Things I would most want to change

Code	Statement of change	#
1	Process for coordination/compromise	**9**
2	More funding/research on impacts of dredging on resources	**8**
3	More site specific information on resources	**7**
4	More attention to cost minimization, consideration of impact of windows	**4**
5	More attention to impact minimization, environmental concerns higher priority	**3**
6	More flexibility in application of windows, fine tuning for specific projects (see MA)	**7**
7	More specific information in project plans/after projects completed	**2**
8	More specific criteria/protocol for windows	**3**

4	common sense - an area that is less than 1% of a waterbody will not impact anymore than allowed traditional fishing etc to goes on
2 1	Reach a memorandum of understanding about the responsibility for scientific information Create a process that facilitates compromise on project requirements and resource risk
5 8	Addressing cumulative impacts; Increased consistency and transparency with methodology impacts, resource assessments
2 3	There can obviously be more research into the effects of dredging on aquatic resources and site specific evaluations of resource utilization is needed. However, there is adequate information in the scientific literature to understand dredging impacts are adverse to aquatic organisms. A review of the literature supports that statement. We can debate the magnitude of the impacts at the organism level, subpopulation and population level; however, it takes significant funding to support these research questions and, in many cases, we will probably never have the funding that is needed to conduct a site assessment at the level needed for every existing and future dredging project in country. We need to accept that in many cases, inference of adverse impacts will occur and a risk averse approach will be have to be accepted. Everyone needs to start asking questions about who will pay for the research needed. While I am an advocate of additional research in this field, there has to be an appreciation that until this research can be funded and carried out the dredging windows are the one of the best tools managers have to minimize adverse effects during sensitive periods. Time of year windows don't avoid impacts to aquatic resources, and they certainly don't avoid impacts to the habitats, but they do minimize them during sensitive periods. I think the body of research in this area supports that.
2,3 5	1. More and better site specific data collection and impacts related studies 2. More cooperation by dredging proponents to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts and better project (time and contract) management
6 4	Using the default of the most restrictive window. Resource agencies minimizing the effect of windows on cost and feasibility.

6 2	They are applied the same for all projects, no flexibility. Windows based on more research of dredging impacts.
5 2	A change in policy to move environmental concerns from the bottom of the evaluation hierarchy to the top. More scientifically-sound field studies of dredging and more support for the collection of baseline reosurce and habitat data.
7	In applications, include better descriptions of the type of dredge equipment that may be used and operational details as they relate to resources at risk. For example, if a conventional or environmental clamshell bucket is to be used, include the size of bucket, number of barges, provide estimate of average production rate, time to fill barge, time to dispose and return, characteristics of sediment plume that may be produced by that operation under idealized conditions, and how site characteristics might affect that idealized plume. This would give some idea of the area and duration of plumes that would help resource managers evaluate potential risks. Or provide managers with the tools (simple models) to model plumes themselves, but the necessary inputs, such as sediment characteristics, would have to be provided in the application.
1 2	Develop a regional interagency framework/agreement at the policy level for how technical staff should approach windows.Improvement to knowledge on basic life history (e.g., distribution, abundance, habitat usage) of the primary species of interest.
? 4	1. The chicken or the egg principle, if there is no beach there is no breeding habitat, so which is more important? 2. Windows are so broad they have essentially limited dredging to the winter months, creating more costly and more dangerous work.
3 1	More site specific information on the resources in the area. More interagency coordination on dredging projects and windows. The model used for the NY Harbor deepening is a good example, but it requires staff time that most agencies do not have
4 1	1. Pending any data illustrating the species specific impacts of dredging, more informed decisions regarding restrictions of individual projects. 2. Increased coordination between regulatory agencies involved with a specific project.
2 6	1). More research to answer basic questions on suspended sediment impacts to various resources. 2). More willingness on resource managers to look at projects on a case-by-case basis.
1 2	entrenched assumptions; proven models
6 1	More tailoring of a window to the project, species, and water body, the way that Mass is trying to do it. More thinking and less shouting about windows decisions. Bonus opinion: we should probably not call them windows, because nobody can remember if those are times when you can dredge, or when you cannot dredge....
6 3	Better determination of when specific impacts are reduced to an "acceptable"(what ever that is) level Better resource data for specific localities
1 1	1) Improved applicant scheduling and contracting processes so that projects have a better chance of being completed within a TOY restriction. 2) Better communication between resource agencies (state and federal) in order to minimize confusing TOY recommendations.
8	1. Having an established set of criteria which can be used to support changes to timing restrictions in a fast and efficient manner.
6 8	1. Flexibility needs to be added for state regulators to shift windows based on data collected or known species characteristics. This also requires the resources to look for alternative windows that may provide an increased level of protection based on a project specific plan. 2. Stream-lined protocol for developing windows and modifying them as necessary to accomodate local information or knowledge. This wouldn't necessarily result in less protection since it might provide quicker response to managing resources associated with dredging, and provide more on-point protection at less expense.

?	Less rigidity about when the dredging equipment will be available. Often the interested parties are told the equipment is only available at a certain time so if you want the work done that is when it will happen regardless of windows.
7	I would like reports from the dredging people to resource managers on when the dredge was operating , where , and any difficulties they encountered. This could be in the form of a final report or weekly comments. It doesn't have to be very elaborate, but would allow people to compare areas in the vicinity to areas outside of the influence of the dredging
3	During a project, monitoring for presence of target migratory species or environmental target, for instance temperature, as a way to set a start or end date with actual data.
6	Windows seem to be too broad. Need to set window based on each specific project.
1	An enhanced recognition that flexibility and respect for each others positions is key to the process.
3	The ability to establish windows based on site specific data and latest scientific knowledge, taking into account overall project benefits, costs, schedules and impacts to resources.
3	More site specific work to identify