190	32	(120)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	3,359	3,361	6,720	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	0	6	94	100	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	0	3	94	97	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	19,092	9	61	(19,022)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Army	JFHQ ND ARNG	0	271	138	409	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nebraska	Army	JFHQ NE ARNG	0	0	53	53	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	0	0	188	188	No explanation required.
New York	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	0	49	188	237	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	124	68	68	12	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Army	JFHQ RQ ARNG	0	0	265	265	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	Army	JFHQ UT ARNG	0	0	94	94	No explanation required.
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	93	1,402	49	1,358	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	0	6	159	165	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	44,714	58,050	1,826	15,162	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	2	0	15	13	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	21,115	24,582	1,285	4,752	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	10,382	1,085	1,528	(7,769)	No explanation required.
Idaho	Army	KIMAMA TS RUPERT	275	0	15	(260)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE SITE	0	524	122	646	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	KUNIA FIELD STATION	633	546	46	(41)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	111,288	109,637	1,654	3	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	5,849	4,354	323	(1,172)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	1,608	113	246	(1,249)	No explanation required.
California	Army	LOMPOC BRANCH DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS	1,050	1,039	1	(10)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	54,455	47,995	3,219	(3,241)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,387	2,449	475	537	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	760	641	3,539	3,420	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.
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	6,025	4,553	132	(1,340)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	31,972	31,891	1,174	1,093	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	34,180	35,013	1,244	2,077	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,507	2,638	19	150	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	3,479	239	3,718	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,623	7,261	301	3,939	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	287	296	117	126	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2,811	2,901	30	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).
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,915	7,816	770	5,671	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	13,750	14,327	1,015	1,592	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	15,660	2,406	203	(13,051)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	1,363	620	401	(342)	No explanation required.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	285	6,620	90	6,425	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	1,115	1,046	58	(11)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	24,015	77,935	601	54,521	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	30,684	30,145	3,104	2,565	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	98,546	101,292	5	2,751	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,501	1,450	744	693	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	208,340	201,132	30,532	23,324	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) 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.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	13,786	13,728	205	147	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	18,149	21,401	4,636	7,888	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.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	31,030	28,465	902	(1,663)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	876,557	572,961	16,384	(287,212)	No explanation required.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	7,572	19,869	88	12,385	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	8,531	7,215	407	(909)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	204,494	207,378	8,650	11,534	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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,256	2,251	279	274	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	62,002	46,360	5,747	(9,895)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	18,414	30,323	550	12,459	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.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	5,491	4,141	191	(1,159)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	30,230	23,996	726	(5,508)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	18,831	7,204	270	(11,357)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,054	4,386	53	3,385	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.
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	985	1,209	15	239	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	36,637	30,312	6,375	50	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	TARHEEL ARMY MISSILE PLANT	1,067	98	49	(920)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,539	15,888	108	11,457	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	35,043	48,258	3,327	16,542	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.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	2,354	64,769	2,636	65,051	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	Army	TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	1,077	774	272	(31)	No explanation required.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	13,898	9,382	1,248	(3,268)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	42,019	29,700	915	(11,404)	No explanation required.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	40,718	37,440	2,166	(1,112)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	142	4,253	146	4,257	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).
New Jersey	Army	USARC LODI	48	0	23	(25)	No explanation required.
New York	Army	USARC NIAGARA FALLS (AMSA 5)	163	109	19	(35)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC (SOUTH)	0	0	14	14	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,535	1,062	56	(417)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	Army	VOLKSTONE	0	0	2	2	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	VOLUNTEER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	20,360	19,471	574	(315)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIAWA GULCH	445	0	18	(427)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAUWA AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	1,803	756	74	(973)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	3,662	3,928	96	362	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	1,941	1,959	40	58	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	58,488	52,877	814	(4,797)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	2,273	1,068	209	(996)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	3,629	3,407	175	(47)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	2,222	2,235	28	41	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.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	11,092	9,389	2,095	392	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	78,801	100,986	4,559	26,744	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	5,482	6,045	319	882	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	46,071	58,566	15,275	27,770	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 – 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.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,939	12,670	1,790	1,521	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	38,651	37,323	2,451	1,123	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).
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	43,478	45,631	626	2,779	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
District of Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	2,672	3,913	271	1,512	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.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	17,915	18,196	1,286	1,567	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	617	672	305	360	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	79,171	99,648	2,759	23,236	New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	7,785	6,985	1,013	213	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 – Actual 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	116	2,044	129	2,057	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	51,601	49,246	8,761	6,406	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).
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	33,051	30,564	3,286	799	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	15,114	19,628	989	5,503	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).
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	351,761	341,857	12,588	2,684	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	BRIDGEPORT MCMWTC	17,609	17,736	161	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	30,636	30,656	869	889	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
New York	Navy	CALVERTON NWIRP	19,172	13,223	3,987	(1,962)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	158,797	136,344	13,845	(8,608)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	61,912	49,583	15,481	3,152	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,612	10,872	743	3	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	2,703	2,305	226	(172)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	4,991	4,917	304	230	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	77,040	75,590	5,166	3,716	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.
Maryland	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,592	4,042	419	1,869	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	CHESAPEAKE NSGA N WEST	120	120	118	118	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CHINA LAKE NAWS	108,245	108,145	2,857	2,757	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) 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.
Arizona	Navy	CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AGR	9,804	9,147	2,053	1,396	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	41,133	40,761	792	420	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.
California	Navy	CONCORD NWS	60,736	60,578	2,940	2,782	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.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	5,097	4,856	439	198	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	20,751	30,202	2,056	11,507	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.
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	38,260	33,525	2,850	(1,885)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	5,676	5,889	315	528	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	3,434	2,908	290	(236)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	20,897	14,757	509	(5,631)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	20,411	20,459	1,320	1,368	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	17,951	17,497	598	144	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NWIRP	2,229	2,435	99	305	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	32,703	27,866	1,078	(3,759)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	DIXON NRTF	1,417	860	256	(301)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DRIVER NAVRADSTA	535	464	46	(25)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	23,661	25,212	510	2,061	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.
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	46,623	52,118	1,511	7,006	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	23,269	22,940	1,209	880	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	27,558	29,804	1,305	3,551	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.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	32,131	37,292	1,400	6,561	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	7,578	8,235	1,270	1,927	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) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site. 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.
Illinois	Navy	GREAT LAKES NTC	178,876	171,201	5,109	(2,566)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	154	161	2	9	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	57,785	70,694	1,897	14,806	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	154	161	2	9	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,456	1,472	30	46	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	GUAMI COMNAV MARIANAS	2,352	3,606	326	1,580	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	19,027	19,223	3,990	4,186	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	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,907	13,487	1,895	1,475	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	183,485	173,647	6,518	(3,320)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	37,967	36,256	1,933	222	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	10,168	11,446	1,770	3,048	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	78,909	78,407	738	236	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.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	20,338	17,387	1,928	(1,023)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	4,165	3,240	102	(823)	No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	3,373	2,976	11	(386)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	25,925	25,850	1,620	1,545	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	304,448	311,799	744	8,095	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	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	2,301	1,249	1,033	(19)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	11,312	10,566	183	(563)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	693	942	93	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).
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	1,831	2,546	84	799	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	67,574	66,040	3,061	1,527	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	64,241	65,413	8,954	10,126	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	14,557	19,636	404	5,483	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	3,489	3,106	323	(60)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	16,918	17,801	286	1,169	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,867	8,755	1,962	3,850	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) New Site.
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	583	584	400	401	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	46,106	41,716	816	(3,574)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	50,004	26,609	1,287	(22,108)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	46,942	39,979	7,816	853	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	19,657	17,945	2,050	338	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	116	764	11	659	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	66,945	60,209	8,218	1,482	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	19,476	27,799	938	9,261	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	10,010	11,991	517	2,498	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	79,375	80,596	11,964	13,185	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 – Actual 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	716	667	25	(24)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	44,994	45,026	2,849	2,881	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	77,731	89,113	2,654	14,036	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) New Site. 6) 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	ORLANDO NTC	15,321	15,786	987	1,452	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).
