

FY 2019 DEP ARC

Appendix A

Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities in FY 2019

Appendix to Section VI, FY 2019 Funding for Environmental Restoration Activities and Reasons for Increases in Cost Estimates Since FY 2018.

This Appendix provides the amount of funding obligated at each DoD installation and FUDS property for environmental restoration activities in FY 2019; the change in the cost estimate from FY 2018 to FY 2019; and an explanation if the cost estimate did not decrease by at least the amount obligated in FY 2019.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	123,311	133,934	2,996	13,619	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New York	Army	AFRC FORT WADSWORTH	0	148	55	203	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alabama	Army	ALABAMA AAP	9,076	8,862	70	(144)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Army	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	22,416	19,383	4,647	1,614	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Massachusetts	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WATERTOWN	1,601	2,658	603	1,660	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	Army	ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY-WOODBRIDGE	888	842	7	(39)	No explanation required.
Florida	Army	AVIATION SUPPLY FACILITY, 49-A	34	26	29	21	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	Army	BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	19,652	20,034	1,112	1,494	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	1,711	2,747	199	1,235	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Kentucky	Army	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT-LEXINGTON FACILITY	919	583	13	(323)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	CAMERON STATION	1,138	1,091	54	7	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	CAMP BONNEVILLE	13,122	0	8,484	(4,638)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	CAMP CROWDER	217	214	231	228	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP KILMER	4,364	4,316	155	107	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arizona	Army	CAMP NAVAJO	3,507	2,946	519	(42)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	CAMP PEDRICKTOWN	623	255	584	216	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	Army	CARLISLE BARRACKS	0	0	149	149	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Illinois	Army	CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER	4,301	4,476	103	278	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Army	CLACKAMAS/CAMP WITHYCOMBE	267	1,172	222	1,127	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	13,163	39,382	1,455	27,674	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alabama	Army	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX	1	3	9	11	No explanation required.
Nebraska	Army	CORNHUSKER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	25,591	27,246	5,035	6,690	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Tennessee	Army	DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS TENNESSEE	11,884	8,424	2,958	(502)	No explanation required.
Utah	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT OGDEN UTAH	10,817	10,123	243	(451)	No explanation required.
California	Army	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN, SHARPE FACILITY	49,621	58,145	4,819	13,343	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) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Michigan	Army	DETROIT ARSENAL	359	766	97	504	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Massachusetts	Army	DEVENS RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY	47,430	100,970	8,516	62,056	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Utah	Army	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	64,735	65,231	287	783	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Army	FOREST GLEN	27,389	13,935	1,195	(12,259)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT A P HILL	112	38	304	230	New Site.
Virginia	Army	FORT BELVOIR	32,100	28,882	734	(2,484)	No explanation required.
							1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Georgia	Army	FORT BENNING	27,268	28,194	1,856	2,782	
Texas	Army	FORT BLISS	33,773	29,563	3,506	(704)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	Army	FORT BRAGG	7,162	5,689	524	(949)	No explanation required.
							1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Puerto Rico	Army	FORT BUCHANAN	11,880	12,607	524	1,251	
Kentucky	Army	FORT CAMPBELL	9,727	5,009	112	(4,606)	No explanation required.
							1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Colorado	Army	FORT CARSON	11,111	19,205	1,049	9,143	
							Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Arkansas	Army	FORT CHAFFEE	1,101	1,159	47	105	
							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 contract or contract method.
Maryland	Army	FORT DETRICK	6,682	7,346	3,223	3,887	

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Army	FORT DRUM	4,271	9,898	1,744	7,371	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Maryland	Army	FORT GEORGE G MEADE	27,216	27,995	1,466	2,245	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. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Georgia	Army	FORT GILLEM	2,523	1,959	515	(49)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT GORDON	2,066	5,563	561	4,059	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Army	FORT GREELY	12,408	13,683	816	2,091	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 HAMILTON	925	907	488	470	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Texas	Army	FORT HOOD	0	0	1,340	1,340	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Arizona	Army	FORT HUACHUCA	1,592	2,085	2,892	3,385	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	1,988	1,431	30	(527)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Army	FORT JACKSON	17,096	47,492	6,236	36,632	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 – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kentucky	Army	FORT KNOX	3,999	3,632	300	(67)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	FORT LEAVENWORTH	1,863	1,844	497	478	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Army	FORT LEE	976	1,795	187	1,006	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	FORT LEONARD WOOD	30,033	36,848	282	7,097	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) 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). 5) New Site. 6) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN	6,478	49,521	770	43,813	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alabama	Army	FORT MCCLELLAN ARNG	3,220	5,653	197	2,630	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Wisconsin	Army	FORT MCCOY	332	306	5	(21)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT MCPHERSON	23	5	41	23	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	FORT MONMOUTH	18,148	16,035	570	(1,543)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	FORT MONROE	8,421	11,788	1,264	4,631	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	FORT ORD	265,317	301,722	9,575	45,980	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	458	457	864	863	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Louisiana	Army	FORT POLK	6,612	7,388	1,087	1,863	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Kansas	Army	FORT RILEY	33,867	33,283	1,040	456	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.
Maryland	Army	FORT RITCHIE	5,106	5,542	137	573	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	11,818	9,633	963	(1,222)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	FORT SHAFTER	2,577	2,307	381	111	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Army	FORT SHERIDAN	7,088	8,167	39	1,118	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	FORT SILL	1,884	495	87	(1,302)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	FORT STEWART	9,735	7,185	1,088	(1,462)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Army	FORT WAINWRIGHT	47,597	69,461	1,974	23,838	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	Army	FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY	100,719	138,503	8,665	46,449	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	Army	HAINES PIPELINE	21,501	23,733	580	2,812	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	Army	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	1,275	1,200	52	(23)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Army	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT	70,712	67,645	676	(2,391)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	HOLSTON ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	12,393	10,939	513	(941)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Army	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	19,843	19,592	491	240	New Site.
Iowa	Army	IOWA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	65,403	75,479	2,031	12,107	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Indiana	Army	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	35,029	34,005	967	(57)	No explanation required.
California	Army	JFHQ CA ARNG	13,058	12,403	40	(615)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Colorado	Army	JFHQ CO ARNG	870	872	25	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).
Georgia	Army	JFHQ GA ARNG	3,364	3,358	76	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).
Illinois	Army	JFHQ IL ARNG	28	6	25	3	No explanation required.
Michigan	Army	JFHQ MI ARNG	28	0	108	80	No explanation required.
Montana	Army	JFHQ MT ARNG	32	9	5	(18)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	Army	JFHQ NE ARNG	22	0	8	(14)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	JFHQ NM ARNG	45	0	72	27	No explanation required.
New York	Army	JFHQ NY ARNG	96	25	44	(27)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Army	JFHQ OH ARNG	13,769	14,040	4,279	4,550	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Rhode Island	Army	JFHQ RI ARNG	56	8,401	11	8,356	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	Army	JFHQ UT ARNG	22	1,319	26	1,323	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	763	1,261	95	593	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in 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.
Wyoming	Army	JFHQ WY ARNG	89	6	27	(56)	No explanation required.
Washington	Army	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	29,023	29,635	1,460	2,072	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Virginia	Army	JOINT BASE MYER-HENDERSON HALL	70	220	297	447	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Illinois	Army	JOLIET AAP	30,955	25,513	1,668	(3,774)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	Army	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	1,876	1,638	327	89	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	KIPAPA AMMO STORAGE SITE	541	0	10	(531)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	KUNIA FIELD STATION	576	717	50	191	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	108,613	108,243	401	31	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.
South Carolina	Army	LEESBURG TRAINING SITE	270	267	54	51	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Pennsylvania	Army	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	5,270	5,313	545	588	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 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.
Rhode Island	Army	LINCOLN AMSA 68	113	879	30	796	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Army	LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,238	4,526	13	301	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	84,008	80,317	2,347	(1,344)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Army	LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	2,421	2,671	2,574	2,824	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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.
Hawaii	Army	MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION	771	942	58	229	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Army	MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	4,687	6,766	280	2,359	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.
Tennessee	Army	MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	31,746	24,795	3,173	(3,778)	No explanation required.
California	Army	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL CONCORD	97,311	96,861	7,833	7,383	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Mississippi	Army	MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	3,437	3,524	70	157	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	3,542	3,605	12	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).
Massachusetts	Army	MTA CAMP EDWARDS	7,708	6,639	281	(788)	No explanation required.
Florida	Army	MTC CAMP BLANDING	2,891	2,884	30	23	No explanation required.
California	Army	MTC-H CAMP ROBERTS	4,282	4,246	136	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).
California	Army	NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN	9,510	37,183	1,405	29,078	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Army	OAKLAND ARMY BASE	2,006	438	2	(1,566)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Army	PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION	171	2,143	108	2,080	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	PARKS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	7,444	6,973	537	66	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Army	PHOENIX MILITARY RESERVATION	2,022	1,982	58	18	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	PICATINNY ARSENAL	120,809	138,894	2,323	20,408	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) 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.
