

**Author:** Gasper, Kenneth

**Date:** 06/06/2006

**Comment:**

Dear Mr. Clark,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the "CERCLA Five-Year Review Report for the Hanford Site," DOE/RL-2006-20, Revision 0, May 2006.

Here are my comments:

1. The Executive Summary would be more useful if it contained a summary of what was achieved in the five year period in the 100, 200, and 300 Areas in addition to what appears on page iv.

2. The Technical Assessment Summaries, Section 1.5 for the 100 Area, and Section 2.5 for the 200 Area would be more complete and more useful to the reader if they contained the level of detail (progress and

analysis) provided in the Technical Assessment Summary for the 300 Area together with its three subsections 3.5.1, 3.5.2, and 3.5.3.

3. The whole document would be more helpful if there were some discussion about:

a. What was achieved in the 5 year period versus the schedule for the 5 year period that was in place at the beginning of the 5 year period:

what was done sooner than expected, what was done as scheduled, and what took longer than scheduled.

b. The cost to achieve what was performed, versus the plan: what was done for less than plan, what was done for the planned amount, and what cost more than expected.

c. What can now be expected to be done regarding cost and schedule in the next 5 years, based upon the lessons learned in the last 5 years.

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Gasper