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,588	16,864	737	13,013	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	76,155	81,170	458	5,473	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	34,205	34,733	2,295	2,823	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	17,060	15,115	2,247	302	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NS	129,914	118,243	6,126	(5,545)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	333	320	550	537	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	6,179	6,580	917	1,318	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	42,708	41,958	296	(454)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	62,421	56,955	5,674	208	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	6,139	4,500	867	(772)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	1,294	1,049	23	(222)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	335	213	97	(25)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	29,778	31,507	3,081	4,810	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	16,880	14,503	2,785	408	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	2,977	3,330	81	434	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	PORT HUENEME NCBC	9,741	8,959	617	(165)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,439	4,856	1,527	944	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,399	3,352	28	(19)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	1,455	1,953	31	529	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).
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP BREMERTON	1,646	3,024	93	1,471	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NS	20,754	19,374	46	(1,334)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NSY	98,803	97,932	3,328	2,457	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	108,268	105,871	7,540	5,143	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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Puerto Rico	Navy	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	18,906	11,863	148	(6,895)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,268	1,990	218	940	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	6,618	6,894	616	892	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,503	2,783	1,536	2,816	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NS	314,106	314,862	1,179	1,935	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.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	2,527	1,344	1,530	347	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	8,282	8,112	341	171	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	SEAL BEACH NWS	40,946	39,434	1,062	(450)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	42,129	45,776	1,655	5,302	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	8,967	9,042	697	772	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	TREASURE ISLAND NS	26,204	27,995	16,815	18,606	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	222,331	196,857	49,281	23,807	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,092	22,110	1,280	3,298	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	17,296	17,385	508	597	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	23,179	20,885	226	(2,068)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	249,707	250,826	15,563	16,682	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,873	7,419	200	1,746	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).
Hawaii	Navy	WAHIAWA NCTAMS EASTPAC	6,877	5,699	924	(254)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	43,055	46,361	2,356	5,662	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	245	214	49	18	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	25,471	22,140	836	(2,495)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	71,307	78,981	12,422	20,096	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	3,303	2,909	155	(239)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	20,906	21,626	1,376	2,096	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	40,759	35,357	5,186	(216)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,143	57,753	12,078	19,688	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	16,602	26,562	869	10,829	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	YORKTOWN NWS	53,347	52,442	1,072	167	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Navy	YUMA MCAS	31,107	26,463	3,875	(769)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	ABRAHAM LINCOLN CAPITAL AP	2,979	3,011	184	216	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	36,065	40,959	2,803	7,697	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).
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,160	3,184	105	129	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	35,379	30,855	1,052	(3,472)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	50,186	47,859	3,433	1,106	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	891	888	710	707	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	126,543	131,534	2,880	7,871	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.
Ohio	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	11,971	12,984	142	1,155	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	22,078	20,220	574	(1,284)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT	3,989	4,028	311	350	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	71,755	72,161	937	1,343	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.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	83,973	112,631	3,750	32,408	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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	6,677	7,253	149	725	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.
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	10,850	8,635	1,230	(985)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	4,130	4,699	187	756	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	44,122	42,297	1,063	(762)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	107	336	8	237	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	19,463	9,690	7,958	(1,815)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	BEALE	358,757	206,446	9,807	(142,504)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,008	1,101	9	102	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	8,892	9,092	57	257	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	23,860	25,525	116	1,781	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	2,229	2,207	20	(2)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	11,902	12,401	298	797	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	1,940	4,125	39	2,224	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	6,407	8,190	155	1,938	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	494	565	12	83	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Connecticut	Air Force	BRADLEY IAP (EAST GRANBY)	7,206	4,078	70	(3,058)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	9,131	7,281	338	(1,512)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	51,277	58,964	4,269	11,956	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.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	231	1,998	443	2,210	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	862	10,496	69	9,703	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	10,535	21,587	629	11,681	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).
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	473	5,800	175	5,502	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	Air Force	CAMP BEAUREGARD	11	0	15	4	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	741	2,049	93	1,401	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	1,068	1,812	30	774	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	CAMP PENDLETON MIL RESERVATION	0	0	1,252	1,252	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	14,750	21,316	178	6,744	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	31,551	38,384	2,111	8,944	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	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	258,531	214,017	3,810	(40,704)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	6,017	3,748	130	(2,139)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	12,903	10,607	215	(2,081)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	14,639	33,420	539	19,320	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).
Texas	Air Force	CARSWELL	4,442	4,474	52	84	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Air Force	CASTLE	71,890	63,572	1,327	(6,991)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,101	1,162	348	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).
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	22,448	22,645	1,444	1,641	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) 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.
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	16,376	21,190	102	4,916	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CHEENA RIVER	340	339	9	8	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	6,238	5,643	38	(557)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	7,424	9,375	351	2,302	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	2,743	3,608	62	927	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	9,565	9,192	691	318	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	Air Force	COOS HEAD AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION	92	15	46	(31)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	COSTA MESA AIR GUARD STATION	4,183	2,582	62	(1,539)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,386	2,448	45	107	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	7,761	11,455	418	4,112	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.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	8,643	8,558	160	75	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	246	947	76	777	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	130,446	107,503	2,639	(20,304)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	8,052	9,666	392	2,006	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,967	11,089	258	6,380	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	8,236	2,168	6,606	538	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	11,537	11,200	154	(183)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,433	7,355	113	1,035	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	EARECKSON AIR FORCE BASE	100,241	96,687	1,257	(2,297)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	618,241	585,963	18,545	(13,733)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	44,021	42,640	1,681	300	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 5) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 6) New Site. 7) 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	416,287	614,589	17,765	216,067	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	ELLINGTON	0	0	672	672	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	31,729	33,171	1,996	3,438	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	Air Force	ENGLAND	15,222	15,911	340	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) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	68,814	84,472	3,765	19,423	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Kansas	Air Force	FORBES	7,279	3,172	101	(4,006)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	158	200	5	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).
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	105,639	57,196	303	(48,140)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	FRANCIS S. GABRESKI (WEST HAMPTON)	1,128	733	176	(219)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	682	1,101	108	527	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	228,800	258,341	1,324	30,865	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	9,947	12,317	296	2,666	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.
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	4,993	6,369	113	1,489	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	GEORGE	66,137	66,935	3,997	4,795	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.
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,794	3,078	4,043	5,327	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	8,540	9,048	122	630	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	6,865	6,856	326	317	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.
Alaska	Air Force	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	6,590	7,020	81	511	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	20,588	9,629	276	(10,683)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT	4,068	1,942	15	(2,111)	No explanation required.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	24,358	13,469	374	(10,515)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	157	659	69	571	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	3,607	3,821	131	345	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	Air Force	HAMMOND COMM STATION	15	12	24	21	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	2,092	3,051	240	1,199	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	25,693	35,429	2,229	11,965	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	HARRISBURG	1,559	654	31	(874)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	HAYWARD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	614	146	146	(322)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	3,676	6,482	38	2,844	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Utah	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	308,723	295,350	15,991	2,618	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	36,489	32,844	9,100	5,455	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.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	27,201	38,067	1,924	12,790	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.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	6,257	9,088	124	2,955	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.