Arkansas	Army	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL	32,628	31,459	9,197	8,028	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Hawaii	Army	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	14,971	34,920	88	20,037	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 – Actual 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	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY	1,760	1,607	990	838	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Colorado	Army	PUEBLO CHEMICAL DEPOT	209,013	201,527	5,101	(2,385)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	RADFORD ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	12,589	8,148	557	(3,884)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Army	RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	28,403	34,057	4,453	10,107	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – 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.
Texas	Army	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	30,074	31,588	755	2,269	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alabama	Army	REDSTONE ARSENAL	625,582	599,294	16,787	(9,501)	No explanation required.
California	Army	RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	15,265	23,842	1,447	10,024	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Illinois	Army	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	10,761	10,450	1,678	1,367	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Colorado	Army	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL	217,672	221,426	12,346	16,100	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Army	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	2,710	6,238	726	4,254	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Texas	Army	SAGINAW	2,392	2,386	41	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).
Illinois	Army	SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	28,276	27,923	912	559	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Hawaii	Army	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	12,050	12,031	425	406	New Site.
New York	Army	SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	27,368	22,201	777	(4,390)	No explanation required.
California	Army	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	24,176	21,045	629	(2,502)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Army	SIEVERS-SANDBERG USARC	52	168	40	156	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Massachusetts	Army	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	6,606	6,319	195	(92)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Army	ST LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT	5,379	5,553	535	709	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Massachusetts	Army	SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	1,277	1,153	122	(2)	No explanation required.
Kansas	Army	SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	32,383	50,854	15,889	34,360	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) 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.
Pennsylvania	Army	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	6,543	11,871	324	5,652	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	56,085	55,785	1,473	1,173	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Utah	Army	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT SOUTH	57,758	110,801	145	53,189	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Hawaii	Army	TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	815	940	266	391	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Army	TS AFRC LOS ALAMITOS	9,363	14,791	553	5,981	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Minnesota	Army	TWIN CITIES ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	31,527	26,006	1,226	(4,295)	No explanation required.
Oregon	Army	UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT	69,634	52,905	31,571	14,842	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Ohio	Army	USARC KINGS MILLS (AMSA 59)	7,386	7,510	123	247	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New Jersey	Army	USARC LODI	0	0	9	9	No explanation required.
Illinois	Army	VIETNAM VET MEM USARC (SOUTH)	0	0	35	35	No explanation required.
Virginia	Army	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	1,301	1,247	37	(17)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	Army	VOLUNTEER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	19,233	19,481	730	978	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	WAIAWA GULCH	0	0	35	35	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Army	WAIKAKALAU AMMO STORAGE TUNNELS	780	773	10	3	No explanation required.
New York	Army	WATERVLIET ARSENAL	4,007	4,164	329	486	New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Missouri	Army	WELDON SPRING TRAINING AREA	2,768	2,748	468	448	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
New York	Army	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION	52,622	64,632	878	12,888	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) 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. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Hawaii	Army	WHEELER ARMY AIRFIELD	1,063	792	62	(209)	No explanation required.
New Mexico	Army	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	3,041	2,910	503	372	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.
Washington	Army	YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER	1,929	2,342	32	445	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.
Arizona	Army	YUMA PROVING GROUND	7,145	15,719	784	9,358	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	ADAK NAS	92,973	74,505	3,462	(15,006)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	AGANA NAS	4,778	4,779	132	133	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	ALAMEDA NAS	55,729	42,947	12,463	(319)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Georgia	Navy	ALBANY MCLB	12,055	12,133	885	963	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
West Virginia	Navy	ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LAB	38,412	57,705	8,217	27,510	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Navy	AMCHITKA FLTSURSPTDET1	46,325	47,355	312	1,342	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
District of Columbia	Navy	ANACOSTIA NS	3,759	2,904	510	(345)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NS	18,114	17,316	1,419	621	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	ANNAPOLIS NSWC DET BAY HEAD ANNEX	258	410	67	219	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	AZUSA NCCOSC MORRIS DAM FACILITY	1,648	2,411	2,247	3,010	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	BAINBRIDGE NTC	32,704	12,673	4,554	(15,477)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	BANGOR NSB	149,605	142,775	15,791	8,961	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.
Hawaii	Navy	BARBERS POINT NAS	6,730	7,218	120	608	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	BARSTOW MCLB	50,380	46,546	2,527	(1,307)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	BEAUFORT MCAS	31,063	28,466	2,029	(568)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Navy	BEDFORD NWIRP	21,350	21,922	894	1,466	Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	Navy	BETHPAGE NWIRP	356,380	485,878	14,195	143,693	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.
Tennessee	Navy	BRISTOL NWIRP	362	317	65	20	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	BRUNSWICK NAS	32,167	33,553	1,273	2,659	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	18,886	16,396	3,686	1,196	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).
Hawaii	Navy	CAMP H.M. SMITH OAHU	1,433	1,990	81	638	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 Carolina	Navy	CAMP LEJEUNE MCB	143,587	134,003	13,891	4,307	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	CAMP PENDLETON MCB	50,698	46,157	10,831	6,290	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 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.
Alaska	Navy	CAPE PRINCE WALES NCCOSC	1,866	2,976	19	1,129	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	Navy	CARDEROCK NSWC	205	217	134	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).
Florida	Navy	CECIL FIELD NAS	11,759	11,379	1,325	945	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON FISC	2,237	4,638	610	3,011	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Navy	CHARLESTON NS	5,123	7,471	423	2,771	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Navy	CHASE FIELD NAS	0	4,492	999	5,491	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
North Carolina	Navy	CHERRY POINT MCAS	75,127	83,246	3,887	12,006	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 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.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	Navy	CHESAPEAKE BAY DET NRL	2,516	2,735	423	642	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	CHESAPEAKE NSGA NWEST	962	739	688	465	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	117,842	126,720	4,165	13,043	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.
Arizona	Navy	CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AGR	9,019	8,579	483	43	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Jersey	Navy	COLTS NECK NWS EARLE	51,263	51,877	673	1,287	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	Navy	CONCORD NWS	61,655	64,547	5,178	8,070	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Oregon	Navy	COOS HEAD NAV OCEAN PROCESSING FAC.	33	20	11	(2)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	CORONADO NAB	3,784	3,084	419	(281)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Navy	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	26,452	26,838	259	645	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Indiana	Navy	CRANE NSWC	32,352	27,441	2,922	(1,989)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	CRANEY ISLAND FISC	6,606	7,076	423	893	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
California	Navy	CROWS LANDING NALF	2,623	1,520	472	(631)	No explanation required.
Maine	Navy	CUTLER NCTS	17,104	11,733	3,278	(2,093)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Navy	DAHLGREN NSWC	21,286	21,215	1,350	1,279	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 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.
Texas	Navy	DALLAS NAS	18,470	23,078	730	5,338	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	Navy	DAM NECK FCTC	3,048	8,984	36	5,972	1) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 2) New Site.
Rhode Island	Navy	DAVISVILLE NCBC	30,026	29,427	900	301	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DIXON NRTF	1,349	924	278	(147)	No explanation required.
Connecticut	Navy	EAST LYME NUWC	55	0	150	95	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	EL CENTRO NAF	24,239	28,172	369	4,302	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	EL TORO MCAS	46,944	37,929	2,562	(6,453)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	FALLBROOK NOC PAC DIV DET	24,988	23,738	3,981	2,731	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	Navy	FALLON NAS	27,804	26,188	1,167	(449)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Navy	FRIDLEY NIROP	37,991	32,505	4,376	(1,110)	No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	FT WORTH TX NAS JRB	8,386	8,781	793	1,188	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	182,132	182,974	1,150	1,992	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 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.
Guam	Navy	GUAM FISC	165	166	4	5	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NAVACTS	73,659	67,465	5,626	(568)	No explanation required.
Guam	Navy	GUAM NSRF	165	14,248	5	14,088	New Site.
Guam	Navy	GUAM PWC	1,456	1,461	44	49	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	2,151	1,911	691	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	Navy	GULFPORT NCBC	18,776	14,466	6,716	2,406	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	IMPERIAL BEACH OLF	13,417	14,834	1,395	2,812	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Maryland	Navy	INDIAN HEAD NSWC	190,093	191,011	4,195	5,113	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. 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	JACKSONVILLE FISC	458	459	15	16	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	JACKSONVILLE NAS	43,453	42,605	4,190	3,342	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 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.
Hawaii	Navy	KANEOHE BAY MCB	13,800	15,081	125	1,406	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Navy	KEY WEST NAS	49,651	55,089	5,050	10,488	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.
