Fines in Gravel

Existing	Less than 12% embedded fines (<0.85 mm)
Recommendation	**Removal from Schedule L-1**; captured in other performance targets for sediment and mass wasting and hard to establish a reference condition due spatial and temporal variability of inputs in a typical stream.

CMER Summary

	Tally		Comments
SME Recommendations Consistent With Decision Criteria	Yes	10	•Memo was vague enough that you can make an argument that anything was considered. Without hearing the discussions about each topic, the extent to which things were discussed and ideas brought up and dismissed is not something we have access to for further insight. - Debbie Kay
			•Yes, it is difficult to establish a reference condition due to variability and other PTs address main concerns. Arbitrary percentages do not account for differences in watershed and its geology - such as high fines expected in Satsop. - Bill Vogel
			•Current PTs are consistent with the current state of knowledge and there is not sufficient new information to warrant revising, replacing or adding to PTs.- Harry Bell
	No	1	•Fines in gravel is obviously related to salmonid spawning habitat thus we know where in the watershed this would be applicable. - Mark Meleson
SME Recommendations consider climate change	Yes	0	
	No	10	•It is difficult to predict the effects of climate change on salmonid habitat (including fines in gravel). This could be part of an effectiveness study that focuses on potential climate change effects that would also include the assessment of other in-stream PTs. - Mark Meleson
			•Future Climate models vary for PNW (See WA state forestlands report to Legislature this session) so may explain limited to no response. - Chris Mendoza
			•Climate change could be addressed in sediment/mass wasting targets. - Debbie Kay
Assess SME Recommendation	Accept	8	•I agree with SME assessment. - A.J. Kroll
			•This would be a good question to relocate to other targets as recommended. If a good argument exists otherwise, I'm open. - Debbie Kay
			•Agree with SME assessment - Doug Martin
			•Agree with deleting this PT. Road management should be addressing the primary source of fine sediment. - Bill Vogel
			•Concur to drop from L1. This could be investigated through extensive monitoring. As stated by the SME's roads and mass wasting are the source of fines. RMAPS and the QE reports appears to be working well. We should investigate further before developing a target. The diversity across the landscape is immense and one size does not fit all conditions. - Harry Bell
	Keep Existing	1	• Imperfect data is not a reason to not measure something known to be important - Danielle Miles
	Modify Original	3	•This PT is an indirect metric of FP influence on Riparian and upland forests on the restoration on the maintenance and restoration of aquatic habitat. If this PT is to be retained, then it needs to be assessed in an in-stream effectiveness study as described in the Schedule L-1 in response to key question #2. - Mark Meleson
			•At this time I do not support removing - the original intent of this as a performance target was to capture more than sediment from roads and mass wasting. - Aimee McIntyre
			•Will need to modify other PTs that address this if removed. If keeping, slight modification from the original. - Welles Bretherton
	Modify Recommendation	0	