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,092	10,962	1,404	1,274	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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	26,668	23,240	385	(3,043)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	293	2,461	132	2,300	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	10,112	15,988	332	6,208	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	124,945	135,952	3,362	14,369	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.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	143,756	102,408	10,232	(31,116)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	47,504	45,081	2,701	278	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.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	53,936	49,367	2,562	(2,007)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	187,515	256,419	5,073	73,977	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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	42,390	67,345	4,366	29,321	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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	21,554	22,422	1,130	1,998	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	18,836	16,418	415	(2,003)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	28,095	28,438	3,300	3,643	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	58,440	40,673	7,502	(10,265)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	218,496	144,104	11,870	(62,522)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	3,834	5,282	335	1,783	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	3,411	4,977	89	1,655	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	43,687	44,624	827	1,764	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	JBSA-RANDOLPH	6,029	10,346	124	4,441	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	5,118	5,992	62	936	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	897	917	15	35	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,258	13,879	280	4,901	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	6,095	9,095	278	3,278	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	3,448	2,112	18	(1,318)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	4,988	6,453	270	1,735	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	79,159	101,469	871	23,181	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.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEY FIELD	2,320	1,722	100	(498)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	84,781	57,122	1,790	(25,869)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	55,337	49,545	3,989	(1,803)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	110,233	137,306	7,794	34,867	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oregon	Air Force	KLAMATH FALLS IAP (KINGSLEY FIELD)	4,265	3,732	161	(372)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	7,676	7,889	111	324	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	6,522	6,334	278	90	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	17,548	20,027	217	2,696	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	35,892	27,585	320	(7,987)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	Air Force	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	7,756	5,400	138	(2,218)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	26,330	26,006	535	211	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	32,742	18,540	365	(13,837)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	Air Force	LOUISVILLE IAP	6,524	5,284	31	(1,209)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	8,115	6,531	116	(1,468)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	LUIS MUNOZ MARIN	4,928	2,735	317	(1,876)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	25,002	24,712	467	177	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	86,552	77,953	1,600	(6,999)	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	631	3,887	210	3,466	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	25,077	31,815	1,851	8,589	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.
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	993	2,124	154	1,285	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	MARCH	166,740	123,296	8,425	(35,019)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	2,853	5,353	93	2,593	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	MATHER	105,464	120,988	3,411	18,935	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	Air Force	MAXWELL	32,182	30,578	902	(702)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MCCLELLAN	99,761	88,426	10,032	(1,303)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	62,293	42,263	8,697	(11,333)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	669	727	163	221	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
South Carolina	Air Force	MCENTIRE AIR GUARD BASE	3,430	2,665	16	(749)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Air Force	MCGHEE/TYSON	7,342	7,415	110	183	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	652	1,520	32	900	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,134	2,182	28	76	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MAP/IAP ANG	2,629	2,707	139	217	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	16,345	15,097	795	(453)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANG S	3,303	5,632	124	2,453	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	14,312	12,499	3,941	2,128	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.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	5,071	44,101	2,029	41,059	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 – Actual 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	2,965	5,257	974	3,266	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	11,482	12,127	311	956	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	991	1,129	11	149	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	12,091	13,380	162	1,451	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Air Force	NASHVILLE METRO	2,695	1,416	62	(1,217)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	19,166	18,622	598	54	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	5,069	7,115	275	2,321	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	6,010	6,788	423	1,201	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,060	5,736	108	784	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	9,611	9,123	625	137	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS IAP (ANG)	18	8	15	5	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	14,844	15,842	425	1,423	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	6,019	8,819	1,813	4,613	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	NORTON	8,965	10,371	382	1,788	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	36,104	38,364	577	2,838	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.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	5,846	6,215	108	477	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	OLIKTOK RADIO RELAY STATION	15,736	10,702	2,250	(2,784)	No explanation required.
Connecticut	Air Force	ORANGE AIR GUARD STATION	208	22	122	(64)	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	PAINE FIELD	1,753	1,274	436	(43)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	49,326	46,939	1,220	(1,167)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	97,384	113,475	26,042	42,133	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	3,540	4,889	99	1,448	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	14	36	36	58	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	90,112	48,662	1,297	(40,153)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	3,310	3,630	30	350	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	11,743	2,329	8,057	(1,357)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	14,242	4,037	18	(10,187)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LONELY DOME	40	0	43	3	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	15,278	33,816	6,032	24,570	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	1,975	6,512	40	4,577	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA BORINQUEN RADAR SITE	213	56	31	(126)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Air Force	PUNTA SALINAS AIR GUARD STATION	215	59	31	(125)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	1,531	2,200	62	731	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	REESE	21,266	22,452	718	1,904	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	Air Force	RENO TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	5,780	4,493	116	(1,171)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	1,992	2,871	166	1,045	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	1,905	3,750	663	2,508	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	1,842	1,714	119	(9)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER IAP	171	54	61	(56)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	67,543	86,203	1,065	19,725	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	33,991	44,609	1,551	12,169	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 – Actual 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	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	319	1,225	78	984	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	3,458	3,462	52	56	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Air Force	SALT LAKE CITY	308	186	114	(8)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	1,172	754	228	(190)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH CRTS	1,841	1,440	62	(339)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	1,953	1,504	38	(411)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,129	1,907	131	909	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	79,770	71,001	2,433	(6,336)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	21,130	24,949	1,204	5,023	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	SEPULVEDA AIR GUARD STATION	10	0	16	6	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	13,835	14,281	576	1,022	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	75,363	72,050	4,284	971	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	7,597	8,478	81	962	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	5	4	8	7	No explanation required.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	541	620	92	171	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	3,961	4,257	90	386	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,358	2,864	255	761	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	3,955	2,751	54	(1,150)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	Air Force	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	2,623	2,870	9	256	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	18,045	14,251	356	(3,438)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,569	19,303	116	14,850	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).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	56,500	66,542	1,728	11,770	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 – 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.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	124,707	95,472	4,857	(24,378)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,766	3,416	304	954	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	11,776	162	9,042	(2,572)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	578	629	31	82	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	192,344	191,857	13,388	12,901	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	11,834	10,788	97	(949)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	8,256	9,339	1,799	2,882	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site. 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	VANDENBERG	272,745	223,320	29,879	(19,546)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	7,170	9,618	106	2,554	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	WAINWRIGHT	87	0	43	(44)	No explanation required.
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	4,952	5,648	380	1,076	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	WEST NOME TANK FARM	19,398	11,270	150	(7,978)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,900	2,543	284	(73)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	6,075	5,313	1,394	632	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	WILL ROGERS WORLD	6,179	5,270	62	(847)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	WILLIAMS	21,520	19,424	878	(1,218)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	5,716	3,967	124	(1,625)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	5,485	40,434	7,971	42,920	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.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	124,053	120,277	1,635	(2,141)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	104,563	133,923	8,617	37,977	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) 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	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	802	1,848	93	1,139	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,619	1,849	2,125	2,355	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	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	9,881	11,236	1,268	2,623	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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.	5,523	5,479	69	25	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,620	3,217	84	(319)	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	1,951	1,911	70	30	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	DLA	DSC COLUMBUS	1,541	760	25	(756)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	44,156	43,974	2,492	2,310	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	44,413	43,010	2,192	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	FUDS	AF GAT	6,775	9,776	338	3,339	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	AF PLANT NO 74	98	0	57	(41)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	4,232	5,144	2,196	3,108	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AFPLT NO 18	965	0	40	(925)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	42	64	20	42	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	50	41	29	20	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	802	221	39	(542)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	952	106	30	(816)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	11,138	10,367	135	(636)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	AMARILLO AIR FORCE BASE	3,911	3,075	5	(831)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMCHITKA AF AUXILIARY FIELD	80,005	75,722	1,209	(3,074)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	40	231	2	193	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	654	1,260	70	676	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	5,491	2,641	191	(2,659)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	24,371	14,395	113	(9,863)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	27,875	35,250	382	7,757	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	99	92	25	18	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	2,997	3,638	38	679	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	ATLAS AF FAC S-8	1,106	1,150	15	59	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,239	655	49	(535)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	10,402	10,668	38	304	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	196,981	180,123	1,956	(14,902)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	2,317	26	50	(2,241)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AVON PARK ARMY AIRFIELD	2,680	1,946	220	(514)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	BANGOR GAP FIL AX	63	20	1	(42)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	156	199	677	720	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	661	2,448	262	2,049	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	42	97	41	96	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	420	573	38	191	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	2,133	3,479	51	1,397	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	876	10,808	853	10,785	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	3,394	3,674	38	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).
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,481	3,828	47	2,394	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	9,596	12,226	83	2,713	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	250,584	231,780	4,177	(14,627)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	4,325	3,550	42	(733)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	BLUEBONNET ORD PLANT	53	0	19	(34)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	24,789	30,363	103	5,677	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	9,806	13,194	20	3,408	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	2,480	4,155	49	1,724	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	11,962	12,246	1,104	1,388	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).
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	19,245	20,477	47	1,279	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).