Washington	Navy	KEYPORT NUWC	20,154	24,094	2,117	6,057	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Georgia	Navy	KINGS BAY NSB	3,387	3,820	21	454	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	Navy	KINGSVILLE NAS	6,925	2,651	1,228	(3,046)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LEMOORE NAS	23,761	26,220	260	2,719	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	Navy	LITTLE CREEK NAB	353,154	351,450	1,071	(633)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS	1,071	966	64	(41)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	LONG BEACH NS SAN PEDRO	10,828	10,340	576	88	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 NSY	924	834	70	(20)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Navy	LUALUALEI NAVMAG	62,832	53,127	1,959	(7,746)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	MARE ISLAND NSY	67,000	63,982	4,879	1,861	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Navy	MAYPORT NS	19,796	18,220	92	(1,484)	No explanation required.
Texas	Navy	MCGREGOR NWIRP	25,952	25,524	78	(350)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	MECHANICSBURG SPCC	4,288	4,216	1,071	999	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Tennessee	Navy	MEMPHIS NAS	7,996	8,365	287	656	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Mississippi	Navy	MERIDIAN NAS	6,295	11,837	1,289	6,831	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	MIRAMAR MCAS	45,030	31,319	11,884	(1,827)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	MOFFETT FIELD NAS	24,474	18,301	3,252	(2,921)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVACT PUERTO RICO	34,111	30,817	4,993	1,699	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 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.
Connecticut	Navy	NEW LONDON NSB	18,497	13,840	963	(3,694)	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Navy	NEW ORLEANS NAS	1,092	3,322	1,584	3,814	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Rhode Island	Navy	NEWPORT NETC	67,290	71,099	7,508	11,317	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	NORFOLK COMNAVBASE	32,202	41,276	2,575	11,649	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	NORFOLK NSY	16,635	15,774	825	(36)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	NORTH ISLAND NAS	86,875	86,304	13,038	12,467	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	NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	569	366	115	(88)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Guam	Navy	NSA ANDERSEN GUAM	43,006	38,574	8,239	3,807	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	OCEANA NAS	170,551	202,835	12,941	45,225	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) 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. 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 8) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	ORLANDO NTC	15,322	11,932	652	(2,738)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	PANAMA CITY CSS	17,441	11,619	401	(5,421)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Navy	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	87,229	83,053	4,942	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).
Maryland	Navy	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	39,217	37,619	2,932	1,334	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR FISC	16,573	16,804	25	256	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NS	124,153	109,067	17,021	1,935	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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. 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.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR NSB	503	751	46	294	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	PEARL HARBOR NSY	5,772	6,453	200	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) 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.
Hawaii	Navy	PEARL HARBOR PWC	42,998	40,338	626	(2,034)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NAS	58,793	58,188	8,351	7,746	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Florida	Navy	PENSACOLA NTTC CORRY STATION	4,280	6,220	1,778	3,718	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NS	4,413	4,569	60	216	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Pennsylvania	Navy	PHILADELPHIA NSWC-CD	426	299	113	(14)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Navy	POINT BARROW NARL	31,495	32,177	3,466	4,148	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	POINT MUGU NAWS	15,444	15,170	763	489	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.
Washington	Navy	PORT HADLOCK NOC PAC DIV DET	3,579	4,094	203	718	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Navy	PORT HUENEME NCBC	8,430	8,309	342	221	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	Navy	PORTSMOUTH NSY	5,136	5,110	227	201	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC BREMERTON	3,794	3,481	9	(304)	No explanation required.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND FISC MANCHESTER	3,321	3,516	595	790	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Washington	Navy	PUGET SOUND NAVHOSP BREMERTON	3,133	3,135	97	99	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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 NSY	98,903	101,898	3,279	6,274	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Technology – Change to a different or improved cleanup technology (e.g., monitored natural attenuation did not work so active remediation is needed, technology was ineffective).
Virginia	Navy	QUANTICO MCB	105,757	98,621	4,360	(2,776)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Puerto Rico	Navy	ROOSEVELT ROADS CAMP GARCIA	11,876	10,305	3,160	1,589	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	3,004	2,881	87	(36)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND NALF	2,515	2,259	162	(94)	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NCCOSC	8,826	20,913	2,951	15,038	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) New Site. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NISE WEST	916	3,938	550	3,572	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	244,626	246,534	1,429	3,337	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NSB	510	0	849	339	No explanation required.
California	Navy	SAN DIEGO NTC	325	197	145	17	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	SAUFLEY FIELD NAS	7,524	7,580	2,811	2,867	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SEAL BEACH NWS	39,019	38,659	436	76	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).
Massachusetts	Navy	SOUTH WEYMOUTH NAS	48,836	49,773	4,906	5,843	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Virginia	Navy	ST JULIEN'S CREEK ANNEX	14,263	15,405	567	1,709	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS	14,455	34,598	4,950	25,093	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
California	Navy	TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	222,585	249,880	71,265	98,560	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New Jersey	Navy	TRENTON NAWC	24,937	24,385	984	432	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Navy	TUSTIN MCAS	14,821	14,622	1,716	1,517	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	TWENTYNINE PALMS MCAGCC	11,465	7,528	1,536	(2,401)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES EAST	267,208	261,155	15,371	9,318	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.
Puerto Rico	Navy	VIEQUES PUERTO RICO NASD	8,517	8,183	94	(240)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Navy	WARMINSTER NAWC	50,139	50,472	2,961	3,294	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON DC NAVOBSY	520	1,089	301	870	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NAVY YARD	27,290	25,898	1,775	383	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
District of Columbia	Navy	WASHINGTON NRL	1,004	1,183	353	532	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).
Washington	Navy	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	91,754	94,696	14,691	17,633	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maryland	Navy	WHITE OAK NSWC	2,837	1,945	156	(736)	No explanation required.
Florida	Navy	WHITING FIELD NAS	21,226	25,602	1,084	5,460	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Virginia	Navy	WILLIAMSBURG FISC CHEATHAM ANNEX	41,677	42,608	1,980	2,911	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Navy	WILLOW GROVE NAS	57,295	58,179	4,413	5,297	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	Navy	YORKTOWN FISC FUELS DIVISION	28,017	28,011	701	695	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual 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	62,343	65,988	2,075	5,720	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	Navy	YUMA MCAS	25,071	17,938	4,174	(2,959)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	AF PLANT NO 42 - B	43,317	41,854	912	(551)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Oklahoma	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 3	3,635	3,106	185	(344)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 4	49,414	72,190	1,610	24,386	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 – Change in contract or contract method.
Arizona	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 44	43,869	46,022	3,035	5,188	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 59	625	684	41	100	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Georgia	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT 6	157,199	199,045	7,202	49,048	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	AIR FORCE PLANT 85	14,701	11,561	437	(2,703)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS	22,755	18,908	418	(3,429)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE	74,915	72,677	2,548	310	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.
Tennessee	Air Force	ARNOLD	118,258	110,653	2,156	(5,449)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE	5,269	5,033	361	125	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Dakota	Air Force	BADLANDS BOMBING RANGE	6,654	6,328	343	17	No explanation required.
Louisiana	Air Force	BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE	55,911	54,126	1,873	88	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	Air Force	BARTER ISLAND	5,556	7,477	747	2,668	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	BEALE	222,833	202,437	4,365	(16,031)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BEAR CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	1,261	1,238	16	(7)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	Air Force	BELLOWS AIR FORCE STATION	9,186	4,930	2,874	(1,382)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	BERGSTROM	29,345	23,050	144	(6,151)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BETHEL RANGE	1,652	1,635	16	(1)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	BIG MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	18,220	17,652	646	78	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Texas	Air Force	BROOKS-CITY	7,533	5,370	191	(1,972)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY AFB	59,468	59,172	2,927	2,631	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 contract or contract method.
Colorado	Air Force	BUCKLEY ANNEX	1,396	660	64	(672)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	BULLEN POINT	13,750	12,486	1,197	(67)	No explanation required.
Vermont	Air Force	BURLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	1,410	93	1,503	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Michigan	Air Force	CALUMET AIR FORCE STATION	6,041	5,895	470	324	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CAMPION AIR FORCE STATION	22,352	24,045	3,141	4,834	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
New Mexico	Air Force	CANNON	35,498	75,074	3,385	42,961	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Florida	Air Force	CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION	221,408	207,251	5,124	(9,033)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE LISBURNE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	3,038	2,948	70	(20)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	CAPE NEWENHAM LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	11,461	13,482	480	2,501	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	36,364	40,052	694	4,382	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	CARSWELL	5,603	5,270	64	(269)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	CASTLE	68,870	76,781	926	8,837	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).
Illinois	Air Force	CHANUTE	51,937	57,059	443	5,565	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	CHENA RIVER	319	379	16	76	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION	9,905	9,357	142	(406)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	COLD BAY LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	6,948	6,602	142	(204)	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	10,694	11,107	299	712	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nevada	Air Force	CREECH AIR FORCE BASE	2,861	2,901	48	88	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arizona	Air Force	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE	11,786	10,974	228	(584)	No explanation required.
