

## 5. In what areas is stakeholder acceptance at risk and how is this addressed?

- Good job with Phase 1 engagement – real changes to design.
- Need acronym guide & definitions: CMS, CSM, CMI, etc.
- Stakeholders “patience” for a long-term solution?
- What is process for resolving potential conflicts between regulatory requirements and stakeholder acceptance (Phase 2 & beyond)?
- Possible inherent conflict between Mg remediation and habitat protection, since higher Hg levels in forested areas. Hope for more “Constitution Parks.”
- “Contiguous” landowner acceptance

## 6. How can we improve the adaptive management approach for the river remedy?

- Seems likely to be effective.
- More explicit indication of how unexpected outcomes from the adaptive management approach will be used to inform Phase II.
- Integrate Relative Risk/Other models.
- Anticipate regulatory uncertainty in meshing remedial actions/monitoring with regulatory outcomes. Right now, it is collaborative, but regulatory process also demands particular outcomes. What is the end game?
- Anticipate that chasing down later increments of reduction will be more difficult/expensive.

# Cost of Remedial Outcomes