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	8,029	7,554	535	60	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BROOKSVILLE TURRET GUNNERY RANGE	587	878	7	298	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	BROWNWOOD AAF	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	21,885	6,984	775	(14,126)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	719	737	20	38	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,624	1,467	149	(8)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,432	2,075	40	683	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	20,570	23,635	749	3,814	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.
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	245	150	21	(74)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	164	165	30	31	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.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	6,895	5,742	1,367	214	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	28,330	14,650	172	(13,508)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BARKELEY (FORT BARKLEY)	16,258	15,284	1	(973)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	161,617	170,010	1,024	9,417	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	73,924	87,363	1,978	15,417	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	15,180	17,370	4,740	6,930	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	15,128	19,467	505	4,844	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	128	176	135	183	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP CLAIBORNE	27,302	27,652	285	635	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP CLAYBANK AAA FIRING RANGE	9,307	6,140	1	(3,166)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	27,536	31,376	100	3,940	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	6,984	16,624	3,949	13,589	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) New Site.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	32,329	18,186	670	(13,473)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP GRANT RIFLE RANGE	1,811	2,646	4	839	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	24,138	2,457	26	(21,655)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	202	32	125	(45)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	89,982	112,485	3,001	25,504	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	87,676	95,141	128	7,593	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.
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	660	1,849	245	1,434	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	24,144	25,014	370	1,240	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP LOCKETT	12,383	11,871	84	(428)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	63	1,102	1	1,040	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 MAXEY	41,572	40,672	52	(848)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	4,562	2,503	83	(1,976)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	92,525	124,737	238	32,450	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.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	18,668	21,035	62	2,429	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUVER AREA	14,255	16,869	135	2,749	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	7,523	4,367	424	(2,732)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	37,507	107,727	25	70,245	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	6,959	6,220	58	(681)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	554	454	15	(85)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,989	16,906	434	2,351	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) New Site.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGUE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	1,438	1,966	3,758	4,286	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE PROMINENCE AWS	2,149	2,025	136	12	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	3,045	2,817	77	(151)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKAK RADIO STA	15,303	13,338	181	(1,784)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	7,935	148	1	(7,786)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CARMI AIR FORCE STATION	102	45	26	(31)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	CASPER AFB	3,321	2,028	27	(1,266)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	380	319	58	(3)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	570	1,383	17	830	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	7,696	6,256	42	(1,398)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	10,742	20,578	2	9,838	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,982	3,812	276	106	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	27,562	35,517	944	8,899	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	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	509	277	532	301	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	FUDS	CHOPAWAMSIC TROOP TRAINING SITE	27,182	19,517	151	(7,514)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	7	101	8	102	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	FUDS	CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE	1,518	1,275	1	(242)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,231	9,962	209	2,940	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	45,546	41,720	153	(3,673)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	214	88	91	(35)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR STATION	298	2,926	2	2,630	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	152	112	71	31	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	12,692	15,121	34	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	578	1,133	4	559	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	844	1,201	39	396	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	12,564	209,433	163	197,032	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	23,312	8,851	82	(14,379)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	13,447	36,324	3,126	26,003	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	CP KILMER	54	38	106	90	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	30,124	52,806	57	22,739	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	1,668	2,027	92	451	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	267	711	26	470	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	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,193	1,680	44	531	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CULEBRA PUERTO RICO	107,657	105,153	10,704	8,200	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,052	3,336	37	321	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	97,687	112,525	89	14,927	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	79	1,309	27	1,257	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).
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	357	1,563	96	1,302	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Mexico	FUDS	DEMING AAF PBR #24	1,475	63	23	(1,389)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	8,559	8,950	51	442	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DONALDSON AFB	16,251	9,046	550	(6,655)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	9,451	8,026	165	(1,260)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	160	2,133	47	2,020	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	7,256	9,638	334	2,716	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	1,074	711	82	(281)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	599	510	50	(39)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,995	5,261	1,145	411	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	173	54	44	(75)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ELMIRA SUB DEPOT	191	13	47	(131)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ENGINEER SCH	121	17	86	(18)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	341	324	7	(10)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	680	609	46	(25)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	290	313	60	83	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	21,145	24,304	1,194	4,353	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	290	2,048	1,897	3,655	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	2,516	393	2,273	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).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 13	834	313	254	(267)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	57,370	70,450	34	13,114	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	64,881	53,646	3,709	(7,526)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	164,081	136,721	8,121	(19,239)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	294	313	55	74	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	19,481	15,036	154	(4,291)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	3,288	1,341	14	(1,933)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	827	1,199	19	391	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	FUDS	FLOYD BENNETT FLD	178	0	218	40	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	9,877	10,276	480	879	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,776	7,191	69	1,484	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	5,767	1,169	287	(4,311)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-04	74	0	49	(25)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,501	1,647	73	219	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,805	1,561	63	(181)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	930	670	42	(218)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,197	1,231	107	141	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	668	521	32	(115)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORMER CAMP FANNIN	62,434	41,691	10,986	(9,757)	No explanation required.
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	813	142	34	(637)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	FORT A.P. HILL	0	0	29	29	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,762	4,160	107	1,505	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,048	33,520	18	32,490	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	20,313	14,591	2,891	(2,831)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	3,641	1,217	25	(2,399)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	FORT DOUGLAS	10,455	12,095	26	1,666	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	6,047	1,732	56	(4,259)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT GLENN	343,078	285,113	1,699	(56,266)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	FORT GORGES	106	6	55	(45)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	41	36	40	35	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	19,841	13,622	632	(5,587)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	11,858	16,457	185	4,784	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.
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	3,942	5,334	1,172	2,564	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).
California	FUDS	FORT MASON	41	0	36	(5)	No explanation required.
Nevada	FUDS	FORT MCDERMITT	42	5	24	(13)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	4,687	8,175	55	3,543	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Delaware	FUDS	FORT MILES MILITARY RESERVATION	18,581	17,626	8	(947)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	20,188	24,085	39	3,936	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	17,423	14,347	4,150	1,074	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	FORT SLOCUM	3,474	25,210	1	21,737	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 TAYLOR	14,193	13,413	2,924	2,144	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Texas	FUDS	FORT WORTH ARMY DEPOT	0	0	8	8	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,689	2,174	239	(2,276)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	7,180	1,329	1,434	(4,417)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	FT BROOKE	12,999	11,093	28	(1,878)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	6,217	6,540	16	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	9,219	10,716	39	1,536	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	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	17,320	26,496	118	9,294	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,929	7,054	844	1,969	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	87	201	38	152	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	GOFFS CAMPSITE	3,835	2,832	114	(889)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	351	395	115	159	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.
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	82	62	21	1	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,822	1,757	886	821	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).
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	49	25	4	(20)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GRAND RAPIDS NGTR	268	6	8	(254)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNR Y R	7,077	8,011	18	952	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	111,516	101,831	15	(9,670)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	8,485	4,680	326	(3,479)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	GUNTER AIR FORCE STATION	190	0	6	(184)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	2,264	1,814	71	(379)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	13,746	12,716	3,207	2,177	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.