Georgia	Air Force	DOBBINS AIR FORCE BASE	11,218	10,261	496	(461)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Delaware	Air Force	DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	126,726	123,310	3,731	315	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	DRIFTWOOD BAY RADIO RELAY STATION	9,956	6,494	143	(3,319)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Air Force	DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	2,424	94	2,518	Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC.
Alaska	Air Force	DUNCAN CANAL RADIO RELAY STATION (RRS)	2,584	2,076	198	(310)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	DYESS	14,786	15,440	256	910	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Arkansas	Air Force	EAKER	26,009	27,440	140	1,571	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	111,156	121,379	3,981	14,204	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
California	Air Force	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	665,846	578,496	21,737	(65,613)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	Air Force	EGLIN	51,749	62,944	1,939	13,134	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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) New Site. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE	626,616	483,032	64,719	(78,865)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	Air Force	ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE	45,435	92,937	4,280	51,782	1) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 2) Standards or Regulations – DoD Policy or Directive – A change in DoD policy or directive that redefines the costs included in the CTC. 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Louisiana	Air Force	ENGLAND	36,620	37,088	425	893	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	50,667	100,449	4,643	54,425	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.
Wyoming	Air Force	FRANCIS E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE	65,234	68,795	1,051	4,612	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 – Change in contract or contract method.
Alaska	Air Force	GALENA	260,614	217,400	827	(42,387)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Wisconsin	Air Force	GEN B MITCHELL	8,922	10,333	144	1,555	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	GENTILE	9,351	9,724	140	513	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	GEORGE	72,789	97,659	1,663	26,533	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).
Arizona	Air Force	GOLDWATER RANGE	3,559	3,553	24	18	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	GOODFELLOW	8,314	8,064	162	(88)	No explanation required.
North Dakota	Air Force	GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE	18,762	18,597	420	255	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	GRANITE MOUNTAIN RADIO RELAY STATION	8,391	8,354	144	107	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Indiana	Air Force	GRISSOM ARB	20,699	22,359	285	1,945	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Alabama	Air Force	GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE	4,386	4,240	111	(35)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Air Force	HANSCOM	34,905	41,030	829	6,954	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	HILL AIR FORCE BASE	368,723	443,560	5,809	80,646	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	HOLLOMAN	32,110	29,364	2,316	(430)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	HOMESTEAD	45,203	36,083	2,031	(7,089)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	HURLBURT FIELD	11,616	12,295	393	1,072	1) New Site. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	INDIAN MOUNTAIN RESEARCH	24,860	16,261	6,341	(2,258)	No explanation required.
Maryland	Air Force	JB-ANDREWS	151,697	139,885	2,140	(9,672)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	Air Force	JB-CAPE COD	125,218	56,076	3,513	(65,629)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-AIR	48,360	41,588	2,409	(4,363)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	JB-CHARLESTON-WEAPONS	58,456	50,740	4,079	(3,637)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-ELMENDORF	294,203	335,898	5,118	46,813	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) 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. 7) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method. 8) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	JBER-RICHARDSON	58,839	94,746	4,691	40,598	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.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-EUSTIS	26,294	21,482	3,499	(1,313)	No explanation required.
Virginia	Air Force	JBLE-LANGLEY	17,466	16,787	574	(105)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-DIX	18,470	21,571	2,326	5,427	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval). 4) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 5) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
New Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-LAKEHURST	34,681	29,063	7,277	1,659	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 Jersey	Air Force	JBMDL-MCGUIRE	148,612	145,933	6,795	4,116	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-CAMP BULLIS	9,785	15,587	1,072	6,874	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.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-FORT SAM HOUSTON	5,449	5,343	64	(42)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-LACKLAND	44,529	46,796	1,110	3,377	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.
Texas	Air Force	JBSA-RANDOLPH	14,534	14,254	407	127	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Mississippi	Air Force	JOHN C. STENNIS SPACE CENTER	1,091	1,069	22	(0)	No explanation required.
Johnston Atoll	Air Force	JOHNSTON ATOLL	15,667	20,946	201	5,480	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Hawaii	Air Force	KAENA POINT	5,526	5,099	48	(379)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KALAKAKET CREEK RADIO RELAY STATION	2,430	2,402	32	4	No explanation required.
Mississippi	Air Force	KEESLER	10,492	8,520	569	(1,403)	No explanation required.
Texas	Air Force	KELLY	113,342	110,149	539	(2,654)	No explanation required.
Michigan	Air Force	KI SAWYER	91,809	67,503	873	(23,433)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KING SALMON	59,759	55,989	14,624	10,854	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	140,886	124,779	5,478	(10,629)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	KOTZEBUE LONG RANGE RADAR SITE	7,735	7,629	123	17	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	LAKE LOUISE	6,812	6,713	127	28	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	Air Force	LAUGHLIN	32,464	36,119	560	4,215	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Arkansas	Air Force	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE	27,279	26,575	453	(251)	No explanation required.
Maine	Air Force	LORING	31,773	36,560	390	5,177	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Colorado	Air Force	LOWRY	8,214	6,323	144	(1,747)	No explanation required.
Arizona	Air Force	LUKE	19,068	13,174	564	(5,330)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	MACDILL	74,687	44,564	4,039	(26,084)	No explanation required.
Washington	Air Force	MAKAH AIR FORCE STATION	3,665	18,464	204	15,003	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Montana	Air Force	MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE	29,190	23,927	1,196	(4,067)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MARCH	133,624	121,784	5,426	(6,414)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	MATHER	151,228	135,308	4,494	(11,426)	No explanation required.
Alabama	Air Force	MAXWELL	30,439	34,688	1,033	5,282	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	MCCLELLAN	112,594	162,005	6,580	55,991	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	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE	32,467	35,249	6,979	9,761	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. 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.
Kansas	Air Force	MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE TITAN SITES	556	217	125	(214)	No explanation required.
Minnesota	Air Force	MINNEAPOLIS ARS	2,633	2,643	50	60	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Dakota	Air Force	MINOT	18,193	51,646	2,147	35,600	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.
Georgia	Air Force	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE	59,555	64,634	798	5,877	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Idaho	Air Force	MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE	44,580	46,547	4,928	6,895	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	MURPHY DOME	4,445	6,612	274	2,441	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	Air Force	MYRTLE BEACH	22,052	30,741	699	9,388	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) New Site.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP I	1,173	1,177	16	20	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	NAKNEK RECREATIONAL CAMP II	14,755	7,743	348	(6,664)	No explanation required.
Nevada	Air Force	NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE	30,873	30,820	381	328	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	NEW BOSTON	5,773	4,729	1,939	895	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Ohio	Air Force	NEWARK	8,019	8,312	144	437	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
New York	Air Force	NIAGARA FALLS	9,892	10,608	517	1,233	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	Air Force	NIKOLSKI RADIO RELAY STATION	14,949	16,586	388	2,025	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	NORTH RIVER RADIO RELAY STATION	9,073	8,023	751	(299)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	NORTON	12,102	12,265	339	502	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Nebraska	Air Force	OFFUTT	82,876	69,197	2,393	(11,286)	No explanation required.
Illinois	Air Force	OHARE	24,685	29,146	130	4,591	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	11,636	11,405	54	(177)	No explanation required.
Florida	Air Force	PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE	42,767	42,678	1,006	917	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New Hampshire	Air Force	PEASE	171,206	188,737	5,192	22,723	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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.
Colorado	Air Force	PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE	134,956	108,644	9,683	(16,629)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	PLATTSBURGH	77,550	111,712	1,301	35,463	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	POINT ARENA AIR FORCE STATION	3,039	2,865	69	(105)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT BARROW LONG RANGE RADAR	2,584	1,869	32	(683)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	POINT LAY	18,470	26,945	1,315	9,790	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Alaska	Air Force	PORT HEIDEN RADIO RELAY STATION	39,909	36,401	9,024	5,516	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	REESE	199,649	398,104	12,815	211,270	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Missouri	Air Force	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	11,286	12,673	144	1,531	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	Air Force	RICKENBACKER	7,275	10,472	210	3,407	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	ROBINS	82,680	105,132	1,207	23,659	1) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such 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	Air Force	ROME RESEARCH SITE	58,517	49,032	1,030	(8,455)	No explanation required.
New York	Air Force	ROSLYN	4,369	4,241	64	(64)	No explanation required.
California	Air Force	SAN DIEGO SPACE SURVEILLANCE FIELD STATN	897	752	262	117	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Illinois	Air Force	SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE	66,321	61,593	6,453	1,725	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.
North Carolina	Air Force	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE	16,662	15,739	541	(382)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	Air Force	SHAW AIR FORCE BASE	76,968	75,768	5,118	3,918	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Texas	Air Force	SHEPPARD	9,686	8,959	937	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	SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION	5,035	5,772	80	817	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	SUNDANCE AIR FORCE STATION	3,243	2,296	16	(931)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	TATALINA AIR FORCE STATION	27,722	27,533	393	204	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	Air Force	TED STEVENS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	21,074	18,898	346	(1,830)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	Air Force	TINKER	91,660	104,452	1,374	14,166	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE	116,202	132,325	2,431	18,554	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). 3) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	Air Force	TULELAKE OTHB RADAR SITE	108	105	125	122	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Florida	Air Force	TYNDALL	213,237	155,275	4,164	(53,798)	No explanation required.
Colorado	Air Force	USAF ACADEMY	12,881	19,568	166	6,853	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in contract or contract method.
Oklahoma	Air Force	VANCE	20,840	45,353	1,421	25,934	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
California	Air Force	VANDENBERG	212,335	198,148	23,028	8,841	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.
Wake Island	Air Force	WAKE ISLAND AIRFIELD	11,337	11,030	205	(102)	No explanation required.
Alaska	Air Force	WEST NOME TANK FARM	11,367	10,534	79	(754)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	Air Force	WESTOVER	2,935	2,728	32	(175)	No explanation required.
Missouri	Air Force	WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE	9,172	11,847	307	2,982	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	Air Force	WILLIAMS	39,478	58,410	1,040	19,972	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).
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE AIR FORCE RESERVE	3,154	2,987	158	(9)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	Air Force	WILLOW GROVE ANG	46,102	23,146	1,595	(21,361)	No explanation required.
Ohio	Air Force	WRIGHT PATTERSON	135,599	133,043	4,050	1,494	1) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model. 2) Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Michigan	Air Force	WURTSMITH	217,743	237,967	5,749	25,973	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Maryland	DLA	CURTIS BAY	2,387	3,914	132	1,659	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway 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	DLA	DD SAN JOAQUIN, TRACY FACILITY	13,765	12,288	1,180	(297)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	DLA	DD SUSQUEHANNA, NEW CUMBERLAND FAC.	811	1,201	30	420	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Alaska	DLA	DLA ENERGY	3,427	2,499	155	(773)	No explanation required.
California	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	0	100	100	No explanation required.
California	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	0	68	68	No explanation required.
California	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	0	87	87	No explanation required.
New Hampshire	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	300	137	437	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
New York	DLA	DLA ENERGY	0	0	476	476	No explanation required.
Alaska	DLA	DLA PACIFIC, ARCTIC SURPLUS	1,935	1,908	74	47	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Pennsylvania	DLA	DSC PHILADELPHIA	45,429	53,480	3,473	11,524	Project Scope – Added requirements due to other site-level project change (e.g., newly discovered contaminants, increased physical dimensions of the cleanup, additional risk pathway such as vapor intrusion (that is required and initiated by DoD), change in future property reuse, site reopened to address additional risk, additional sampling).
Virginia	DLA	DSC RICHMOND	43,223	32,985	2,220	(8,018)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	AF GAT	10,213	10,187	308	282	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
Maine	FUDS	AF RADAR TRACKING STATION	5,000	6,847	242	2,089	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT 15 (NAA)	70	74	36	40	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	FUDS	AIR FORCE PLANT NO 75	30	14	21	5	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	AIR-TO-GROUND GUN RANGE PINELLAS	118	96	47	25	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	ALMADEN AIR FORCE STATION	111	17	36	(58)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	AMAKNAK	10,769	18,757	571	8,559	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 – 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	FUDS	AMCHITKA AF AUXILIARY FIELD	77,852	39,083	77	(38,692)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ANIAK ARPT	226	224	2	(0)	No explanation required.
Wisconsin	FUDS	ANTIGO AIR FORCE STATION	3,007	4,765	82	1,840	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	FUDS	ARDMORE AIR FORCE BASE	819	216	62	(541)	No explanation required.
Guam	FUDS	AREA 101	11,151	20,106	2,754	11,709	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maryland	FUDS	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND	8,197	2,764	174	(5,259)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA AF AUX FLD	35,768	57,177	73	21,482	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	ATKA CAPE KUDUGNAX	71	22	33	(16)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	ATLANTIC CITY NAS	7,901	7,958	143	200	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oklahoma	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO. 5	1,663	1,653	25	15	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	ATLAS MISSILE NO.7 (K06OK0407)	5,301	1,081	33	(4,187)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	ATTU ISL MIL SITES	183,556	207,093	25	23,562	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
American Samoa	FUDS	AUA FUEL FARM	7,820	13,148	2,452	7,780	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Georgia	FUDS	AUGUSTA ARSENAL DEPOT	31	146	5	120	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	FUDS	AVON PARK ARMY AIRFIELD	2,157	1,204	58	(895)	
California	FUDS	BASIC TRAINING CENTER NO. 8	131	27	109	5	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	BEALE AFB TITAN 1-A	5,387	14,367	301	9,281	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	BENEDICT FIELD	2,865	3,970	63	1,168	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	BENICIA ARSENAL	9,655	4,284	2,460	(2,911)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL AC&W STATION	3,790	2,044	58	(1,688)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BETHEL ARPT	6,494	2,146	365	(3,983)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	BIRDSBORO ARMY TANK FOUNDRY	0	10	6	16	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	BLACK HILLS ORD DPT	12,587	10,765	83	(1,739)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	BLAINE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	181,769	176,289	3,817	(1,663)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	BLUE BEACH	4,543	3,561	115	(867)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	BOARDMAN AIR FORCE RANGE	30,591	22,272	2,435	(5,884)	No explanation required.
Idaho	FUDS	BOISE ARMY BARRACKS	10,015	17,491	82	7,558	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	BORREGO SPRINGS	94,762	41,389	5,910	(47,463)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	BOSTWICK BOMB TARGET	12,450	9,407	105	(2,938)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	BOWLING GREEN GF ANX	0	382	400	782	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	BREEZY HILL ARTLY RG	21,764	21,358	12	(394)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	BROOKLEY AFB U SO ALA	7,957	6,020	39	(1,898)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	BROOKSVILLE TURRET GUNNERY RANGE	592	501	5	(86)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	BUCKLEY FIELD	3,261	47,660	250	44,649	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	BUCKROE BEACH	668	996	35	363	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).
New Jersey	FUDS	BURLINGTON AAP	1,236	877	351	(8)	
Alaska	FUDS	BURMA ROAD	20,825	41,874	7	21,056	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	FUDS	BUSHNELL ARMY AIRFIELD	1,744	1,563	27	(154)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	BUSKIN BCH-KODIAK ISL	29,932	22,052	3,143	(4,737)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	BUXTON NAVAL FACILITY	227	2,035	82	1,890	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	CAINES HEAD, FT MCGILV	134	70	5	(59)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMARILLO AIRPRT	5,872	4,590	132	(1,150)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	CAMP ADAIR/ADAIR AFS	15,154	55,363	37	40,246	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	CAMP BEALE	168,217	99,331	5,476	(63,410)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP BLANDING	90,272	60,941	71	(29,260)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP BOWIE	18,561	43,992	334	25,765	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kentucky	FUDS	CAMP BRECKINRIDGE	24,806	77,873	1,892	54,959	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP CHAFFEE	238	80	7	(151)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAMP EDWARDS	671	640	54	23	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP ELLIOT	45,770	42,248	725	(2,797)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	CAMP ELLIS MILITARY RESERVATION	12,466	9,196	551	(2,719)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	CAMP GORDON JOHNSTON	20,484	12,550	57	(7,877)	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	CAMP GRUBER	2,342	2,354	17	29	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
California	FUDS	CAMP HAAN	32	0	44	12	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	CAMP HALE	121,304	140,181	161	19,039	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Texas	FUDS	CAMP HOWZE (FELDERHOFF)	92,599	215,474	141	123,016	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	CAMP IBIS (CAMA)	2,401	2,426	86	111	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Louisiana	FUDS	CAMP LIVINGSTON	25,698	24,820	220	(658)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	CAMP LUCAS / FT BRADY TARGET RANGE	12,873	7,503	1,488	(3,882)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CAMP MAXEY	43,526	37,073	4,688	(1,765)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	CAMP O'REILLY	1,995	2,205	90	300	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arkansas	FUDS	CAMP ROBINSON/CAMP PIKE	131,649	131,381	84	(184)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO	37,324	43,391	2,655	8,722	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 – 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).
Ohio	FUDS	CAMP SHERMAN ARTILLERY RANGE	4,355	4,183	62	(110)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Texas	FUDS	CAMP SWIFT	111,978	76,414	42	(35,522)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	CAMP WHEELER	29,959	294,589	5,307	269,937	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 – 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).