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	5,366	3,163	604	(1,599)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	110	270	15	175	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	1,912	3,913	123	2,124	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	553	446	67	(40)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	HAYWARD ARMY AIRFIELD	408	134	87	(187)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	36,272	31,007	255	(5,010)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	HENDRICKS AAF	301	61	45	(195)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	571	939	49	417	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	17,301	14,189	296	(2,816)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	13,156	16,260	26	3,130	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	33	75	2	44	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	2,299	1,284	352	(663)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,429	3,432	113	116	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	9,361	4,142	256	(4,963)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	161	111	75	25	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	IONA ISLAND NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	14,834	15,628	194	988	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	771	650	68	(53)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	839	358	8	(473)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	1,467	1,312	29	(126)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	13,041	14,880	282	2,121	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	4,067	1,523	4,057	1,513	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	FUDS	KINGSBURY ORDNANCE PLANT	18,314	159	3	(18,152)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIELD	21	0	7	(14)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE ANNEX	7,159	3,695	1	(3,463)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	6,831	6,608	157	(66)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	1,276	530	92	(654)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3	9,211	11,958	213	2,960	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	12,821	11,762	30	(1,029)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	57,348	53,542	1,641	(2,165)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	6,970	1,500	168	(5,302)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	LAKE CHABOT MACHINE GUN RANGE	15	0	20	5	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	10,051	12,510	1,142	3,601	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	LAKELAND AAF	265	77	28	(160)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	4,909	4,840	67	(2)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LEE FIELD	7,840	2,759	353	(4,728)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	115	155	28	68	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	3,125	5,842	460	3,177	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	23,759	31,364	53	7,658	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	13,226	12,526	37	(663)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	6,125	8,646	186	2,707	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,210	831	96	(2,283)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	3,968	1,929	65	(1,974)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	78	352	2	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	35,113	35,329	1,202	1,418	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	LOCKPORT AFS	7,221	3,712	730	(2,779)	
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	53	145	11	103	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	4,443	6,618	217	2,392	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	53	17	19	(17)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	143	67	99	23	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	912	68	664	(180)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	4,048	5,136	80	1,168	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	85	62	353	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	5,540	4,471	219	(850)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE	8,566	5,150	56	(3,360)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	4,585	5,038	178	631	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,526	6,647	358	479	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	284	160	47	(77)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	2,903	4,949	142	2,188	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	654	474	19	(161)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,574	46,644	213	42,283	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	17,062	6,430	1,233	(9,399)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	MCCOY AFB	3,844	202	172	(3,470)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	315	154	390	229	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	88	154	352	418	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	46,550	62,786	142	16,378	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AF STATION	0	160	424	584	New Site.
New York	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AUX FLD #1	191	0	3	(188)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	MOORE AIRFORCE BASE (USDA SITE	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	12	12	1	1	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	0	2,791	4,695	7,486	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) New Site.
California	FUDS	MOUNT CAMPBELL RIFLE RANGE	32	15	17	0	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	2,244	309	929	(1,006)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	708	366	15	(327)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	1,446	316	3,100	1,970	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	807	443	348	(16)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	3,155	1,808	44	(1,303)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,695	34,188	119	18,612	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	10,774	4,359	134	(6,281)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	34,734	28,373	771	(5,590)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	399	295	20	(84)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET MEM ARPT	139	0	34	(105)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,623	2,469	40	886	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	5,967	5,344	141	(482)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	360	167	326	133	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	10,277	7,251	388	(2,638)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAV SHIPBLDG CORP	0	0	2	2	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	97	415	48	366	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	7,690	10,146	214	2,670	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	6,953	8,094	135	1,276	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	5,072	4,073	131	(868)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	5,741	2,386	1,635	(1,720)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	1,236	482	1,190	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION WATSONVILLE	285	0	9	(276)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	1,010	1,075	270	335	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	5,625	5,416	62	(147)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	243,847	253,419	4,282	13,854	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,321	2,730	53	1,462	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).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NEW CUMBERLAND ARMY DEPOT	787	719	77	9	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	88	19	31	(38)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NEW YORK ORDNANCE WORKS	16,101	11,763	82	(4,256)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	1,370	969	48	(353)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-03 (PHOENIX)	0	0	41	41	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	2,093	125	75	(1,893)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	2,129	147	630	(1,352)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	2,603	3,254	69	720	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,484	5,691	50	1,257	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).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,270	2,458	120	308	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	156	364	82	290	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,039	3,176	56	193	New Site.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	1,964	1,298	247	(419)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	0	139	8	147	New Site.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-86 - WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	20	0	10	(10)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	219	27	50	(142)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	53	44	174	165	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE NF 03	159	0	5	(154)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NIKE NY 09	190	0	4	(186)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	63	29	104	70	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	139	635	237	733	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE PR-79	6,318	6,660	419	761	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,541	2,642	290	1,391	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	489	129	277	(83)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,538	2,635	95	192	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,212	860	54	(298)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	54	97	30	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).
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	3,163	1,306	291	(1,566)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,530	4,088	245	1,803	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	709	1,405	7	703	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	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	888	1,623	8	743	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	633	104	168	(361)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	10,147	6,347	1,657	(2,143)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	64	36	55	27	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	811	3,958	72	3,219	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	128	237	32	141	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	9,882	12,508	1,566	4,192	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	OGLIUGA ISL	8,447	8,540	18	111	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	617	976	157	516	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	1,659	1,028	20	(611)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	ONTARIO ARMY AIRFIELD	37	0	21	(16)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,345	2,748	109	512	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	OROVILLE PRECISION BOMBING RANGE	76	0	39	(37)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	OWOSSO NGTR	20	0	17	(3)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	958	3,532	45	2,619	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	PACIFIC JUNGLE COMBAT	7,964	4,099	83	(3,782)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	910	1,623	7	720	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	FUDS	PALI TRAINING CAMP	35,508	11,988	58	(23,462)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	PANTEX ORDNANCE PLANT (TX TECH)	97	80	4	(13)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	1,134	16,124	322	15,312	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	723	1,468	23	768	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	65	75	23	33	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	PETALUMA BOMBING TARGET	5,627	46	143	(5,438)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	4,292	2,844	71	(1,377)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH OTR MK AUX	96	3	100	7	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-10	886	13	45	(828)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-11	3,093	11	46	(3,036)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-4	46	13	20	(13)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-5	187	13	46	(128)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-6	210	13	2	(195)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-8	46	0	5	(41)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-9	2,846	14	45	(2,787)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	13,950	6,937	7,062	49	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL RESEARCH CENTER	14,576	17,741	62	3,227	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	29,382	19,785	71	(9,526)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	1,372	2,380	27	1,035	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	27,516	29,409	40	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	1,397	2,277	257	1,137	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORCUPINE RIVER DEW STAGING CAMP	5,782	5,745	117	80	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	3,783	3,004	67	(712)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	17,529	8,835	2,378	(6,316)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	109	303	32	226	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	112	72	135	95	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	6,242	6,191	72	21	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	223	731	55	563	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	20,687	53,330	681	33,324	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	2,348	4,279	668	2,599	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE	7,504	6,462	41	(1,001)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,000	11,709	811	1,520	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	RED BLUFF AIR FORCE STATION	80	0	110	30	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	RIALTO AMMUNITION STORAGE POIT	5	0	9	4	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	439	307	196	64	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Ohio	FUDS	ROSSFORD AD	9	3	8	2	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	79	1,132	21	1,074	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SAHUARITA AFR	26,938	20,413	160	(6,365)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	412	53	51	(308)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 25	68	61	59	52	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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	85	82	51	48	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,387	7,399	327	2,339	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) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	2,457	1,586	13	(858)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	4,178	1,410	712	(2,056)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	11	6	2	(3)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	1,381	1,564	30	213	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-03	350	117	53	(180)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,682	3,677	59	1,054	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	5,251	4,791	245	(215)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,790	6,375	126	711	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	3,217	1,879	58	(1,280)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	SCIOTO ORDNANCE PLANT	81	0	10	(71)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	SEATTLE NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	7,051	0	41	(7,010)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	3,167	3,676	89	598	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	4,566	1,821	218	(2,527)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SHO BEA FIRE CON STA	63	0	34	(29)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SHUMAKER NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	10	16	1	7	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	28,543	32,472	43	3,972	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	99,369	14,561	74	(84,734)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	15,357	6,965	127	(8,265)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	33,669	34,143	13,860	14,334	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).
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	2,811	153	3,132	474	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	913	1,265	12	364	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	STEWART AFB	9,259	6,555	69	(2,635)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	2,086	1,102	66	(918)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,315	7,706	3	1,394	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	SYRACUSE AFS MCC-10	145	0	3	(142)	
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	25,562	40,936	618	15,992	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	578	261	277	(40)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TIGALDA ISLAND	7,727	345	2,093	(5,289)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,296	1,922	404	1,030	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	17,554	16,443	138	(973)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	484	315	59	(110)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	520	618	25	123	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	61	54	15	8	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,704	15,604	1,857	3,757	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	18,530	18,052	202	(276)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	18,000	18,709	164	873	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	UMIAT AFS	237,376	184,558	872	(51,946)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	9,366	4,140	82	(5,144)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALGA ISL NAV RADIO	16,477	14,506	74	(1,897)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	108	102	6	0	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	US NAV SUP DEPOT	1,790	0	4	(1,786)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN	674	697	69	92	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	8	101	18	111	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	266	347	48	129	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	65,659	13,125	389	(52,145)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VERNALIS DIVE BOMB NO. 7	14,378	12,421	13	(1,944)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	VERO BEACH NAVAL AIR STATION	53	0	21	(32)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	VHF SITE 4K4 MILITARY RESERVATION	259	61	38	(160)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS	29	14,966	26	14,963	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKANE TRAINING AREA	4,979	3,451	268	(1,260)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	858,105	629,737	10,842	(217,526)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	7,859	7,031	93	(735)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	26,157	26,304	1,077	1,224	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	WATERTOWN AF STA 249	75	0	2	(73)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	3,960	759	19	(3,182)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	WAUGOSHANCE POINT TARGET	2,358	1,546	136	(676)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,706	3,169	659	122	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	FUDS	WEINGARTEN POW CAMP	1,149	800	44	(305)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	WELLSBACH PLT NOBS 258	20	17	5	2	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	69,162	62,893	1,791	(4,478)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	WESTERN REMOUNT AREA & RECEPTION CENTER	25	0	5	(20)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,486	7,101	151	5,766	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	1,516	3,002	36	1,522	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	2,609	1,511	55	(1,043)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,151	1,614	6	469	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	654	723	24	93	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	WOODBINE AIRPORT	184	17	36	(131)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	33,171	46,309	96	13,234	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).
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	7,504	9,482	1,982	3,960	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2017

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	FUDS	YELLOW JACKET TARGET AREA	22,962	23,583	877	1,498	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).
California	FUDS	YERBA BUENA ISLAND	5	0	31	26	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	428	264	53	(111)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	2,504	2,638	28	162	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

FY 2017 DEP ARC

Appendix B

Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2017 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2016.

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

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	18,419	21,427	405	3,413	19%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	560	984	245	669	119%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Florida	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	0	197	8	205	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	1,072	1,169	176	273	25%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Army	CAMP BARKELEY	0	2,856	15	2,871	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	12,445	12,259	7,980	7,794	63%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oregon	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	35	317	62	344	996%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Army	COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY	6,635	13,047	1,634	8,046	121%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX	0	480	1,474	1,954	N/A	New Site.
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	8,211	7,496	1,801	1,086	13%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	45,597	48,666	2,076	5,145	11%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	35,088	37,002	1,691	3,605	10%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	6,195	9,947	104	3,856	62%	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.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	6,355	11,354	211	5,210	82%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	11,389	18,736	3,176	10,523	92%	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.
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	4,308	5,585	2,173	3,450	80%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Pennsylvania	Army	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP TRAINING SITE	279	1,154	37	912	327%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	6,148	12,476	3,343	9,671	157%	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.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,188	2,086	395	1,293	109%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	Army	FORT LEE	438	403	1,297	1,262	288%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	9,740	9,656	2,010	1,926	20%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	1,035	4,551	119	3,635	351%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	1,400	1,410	154	164	12%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Army	FORT MONROE	9,564	11,899	1,471	3,806	40%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	6,365	6,889	400	924	15%	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.
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	12,973	26,062	2,664	15,753	121%	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).
Alabama	Army	FORT RUCKER	10,105	11,697	321	1,913	19%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Montana	Army	FORT WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	10	7,059	9	7,058	69399%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	66,019	75,685	7,511	17,177	26%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	1,867	1,857	492	482	26%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	10,415	12,502	81	2,168	21%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	46,742	64,146	1,161	18,565	40%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	3,669	14,275	1,572	12,178	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) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	14	3,293	3	3,282	23049%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	0	3,359	3,361	6,720	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	0	6	94	100	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	0	3	94	97	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Dakota	Army	JFHQ ND ARNG	0	271	138	409	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	0	49	188	237	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Vermont	Army	JFHQ VT ARNG	93	1,402	49	1,358	1468%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	0	6	159	165	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	44,714	58,050	1,826	15,162	34%	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.
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	21,115	24,582	1,285	4,752	23%	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).
Hawaii	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE SITE	0	524	122	646	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,387	2,449	475	537	23%	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).
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	760	641	3,539	3,420	450%	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.
Alabama	Army	MOBILE OMS 28 & 29	0	3,479	239	3,718	N/A	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	3,623	7,261	301	3,939	109%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	MTA-L CAMP WILLIAMS WEST FED	287	296	117	126	44%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	2,915	7,816	770	5,671	195%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	13,750	14,327	1,015	1,592	12%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	285	6,620	90	6,425	2256%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	24,015	77,935	601	54,521	227%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,501	1,450	744	693	46%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	208,340	201,132	30,532	23,324	11%	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) 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	18,149	21,401	4,636	7,888	43%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	7,572	19,869	88	12,385	164%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,256	2,251	279	274	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	18,414	30,323	550	12,459	68%	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.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	1,054	4,386	53	3,385	321%	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.
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	985	1,209	15	239	24%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	4,539	15,888	108	11,457	252%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	35,043	48,258	3,327	16,542	47%	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.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	2,354	64,769	2,636	65,051	2763%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	142	4,253	146	4,257	2990%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	ADAK NAS	78,801	100,986	4,559	26,744	34%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	5,482	6,045	319	882	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	ALAMEDA NAS	46,071	58,566	15,275	27,770	60%	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.
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,939	12,670	1,790	1,521	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
District of Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	2,672	3,913	271	1,512	57%	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.
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	617	672	305	360	58%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	79,171	99,648	2,759	23,236	29%	New Site.
Hawaii	Navy	BARKING SANDS PMRF	116	2,044	129	2,057	1774%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	51,601	49,246	8,761	6,406	12%	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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	15,114	19,628	989	5,503	36%	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).
Maryland	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,592	4,042	419	1,869	72%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	120	120	118	118	98%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	Navy	CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AGR	9,804	9,147	2,053	1,396	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	20,751	30,202	2,056	11,507	55%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NWIRP	2,229	2,435	99	305	14%	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	46,623	52,118	1,511	7,006	15%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	27,558	29,804	1,305	3,551	13%	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.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	32,131	37,292	1,400	6,561	20%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	7,578	8,235	1,270	1,927	25%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site. 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	57,785	70,694	1,897	14,806	26%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Guam	Navy	GUAMI COMNAVMARIANAS	2,352	3,606	326	1,580	67%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	19,027	19,223	3,990	4,186	22%	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	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,907	13,487	1,895	1,475	11%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	KANEOHE BAY MCB	10,168	11,446	1,770	3,048	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NSY	693	942	93	342	49%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kentucky	Navy	LOUISVILLE NSWC	1,831	2,546	84	799	44%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	64,241	65,413	8,954	10,126	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	14,557	19,636	404	5,483	38%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,867	8,755	1,962	3,850	56%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) New Site.
Midway Islands	Navy	MIDWAY NAF	583	584	400	401	69%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	116	764	11	659	568%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	19,476	27,799	938	9,261	48%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	10,010	11,991	517	2,498	25%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	79,375	80,596	11,964	13,185	17%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	77,731	89,113	2,654	14,036	18%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	4,588	16,864	737	13,013	284%	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	333	320	550	537	162%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSY	6,179	6,580	917	1,318	21%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	29,778	31,507	3,081	4,810	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	2,977	3,330	81	434	15%	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,439	4,856	1,527	944	17%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	1,455	1,953	31	529	36%	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).
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP BREMERTON	1,646	3,024	93	1,471	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	1,268	1,990	218	940	74%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	6,618	6,894	616	892	13%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	1,503	2,783	1,536	2,816	187%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	2,527	1,344	1,530	347	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	42,129	45,776	1,655	5,302	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	26,204	27,995	16,815	18,606	71%	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.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	222,331	196,857	49,281	23,807	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	20,092	22,110	1,280	3,298	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	5,873	7,419	200	1,746	30%	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).