Mississippi	FUDS	CAMP/FT MCCAIN	458	1,776	991	2,309	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	CANOL PIPELINE	16,229	14,586	1,632	(11)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CAPE POGE LITTLE NECK BOMB TARGET SITE	653	2,338	562	2,247	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	FUDS	CAPE PROMINENCE AWS	2,060	69	2,118	127	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE SARICHEF	2,824	2,620	50	(154)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKAK RADIO STA	13,671	7,173	4,307	(2,191)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CAPE YAKATAGA RRS	148	140	2	(6)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	CASTNER RANGE	598	492	25	(81)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CASWELL AFS Z-80	1,585	612	886	(87)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	CATON ISLAND	6,528	0	3	(6,525)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	CHARLESTON AFS	0	6,940	1,306	8,246	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 ARMY MIS PL	23,679	19,746	183	(3,750)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	CHARLOTTE NAV AMM DEPO	3,872	5,016	105	1,249	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 – 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	FUDS	CHERNOFSKI HBR SUP&STO	35,835	26,192	177	(9,466)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	CHICO ARMY AIRFIELD	498	260	207	(31)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	CHOPAWAMSIK TROOP TRAINING SITE	24,288	51,031	108	26,851	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Utah	FUDS	CLEARFIELD NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT	186	36	175	25	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	FUDS	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	6,934	4,437	387	(2,110)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	COLD BAY - FORT RANDALL	44,229	25,755	7,541	(10,933)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	COLLINSON POINT DEW	71	0	24	(47)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	CONCORDIA POW CAMP	54	0	3	(51)	No explanation required.
South Carolina	FUDS	CONWAY BMB&GUNRY RNG	15,931	49,692	150	33,911	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	FUDS	COROLLA NAVAL TARGET	1,463	4,728	5	3,270	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	FUDS	CORRY ST USN TECH TRAINING	1,352	5,322	57	4,028	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
North Carolina	FUDS	CP BUTNER TRNG CMP	204,719	208,404	73	3,758	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
South Carolina	FUDS	CP CROFT	9,195	180,603	388	171,796	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 – 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).
New York	FUDS	CP HERO	36,964	22,854	218	(13,892)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CP SIBERT	53,486	47,046	1,042	(5,398)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	CP WELLFLEET	2,284	1,076	68	(1,140)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	CRAIG AFB	448	557	62	171	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Texas	FUDS	CUDDIHY FIELD	1,257	1,688	11	442	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	87,544	103,526	4,796	20,778	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 – 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	FUDS	DAVIS AFB	113,172	91,363	241	(21,568)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	DEAL TEST SITE	0	0	86	86	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	DELAND NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	644	130	141	(373)	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	DESECHEO ISLAND	9,641	9,824	88	271	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
South Carolina	FUDS	DONALDSON AFB	10,731	10,160	1,448	877	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 – 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).
Maine	FUDS	DOW MIL AF	6,975	6,005	359	(611)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	D-Q UNIVERSITY	2,224	2,860	142	778	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	DRY CANYON ARTILLERY RANGE	9,948	37,505	74	27,631	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
North Carolina	FUDS	DUCK TARGET FACILITY	1,633	453	756	(424)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EIELSON FARM ROAD AAA SITE	682	544	22	(116)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	EKLUTNA ARMY SITES	5,350	4,947	518	115	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	ELLYSON FIELD	42	31	39	28	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).
Ohio	FUDS	ERIE ARMY DEPOT	412	494	1	83	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC S-6	1,529	2,605	55	1,131	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WAR AFB AF FAC SITE 5	1,193	4,250	94	3,151	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 1	25,293	27,906	66	2,679	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	2,193	2,068	97	(28)	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 12	1,301	3,123	75	1,898	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 2	74,067	37,344	62	(36,661)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 3	48,571	104,940	164	56,533	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).
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 4	152,281	38,943	8,521	(104,817)	No explanation required.
Wyoming	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 7	0	85	7	92	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	FE WARREN AFB FAC SITE 8	1,308	4,318	91	3,101	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).
Missouri	FUDS	FEDERAL CENTER COMPLEX	12,401	12,920	84	603	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Minnesota	FUDS	FINLAND AFS Z-69	2,032	2,437	470	875	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Texas	FUDS	FIVE POINTS OLF(TWINPARKSESTATES)	1,535	1,449	11	(75)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB	10,227	8,281	393	(1,553)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-01	7,358	3,122	1,277	(2,959)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-02	101	0	44	(57)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-05	1,629	1,503	70	(56)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-07	1,497	1,369	91	(37)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-08	549	523	67	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).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Kansas	FUDS	FORBES AFB ATLAS S-09	1,118	1,041	538	461	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).
Missouri	FUDS	FOREST PARK RECREATION CAMP	532	533	10	11	No explanation required.
Louisiana	FUDS	FORMER CAMP CLAIBORNE	31,267	30,032	127	(1,108)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	FORMER CAMP FANNIN	5,052	4,205	934	87	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 – 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).
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	FUDS	FORMER FORT SEGARRA	134	124	32	22	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	FORT BABCOCK, SITKA	4,147	2,904	63	(1,180)	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER REC/INDUSTRIAL AREAS	15,099	17,949	634	3,484	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 – 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).
Michigan	FUDS	FORT CUSTER VA AREA	5,284	5,485	89	290	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Wyoming	FUDS	FORT FRANCIS E. WARREN TAR & MANEUVER RGE	724	5,004	91	4,371	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	FUDS	FORT GLENN	293,463	245,431	5,782	(42,250)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FORT H G WRIGHT	20,027	16,369	411	(3,247)	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	FORT HANCOCK	14,733	10,139	1,155	(3,439)	No explanation required.
Arizona	FUDS	FORT HUACHUCA	19,449	19,140	73	(236)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	FORT JAY	5,491	4,667	95	(729)	No explanation required.
Delaware	FUDS	FORT MILES MILITARY RESERVATION	18,072	26,644	35	8,607	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 – 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	FUDS	FORT PICKENS	24,368	28,797	221	4,650	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	FORT ROUSSEAU, SITKA	14,000	22,056	262	8,319	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 – 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	FUDS	FORT TAYLOR	15,150	18,662	109	3,621	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Alaska	FUDS	FORT TIDBALL/LONG ISLAND	422	420	50	48	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	FUDS	FORT WARD-BAINBRIDGE ISLAND AAA BATTERY 7	0	286	12	298	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Texas	FUDS	FOSTER AIR FORCE BASE	737	523	42	(172)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	FRANKFORD ARSENAL	1,175	1,226	116	167	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).
Missouri	FUDS	FT CROWDER	6,794	6,075	53	(666)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT MYERS BOMB & GUN RANGE	6,711	2,532	153	(4,026)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	FT PIERCE NAVAL AMPH BASE	27,217	19,594	114	(7,509)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	GADSDEN ORDNANCE PLANT	31	146	4	119	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).
Montana	FUDS	GLASGOW AFB	7,996	7,834	51	(111)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	GLYNCO NAS	133	244	56	167	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA	358	318	182	142	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).
Minnesota	FUDS	GOPHER ORD PLT ROSEMOUNT	66	42	68	44	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	GOULD ISLAND NUSC	1,789	1,799	2,094	2,104	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Delaware	FUDS	GOVERNOR BACON HEALTH CENTER	40	52	6	18	No explanation required.
Oklahoma	FUDS	GR SALT PL BOMB RGE	627	604	16	(7)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	GREAT BEND A-GRND GNR Y R	5,981	3,635	17	(2,329)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	GREAT SITKIN ISL	102,615	91,768	5,816	(5,031)	No explanation required.
New Hampshire	FUDS	GRENIER MIL AF	0	0	5	5	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	GROSSE ILE NAS - NIKE D-51	5,811	6,006	242	437	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Hawaii	FUDS	HAIKU RADIO STATION	1,758	0	22	(1,736)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HAINES FAIRBANKS PIPELINE	13,957	15,307	731	2,081	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 – 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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
California	FUDS	HAMILTON ARMY AIRFIELD	3,198	28,929	1,115	26,846	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	HAMMER FIELD	298	409	308	419	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).
Louisiana	FUDS	HAMMOND BOMBING RANGE	3,837	10,969	31	7,163	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).
Mississippi	FUDS	HANCOCK CO. BOMBING & GUNNERY RANGE	432	1,898	655	2,121	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	HEEIA COMBAT TRAINING CAMP	31,956	15,515	53	(16,388)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	HERINGTON AAF	840	783	26	(31)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	HINGHAM NAD (ANNEX)	14,754	14,598	76	(80)	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	HOMERVILLE BMB&GNRY	16,837	7,146	63	(9,628)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	HOONAH RRS	74	220	100	246	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).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	HOSPITAL DUMP SITE	1,825	2,172	123	470	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).
Kansas	FUDS	HUTCHINSON NAS	3,754	3,536	35	(183)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	IL ORDNANCE PLANT (CRAB ORCHARD)	2,808	3,349	206	747	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).
New York	FUDS	IONA ISLAND NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT	14,068	4,723	659	(8,686)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	1,675	503	28	(1,144)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	JEFFERSON BARRACKS	681	654	26	(1)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KCDA NIKE BATTERY 10	363	124	216	(23)	No explanation required.