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	43,055	46,361	2,356	5,662	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	71,307	78,981	12,422	20,096	28%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	20,906	21,626	1,376	2,096	10%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	50,143	57,753	12,078	19,688	39%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	16,602	26,562	869	10,829	65%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	36,065	40,959	2,803	7,697	21%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	891	888	710	707	79%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	83,973	112,631	3,750	32,408	39%	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.
New Jersey	Air Force	ATLANTIC CITY MUN	6,677	7,253	149	725	11%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	4,130	4,699	187	756	18%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	Air Force	BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	107	336	8	237	222%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,008	1,101	9	102	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	BIRMINGHAM	1,940	4,125	39	2,224	115%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	Air Force	BLUE ASH AIR GUARD STATION	6,407	8,190	155	1,938	30%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	Air Force	BOISE	494	565	12	83	17%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	51,277	58,964	4,269	11,956	23%	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.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	231	1,998	443	2,210	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).
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	862	10,496	69	9,703	1125%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	10,535	21,587	629	11,681	111%	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).
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	473	5,800	175	5,502	1163%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	Air Force	CAMP BLANDING MIL RESERVATION	741	2,049	93	1,401	189%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	Air Force	CAMP MURRAY AIR GUARD STATION	1,068	1,812	30	774	72%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	14,750	21,316	178	6,744	46%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	31,551	38,384	2,111	8,944	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	14,639	33,420	539	19,320	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) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	Air Force	CHANNEL ISLANDS	1,101	1,162	348	409	37%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
North Carolina	Air Force	CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	16,376	21,190	102	4,916	30%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	7,424	9,375	351	2,302	31%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	2,743	3,608	62	927	34%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	7,761	11,455	418	4,112	53%	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.
Alabama	Air Force	DOTHAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	246	947	76	777	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).
Alaska	Air Force	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	8,052	9,666	392	2,006	25%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,967	11,089	258	6,380	128%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	6,433	7,355	113	1,035	16%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	416,287	614,589	17,765	216,067	52%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	31,729	33,171	1,996	3,438	11%	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.
Washington	Air Force	FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE	68,814	84,472	3,765	19,423	28%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Indiana	Air Force	FORT WAYNE	158	200	5	47	30%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	Air Force	FT SMITH	682	1,101	108	527	77%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	228,800	258,341	1,324	30,865	13%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	9,947	12,317	296	2,666	27%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	GENTILE	4,993	6,369	113	1,489	30%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	1,794	3,078	4,043	5,327	297%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Mississippi	Air Force	GULFPORT BILOXI REGIONAL AIRPORT	157	659	69	571	365%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	HANCOCK ANG	2,092	3,051	240	1,199	57%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	25,693	35,429	2,229	11,965	47%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
North Dakota	Air Force	HECTOR IAP	3,676	6,482	38	2,844	77%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Mexico	Air Force	HOLLOMAN	36,489	32,844	9,100	5,455	15%	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.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	27,201	38,067	1,924	12,790	47%	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.
Indiana	Air Force	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	6,257	9,088	124	2,955	47%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,092	10,962	1,404	1,274	11%	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.
Mississippi	Air Force	JACKSON IAP (ALLEN C THOMPSON)	293	2,461	132	2,300	785%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	JACKSONVILLE	10,112	15,988	332	6,208	61%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	124,945	135,952	3,362	14,369	12%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	JBBER-ELMENDORF	187,515	256,419	5,073	73,977	39%	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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	42,390	67,345	4,366	29,321	69%	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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	28,095	28,438	3,300	3,643	13%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	3,834	5,282	335	1,783	47%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	3,411	4,977	89	1,655	49%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	6,029	10,346	124	4,441	74%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Missouri	Air Force	JEFFERSON BARRACKS AIR GUARD STATION	5,118	5,992	62	936	18%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	9,258	13,879	280	4,901	53%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	6,095	9,095	278	3,278	54%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	4,988	6,453	270	1,735	35%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	79,159	101,469	871	23,181	29%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	Air Force	KIRTLAND	110,233	137,306	7,794	34,867	32%	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.
Missouri	Air Force	LAMBERT ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	17,548	20,027	217	2,696	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	631	3,887	210	3,466	550%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	25,077	31,815	1,851	8,589	34%	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.
Ohio	Air Force	MANSFIELD LAHM	993	2,124	154	1,285	130%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Air Force	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	2,853	5,353	93	2,593	91%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	MATHER	105,464	120,988	3,411	18,935	18%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	669	727	163	221	33%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Tennessee	Air Force	MEMPHIS	652	1,520	32	900	138%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Air Force	MONTGOMERY ANGTS	3,303	5,632	124	2,453	74%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	14,312	12,499	3,941	2,128	15%	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.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	5,071	44,101	2,029	41,059	810%	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 – Actual 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	2,965	5,257	974	3,266	110%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	991	1,129	11	149	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	12,091	13,380	162	1,451	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	5,069	7,115	275	2,321	46%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Delaware	Air Force	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	6,010	6,788	423	1,201	20%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	5,060	5,736	108	784	16%	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.
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	6,019	8,819	1,813	4,613	77%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	NORTON	8,965	10,371	382	1,788	20%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	97,384	113,475	26,042	42,133	43%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE ANG NEW HAMPSHIRE	3,540	4,889	99	1,448	41%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	14	36	36	58	406%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	3,310	3,630	30	350	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	15,278	33,816	6,032	24,570	161%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Oregon	Air Force	PORTLAND	1,975	6,512	40	4,577	232%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	Air Force	QUONSET STATE	1,531	2,200	62	731	48%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	1,992	2,871	166	1,045	52%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Virginia	Air Force	RICHMOND IAP BYRD FIELD	1,905	3,750	663	2,508	132%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Air Force	ROBINS	67,543	86,203	1,065	19,725	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).
New York	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	33,991	44,609	1,551	12,169	36%	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 – Actual 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	Air Force	ROSECRANS MEM	319	1,225	78	984	308%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	SCHENECTADY CO	1,129	1,907	131	909	81%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	Air Force	SELFRIDGE	21,130	24,949	1,204	5,023	24%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	7,597	8,478	81	962	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maine	Air Force	SOUTH PORTLAND FACILITY	541	620	92	171	32%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	2,358	2,864	255	761	32%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	4,569	19,303	116	14,850	325%	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).
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	56,500	66,542	1,728	11,770	21%	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.
Arizona	Air Force	TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	2,766	3,416	304	954	34%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	Air Force	TULSA	578	629	31	82	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	8,256	9,339	1,799	2,882	35%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Wisconsin	Air Force	VOLK FIELD AIR GUARD BASE	7,170	9,618	106	2,554	36%	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).
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	4,952	5,648	380	1,076	22%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	6,075	5,313	1,394	632	10%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	5,485	40,434	7,971	42,920	783%	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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	104,563	133,923	8,617	37,977	36%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	YEAGER ANG	802	1,848	93	1,139	142%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	1,619	1,849	2,125	2,355	145%	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	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	9,881	11,236	1,268	2,623	27%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	6,775	9,776	338	3,339	49%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	4,232	5,144	2,196	3,108	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).
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	42	64	20	42	101%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAC ARPT	40	231	2	193	487%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	654	1,260	70	676	103%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	27,875	35,250	382	7,757	28%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	2,997	3,638	38	679	23%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	156	199	677	720	463%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	BAYWOOD PARK TRAINING AREA	661	2,448	262	2,049	310%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	42	97	41	96	231%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-C	420	573	38	191	45%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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).
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	2,133	3,479	51	1,397	66%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	876	10,808	853	10,785	1232%	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL BIA HDQRS	1,481	3,828	47	2,394	162%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	9,596	12,226	83	2,713	28%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	24,789	30,363	103	5,677	23%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	9,806	13,194	20	3,408	35%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	BORDER FIELD STATE PARK	2,480	4,155	49	1,724	69%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	11,962	12,246	1,104	1,388	12%	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	BROOKSVILLE TURRET GUNNERY RANGE	587	878	7	298	51%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,432	2,075	40	683	48%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	20,570	23,635	749	3,814	19%	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.
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	164	165	30	31	19%	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.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	73,924	87,363	1,978	15,417	21%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	15,180	17,370	4,740	6,930	46%	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).
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	15,128	19,467	505	4,844	32%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	128	176	135	183	143%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	27,536	31,376	100	3,940	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	6,984	16,624	3,949	13,589	195%	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) New Site.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP GRANT RIFLE RANGE	1,811	2,646	4	839	46%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	89,982	112,485	3,001	25,504	28%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	660	1,849	245	1,434	217%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	63	1,102	1	1,040	1649%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	92,525	124,737	238	32,450	35%	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.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	18,668	21,035	62	2,429	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP SHELBY MANUEVER AREA	14,255	16,869	135	2,749	19%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	37,507	107,727	25	70,245	187%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	14,989	16,906	434	2,351	16%	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) New Site.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	1,438	1,966	3,758	4,286	298%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	570	1,383	17	830	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE ARMY MIS PL	10,742	20,578	2	9,838	92%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	27,562	35,517	944	8,899	32%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	509	277	532	301	59%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	7	101	8	102	1431%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	7,231	9,962	209	2,940	41%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Ohio	FUDS	COLUMBUS NAVAL AIR STATION	298	2,926	2	2,630	883%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	152	112	71	31	21%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	12,692	15,121	34	2,463	19%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	578	1,133	4	559	97%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	844	1,201	39	396	47%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	12,564	209,433	163	197,032	1568%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	13,447	36,324	3,126	26,003	193%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CP KILMER	54	38	106	90	167%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	30,124	52,806	57	22,739	75%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	1,668	2,027	92	451	27%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	267	711	26	470	176%	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	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,193	1,680	44	531	45%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	FUDS	DALE MABRY AAF	3,052	3,336	37	321	11%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	97,687	112,525	89	14,927	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	79	1,309	27	1,257	1584%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	357	1,563	96	1,302	365%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	160	2,133	47	2,020	1265%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	7,256	9,638	334	2,716	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	290	313	60	83	29%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	21,145	24,304	1,194	4,353	21%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 11	290	2,048	1,897	3,655	1261%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	57,370	70,450	34	13,114	23%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	294	313	55	74	25%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	827	1,199	19	391	47%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	5,776	7,191	69	1,484	26%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,501	1,647	73	219	15%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,197	1,231	107	141	12%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	2,762	4,160	107	1,505	54%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	FORT BARRY	1,048	33,520	18	32,490	3102%	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.
Utah	FUDS	FORT DOUGLAS	10,455	12,095	26	1,666	16%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	FORT GREBLE DUTCH ISL	41	36	40	35	87%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	11,858	16,457	185	4,784	40%	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.
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	3,942	5,334	1,172	2,564	65%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	FORT MCDOWELL	4,687	8,175	55	3,543	76%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	20,188	24,085	39	3,936	19%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	FORT SLOCUM	3,474	25,210	1	21,737	626%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 TAYLOR	14,193	13,413	2,924	2,144	15%	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	FT GREEN	9,219	10,716	39	1,536	17%	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	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	17,320	26,496	118	9,294	54%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	5,929	7,054	844	1,969	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).
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	87	201	38	152	173%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	351	395	115	159	45%	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.
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,822	1,757	886	821	45%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNR Y R	7,077	8,011	18	952	13%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	13,746	12,716	3,207	2,177	16%	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.
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	110	270	15	175	159%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	1,912	3,913	123	2,124	111%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	571	939	49	417	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).
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	13,156	16,260	26	3,130	24%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	33	75	2	44	137%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kansas	FUDS	INDEPENDENCE AAF	161	111	75	25	16%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	13,041	14,880	282	2,121	16%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	4,067	1,523	4,057	1,513	37%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB PBR N1 N3	9,211	11,958	213	2,960	32%	1) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	10,051	12,510	1,142	3,601	36%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	115	155	28	68	59%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	3,125	5,842	460	3,177	102%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	23,759	31,364	53	7,658	32%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	6,125	8,646	186	2,707	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	78	352	2	276	352%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	53	145	11	103	195%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	4,443	6,618	217	2,392	54%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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)	4,048	5,136	80	1,168	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).
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	85	62	353	330	386%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	4,585	5,038	178	631	14%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	2,903	4,949	142	2,188	75%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	4,574	46,644	213	42,283	924%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	315	154	390	229	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).
Tennessee	FUDS	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	88	154	352	418	472%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	46,550	62,786	142	16,378	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).
Alabama	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AF STATION	0	160	424	584	N/A	New Site.
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	0	2,791	4,695	7,486	N/A	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) New Site.
Alaska	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	1,446	316	3,100	1,970	136%	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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	15,695	34,188	119	18,612	119%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	1,623	2,469	40	886	55%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Washington	FUDS	NAS-QUILLAYUTE	360	167	326	133	37%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 AIR STATION OAKLAND	97	415	48	366	379%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	7,690	10,146	214	2,670	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	6,953	8,094	135	1,276	18%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	1,236	482	1,190	436	35%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	1,010	1,075	270	335	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	1,321	2,730	53	1,462	111%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	2,603	3,254	69	720	28%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,484	5,691	50	1,257	28%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	2,270	2,458	120	308	14%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	156	364	82	290	187%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	0	139	8	147	N/A	New Site.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	53	44	174	165	312%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	63	29	104	70	111%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	139	635	237	733	526%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	NIKE PR-79	6,318	6,660	419	761	12%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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 B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	1,541	2,642	290	1,391	90%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	54	97	30	73	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).
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,530	4,088	245	1,803	71%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	709	1,405	7	703	99%	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	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	888	1,623	8	743	84%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	64	36	55	27	42%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	811	3,958	72	3,219	397%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	128	237	32	141	110%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	9,882	12,508	1,566	4,192	42%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	617	976	157	516	84%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,345	2,748	109	512	22%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	958	3,532	45	2,619	273%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	FUDS	PALERMO COMMU FAC	910	1,623	7	720	79%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	1,134	16,124	322	15,312	1350%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Florida	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	723	1,468	23	768	106%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PEDRO DOME	65	75	23	33	51%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL RESEARCH CENTER	14,576	17,741	62	3,227	22%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	1,372	2,380	27	1,035	75%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	1,397	2,277	257	1,137	81%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	109	303	32	226	208%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	PORTERVILLE ARMY AIRFIELD	112	72	135	95	85%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	223	731	55	563	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	20,687	53,330	681	33,324	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).
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	2,348	4,279	668	2,599	111%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	11,000	11,709	811	1,520	14%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	439	307	196	64	14%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	ROTTERDAM INDUST. PARK	79	1,132	21	1,074	1353%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 25	68	61	59	52	76%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	85	82	51	48	56%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	5,387	7,399	327	2,339	43%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	1,381	1,564	30	213	15%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	2,682	3,677	59	1,054	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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	5,790	6,375	126	711	12%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	3,167	3,676	89	598	19%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	28,543	32,472	43	3,972	14%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	33,669	34,143	13,860	14,334	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).
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	2,811	153	3,132	474	17%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	STARK GENERAL HOSP	913	1,265	12	364	40%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	6,315	7,706	3	1,394	22%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	25,562	40,936	618	15,992	63%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	1,296	1,922	404	1,030	80%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	520	618	25	123	24%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	13,704	15,604	1,857	3,757	27%	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
New York	FUDS	US NAV TRG DEVICE CEN	674	697	69	92	14%	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	8	101	18	111	1363%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	266	347	48	129	48%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Virginia	FUDS	VIRGINIA ORDNANCE WORKS	29	14,966	26	14,963	50732%	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	1,486	7,101	151	5,766	388%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	1,516	3,002	36	1,522	100%	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,151	1,614	6	469	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).
Florida	FUDS	WITHLACOOCHEE CWS SITE	654	723	24	93	14%	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	33,171	46,309	96	13,234	40%	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix B: Causes of Increases in Cleanup Estimates

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2016 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2017 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2017 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (Percentage)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	7,504	9,482	1,982	3,960	53%	<p>1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.</p>