Kentucky	FUDS	KENTUCKY ORDNANCE WORKS	3,078	3,568	53	543	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Michigan	FUDS	KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE	14,137	15,392	1,438	2,693	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Arizona	FUDS	KINGMAN G TO G GUNNERY RANGE	1,620	8,127	148	6,655	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Oregon	FUDS	KINGSLEY FIRING RANGE ANNEX	1,541	757	219	(565)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	KIRKSVILLE AFS P-64	6,713	6,579	292	158	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Actual contract cost for prior or ongoing work is greater than the prior estimate. This additional cost may also be caused by changes in schedule.
New Mexico	FUDS	KIRTLAND AFB DEM BOMB RGE	1,311	1,451	113	253	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	KOBLER NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	11,859	12,025	3,100	3,266	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	KODIAK NAVY/ARMY	54,087	40,441	1,107	(12,539)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	LAKE BRYANT BOMB & GUNNERY RANGE	777	702	54	(21)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS	351	318	654	621	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Texas	FUDS	LAREDO AFB	314	327	49	62	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	FUDS	LEE FIELD	1,742	5,632	264	4,154	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 – 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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-1	705	2,149	63	1,507	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-10	5,843	8,236	843	3,236	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-4	32,937	33,253	53	369	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-6	14,413	9,869	2,960	(1,584)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-7	9,189	8,034	2,633	1,478	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-8	429	378	58	7	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AFB AF FAC S-9	1,967	3,976	60	2,069	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).
Nebraska	FUDS	LINCOLN AIR FORCE BASE	155	112	48	5	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	LOCKBOURNE AIR FORCE BASE	30,799	21,431	685	(8,683)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	LOCKPORT AFS	3,688	3,941	178	431	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Guam	FUDS	LONFIT PLANNING PROJECT	33,319	54,520	384	21,585	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	FUDS	LOR AFB LAU AX	74	2,379	37	2,342	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Ohio	FUDS	LORDSTOWN ORDNANCE DEPOT	6,663	5,406	854	(403)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	LORING AFB COMMO AX #2	33	0	91	58	No explanation required.
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1B)	308	471	1,610	1,773	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).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-1 (COMPLEX 1C)	343	1,500	103	1,260	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).
Colorado	FUDS	LOWRY AFB S-2 (COMPLEX 2C)	4,944	4,218	44	(682)	No explanation required.
Vermont	FUDS	LYNDONVILLE AIR FORCE STA	0	0	14	14	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	MACON ORDNANCE PLANT	31	146	5	120	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	MAKALAPA CRATER FORMER NAVY SALVAGE YARD	4,601	5,207	93	699	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	MANASSAS AIR FORCE COMM FACILITY	7,576	9,081	78	1,583	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Washington	FUDS	MANCHESTER ANNEX	6,838	8,575	371	2,108	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	MANTEO NAV AUX AIR ST	230	1,136	92	999	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	MARIETTA AIR FORCE STATION	5,846	6,060	78	292	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Ohio	FUDS	MARION ENGINEER DEPOT	869	773	62	(34)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	MARPI POINT FIELD	43,859	44,121	315	577	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Hawaii	FUDS	MAUI BOMBING TARGETS	6,389	6,731	38	380	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	MILL VALLEY AFB	29	0	69	40	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	MILLINGTON ORD WORKS	39	146	2	109	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	MOJAVE GUNNERY RANGE	70,493	58,485	9,995	(2,013)	No explanation required.
Alabama	FUDS	MONTGOMERY AF STATION	39	146	5	112	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).
West Virginia	FUDS	MORGANTOWN OW	20	193	1	174	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).
Tennessee	FUDS	MOTLOW RANGE	2,967	1,545	454	(968)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	MOUNT OWEN RIFLE RANGE	5,660	2,002	848	(2,810)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Massachusetts	FUDS	MOVING TAR MACH GUN RG	315	855	11	551	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	FUDS	MT.EDGE CUMBE/SITKA NOB	301	1,131	25	855	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).
Michigan	FUDS	MUSKEGON ORD PLANT	529	454	132	57	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).
North Carolina	FUDS	NAAS EDENTON	1,678	1,009	68	(601)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN BOMB STORAGE	35,373	138,899	140	103,666	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).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	NAFTAN ORDNANCE DISPOSAL	4,336	4,840	51	555	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).
Virginia	FUDS	NANSEMOND ORDNANCE DEPOT	25,759	17,077	3,220	(5,462)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NANTUCKET BCH	285	879	22	616	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).
Georgia	FUDS	NAS ATLANTA	727	644	100	17	No explanation required.
New Jersey	FUDS	NAS CAPE MAY	6,128	473	519	(5,136)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	NAV AIR STA, TONGUE POINT	7,305	8,548	2,140	3,383	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 – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AIR STATION OAKLAND	237	88	79	(70)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVAL AMMO DEPOT	9,504	7,934	707	(863)	No explanation required.
Rhode Island	FUDS	NAVAL AUX LANDING FIELD	8,365	8,708	4,331	4,674	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	4,247	2,424	236	(1,587)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION ARCATA	5,295	1,443	6,582	2,730	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION SANTA ROSA	286	775	803	1,292	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 – 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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	NAVY FUEL ANX&PIPELINE	45	0	15	(30)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NE CAPE (ST LAWRENCE ISLAND)	9,697	7,508	156	(2,033)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT	264,768	256,660	3,925	(4,183)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Nevada	FUDS	NELLIS SMALL ARMS RGE AX	36,497	50,083	217	13,803	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NETC(MELVILLE IND FAC)	3,361	3,519	39	197	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NEW CUMBERLAND ARMY DEPOT	707	843	60	196	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).
Virginia	FUDS	NEW RIVER ORDNANCE PLANT	40	6	5	(29)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NEW YORK ORDNANCE WORKS	12,654	5,394	1,715	(5,545)	No explanation required.
Maine	FUDS	NIKE 58	986	466	361	(159)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE BA-30/31 (TOLCHESTER)	130	191	43	104	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 34/35	97	56	1,326	1,285	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).
New York	FUDS	NIKE BU 51/52	3,903	2,910	782	(211)	No explanation required.
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-32 - INDIANA DUNES	4,163	5,065	1,405	2,307	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).
Indiana	FUDS	NIKE C-47 - HOBART	855	270	152	(433)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-70 - NAPERVILLE	520	476	7	(37)	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE C-80/81 - ARLINGTON	20	23	41	44	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).
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CD-78 - OXFORD	2,398	1,853	433	(112)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	NIKE CL-11 - PAINESVILLE	9	0	65	56	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	NIKE D-97 - OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	113	4,687	88	4,662	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maine	FUDS	NIKE LO-13	57	40	56	39	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).
New Jersey	FUDS	NIKE PH 58	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	NIKE PH-75/78 (MEDIA)	163	148	80	65	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).
Rhode Island	FUDS	NIKE PR-79	7,997	4,557	1,857	(1,583)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE BAY	2,998	6,010	179	3,191	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	NIKE SITE LOVE	70	68	17	15	No explanation required.
Illinois	FUDS	NIKE SL-10 - MARINE	2,249	2,373	101	225	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Maryland	FUDS	NIKE W-44 (WALDORF)	1,038	1,413	71	446	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	NIRF (UNDERSEA CENTER)	107	77	11	(19)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NOME AREA DEF REGION	1,410	1,074	329	(7)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	NORTHEASTERN INDUSTRIAL PARK	4,459	2,847	123	(1,489)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY ACS	1,552	864	5	(683)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NORTHWAY STAGING FLD	2,018	926	15	(1,077)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	NUVAGAPAK PT DEW(BAR A	71	0	6	(65)	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	OAHU ISLAND TARGET	3,816	1,745	190	(1,881)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	OAKLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	75	0	76	1	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	OCEAN CAPE RR SITE	3,899	52	21	(3,826)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-2	4,169	3,810	54	(305)	No explanation required.
Iowa	FUDS	OFFUTT AFB AF FAC S-3	12,180	20,865	373	9,058	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Alaska	FUDS	OGLIUGA ISL	4,899	2,386	89	(2,424)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	OHIO RUBBER COMPANY	2,478	1,148	149	(1,181)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	OLATHE NAVAL AIR STATION	977	831	90	(56)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	OLMSTED AFB (SUNSET ANNEX)	972	862	119	9	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	OPA LOCKA AIRPORT	2,063	729	162	(1,172)	No explanation required.
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	ORDNANCE PLAN	22,557	12,344	278	(9,935)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	ORLANDO RANGE AND CHEMICAL YARD	648	544	25	(79)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	OYSTER POINT STORAGE AREA	4,065	4,021	843	799	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	4,875	4,891	4	20	No explanation required.
Hawaii	FUDS	PAPOHAKU RANCLAND SUB	14,130	13,868	95	(167)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	PARKS AFB	8,334	11,125	940	3,731	1) Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope). 2) Standards or Regulations – 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	FUDS	PASSAGE KEY AIR-TO-GROUND GUN	928	799	36	(93)	No explanation required.
South Dakota	FUDS	PINE RIDGE GUNNERY RANGE	7,070	21,000	1,041	14,971	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Florida	FUDS	PINECASTLE JEEP RANGE	12,154	1,059	3	(11,092)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-12	3,271	0	1	(3,270)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-5	0	0	19	19	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	PLATTSBURGH ATLAS S-6	107	102	52	47	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).
Ohio	FUDS	PLUM BROOK ORD WORKS	8,127	8,688	674	1,235	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).
New York	FUDS	PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL RESEARCH CENTER	18,378	18,469	10	101	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Virginia	FUDS	PLUM TREE ISLAND RANGE	18,105	27,701	130	9,726	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).
Idaho	FUDS	POCATELLO BOMBING RANGE #3	2,421	2,996	29	604	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	POINT VICENTE MIL RES FC SITES	2,299	2,336	123	160	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Wyoming	FUDS	POLE MOUNTAIN	25,234	115,154	57	89,977	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Hawaii	FUDS	POPOKI TARGET AREA	3,140	3,164	34	58	Standards or Regulations – Regulator-driven Change – A change in the project as a result of negotiations with the regulator (e.g., new requirement imposed by the regulator that increases project scope, delay in regulatory document review or approval).
Alaska	FUDS	PORCUPINE RIVER DEW STAGING CAMP	5,989	0	5	(5,984)	No explanation required.
Washington	FUDS	PORT ANGELES COMBAT RANGE	1,722	3,152	264	1,694	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 – 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	FUDS	PORT HEIDEN	8,882	8,450	624	192	Cost Estimate Change Unrelated to Change in Scope – Change in cost estimating methodology or model.
Alaska	FUDS	PORT OF WHITTIER	230	230	20	21	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	PRATT AAF	6	6	5	5	No explanation required.
Puerto Rico	FUDS	PUERTO RICO BOMB RANGE	3,127	3,840	78	791	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUARRY DISPOSAL SITE	626	1,107	98	579	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Rhode Island	FUDS	QUONSET POINT NAS	57,800	66,214	2,647	11,061	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 – 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).
Michigan	FUDS	RACO AAF-HIAWATHA NF	3,717	4,808	433	1,524	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
New Jersey	FUDS	RARITAN ARSN-TA ED PK	12,806	10,983	501	(1,322)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Florida	FUDS	RICHMOND NAS	140	247	421	528	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).
Arizona	FUDS	SAHUARITA AFR	20,834	3,660	54	(17,120)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	SAN FRANCISCO NIKE BATTERY 08-09	60	32	290	262	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).
Puerto Rico	FUDS	SAN PATRICIO HOSPITAL	0	0	10	10	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	SANAK ISLAND ARMY AWS	7,495	4,779	74	(2,642)	No explanation required.
Florida	FUDS	SANFORD AIRPORT	1,403	1,331	89	18	No explanation required.
Michigan	FUDS	SAULT STE MARIE AFS	2,495	2,385	77	(33)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB	6	7	56	57	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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-01	1,384	2,475	173	1,264	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).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-02	360	1,944	98	1,682	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-04	3,775	3,623	140	(12)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-05	4,886	3,022	162	(1,702)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-06	6,517	5,727	163	(627)	No explanation required.
Kansas	FUDS	SCHILLING AFB ATLAS S-12	1,866	2,855	100	1,089	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).
Missouri	FUDS	SEDALIA AAF RIFLE RANGE	2,900	3,839	55	994	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Tennessee	FUDS	SEWART AFB	2,020	114	5	(1,901)	No explanation required.
Nebraska	FUDS	SIOUX ARMY DEPOT	25,281	19,650	317	(5,314)	No explanation required.
Maryland	FUDS	SOLOMONS NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE	2,359	1,176	409	(774)	No explanation required.
Arkansas	FUDS	SOUTHWESTERN PROV GROUNDS	2,548	678	28	(1,842)	No explanation required.
Tennessee	FUDS	SPENCER ARTILLERY RANGE	16,390	15,608	181	(601)	No explanation required.
District of Columbia	FUDS	SPRING VALLEY	34,982	16,862	11,034	(7,086)	No explanation required.
Vermont	FUDS	ST ALBANS AFS Z-14	54	52	44	42	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	FUDS	STARK GENERAL HOSP	1,324	1,724	90	490	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Nevada	FUDS	STEAD AFB	0	170	5	175	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 A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
New York	FUDS	STEWART AFB	8,059	5,881	2,365	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).
Kansas	FUDS	STROTHER FIELD	30	0	13	(17)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SUFFOLK COUNTY AFB	8,199	7,422	3	(774)	No explanation required.
Oregon	FUDS	SWAN ISLAND NAVAL-MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	64	33	18	(13)	No explanation required.
New York	FUDS	SWINBURNE ISL S/LIGHT	702	0	6	(696)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TANAGA ISL	40,826	41,366	245	786	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 – 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).
Northern Mariana Islands	FUDS	TANAPAG FUEL FARM	661	571	115	25	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
California	FUDS	TEMECULA BOMB TARGET #107	6,710	4,519	1,420	(771)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	TIGALDA ISLAND	131	96	69	34	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	TISBURY GREAT POND	783	868	237	322	Standards or Regulations – Regulation Change – A broad-scale or national change in regulation that impacts multiple sites (e.g., newly promulgated or modified Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement).
Pennsylvania	FUDS	TOBYHANNA ARTILLERY RANGE	4,847	2,186	469	(2,192)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	TRAVIS AFB NIKE BATTERY 10	221	108	534	421	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).
Georgia	FUDS	TRAVIS FIELD	0	211	8	219	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Maryland	FUDS	TRIUMPH EXPLOSIVES, INC.	65	62	6	3	No explanation required.
Georgia	FUDS	TURNER AIR FORCE BASE	9,287	2,157	196	(6,934)	No explanation required.
Missouri	FUDS	TYSON VALLEY POWDER FARM	18,536	1,209	146	(17,181)	No explanation required.
California	FUDS	UCSD (CAMP MATTHEWS)	18,388	35	212	(18,141)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UMIAT AFS	203,436	198,066	358	(5,012)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALAKLEET AFSTA	4,748	4,301	97	(350)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	UNALGA ISL NAV RADIO	12,472	8,596	60	(3,816)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	US EXPLOSIVES PLANT C	142	127	8	(7)	No explanation required.
Utah	FUDS	UTAH ORDNANCE PLANT	110	72	28	(10)	No explanation required.
American Samoa	FUDS	VAIPITO VILLAGE	678	111	479	(88)	No explanation required.

Appendix A: Installations and Properties Where DoD Obligated Funding in FY 2019

State	DoD Component	Installation Name	FY 2018 Cost Estimate Adjusted for Inflation (\$000)	FY 2019 Cost Estimate (\$000)	FY 2019 Funds Obligated (\$000)	Cost Estimate Change (\$000)	Reason(s)
Mississippi	FUDS	VAN DORN-ARMY TRNG CAMP	12,345	62,014	33	49,702	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	3,277	4,697	78	1,498	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).
Hawaii	FUDS	WAIKOLOA MANEUVER AREA	286,575	327,591	4,316	45,332	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 – 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).
New Mexico	FUDS	WALKER AFB	9,502	6,819	18	(2,665)	No explanation required.
Virginia	FUDS	WALLOPS FLIGHT FACILITY	31,356	28,279	250	(2,827)	No explanation required.
Massachusetts	FUDS	WATERTOWN ARSENAL	672	880	55	263	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).
Michigan	FUDS	WAUGOSHANCE POINT TARGET	1,061	241	33	(787)	No explanation required.
Texas	FUDS	WEBB AIR FORCE BASE	3,245	2,542	31	(672)	No explanation required.
North Carolina	FUDS	WEEKSVILLE NAV AIR FAC	31	146	11	126	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).
West Virginia	FUDS	WEST VIRGINIA ORD WORKS	70,090	72,099	1,902	3,911	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).
Massachusetts	FUDS	WESTOVER AFB	7,852	7,962	116	226	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).
Missouri	FUDS	WHITEMAN COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTER SITE	3,161	2,525	59	(577)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	WILDWOOD AFS	1,386	553	125	(708)	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	WILKINS AIR FORCE STATION	1,207	741	19	(447)	No explanation required.
West Virginia	FUDS	WV MANEUVER AREA/DOLLY SODS	40,364	32,038	1,488	(6,838)	No explanation required.
Alaska	FUDS	YAKUTAT AFB	5,458	4,483	1,996	1,021	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 – 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).
Utah	FUDS	YELLOW JACKET TARGET AREA	23,966	8,319	205	(15,442)	No explanation required.
Pennsylvania	FUDS	YORK NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT	125	91	53	19	No explanation required.
Ohio	FUDS	YOUNGSTOWN MUNIC AIRPORT	4,163	4,830	41	708	Project Scope – Added cleanup phases as the project progresses (e.g., feasibility study or remedial action operation added to project scope).