



Overall recommendations for RSMP funding and administration through the permits:

1. Continue to use the SWG and its technical subgroups to set priorities for expenditure of RSMP funds and to modify program details such as parameter lists and site locations. All green
 - a. The SWG has ideas for focusing future monitoring priorities, but the RSMP findings are just beginning to come in and it is too early to make major changes to the RSMP. All green
2. Maintain the current formula for level and allocation of funding RSMP contributions in the current permit. 1 orange

Discussion: Local caucus concern that regional status and trends monitoring program is reducing budget/capacity of local jurisdictions to conduct their own monitoring. Positive change that monitoring is viewed as useful and important. Federal caucus concern about increases in costs of same level of monitoring. Let elected officials know cost per capita. There may be cost savings – reflected in later recommendation.

Clarification: Numbers will be updated based on population.

Revote: All green
3. Require the cities who were new Phase II permittees for this current permit cycle to participate in S8 in the next permit and contribute to the RSMP at the same population-based proportional dollar amount as the other permittees. All green (this is two new, small cities)
4. Continue invoicing permittees in the spring of each year. All green
5. Continue to maintain funds for each of the RSMP components in separate accounts. All green
 - a. Pooled funds for S8.B Status and Trends Monitoring contributed by permittees located in Puget Sound should remain focused on Puget Sound status and trends monitoring activities. All green
6. Continue distributing and posting RSMP quarterly budget and progress reports. All green
7. Continue to use the Pooled Resources Oversight Committee (PRO-Committee) to oversee RSMP expenditures and contracting decisions. All green
8. Increase the percentage of total budget allocated for administering the RSMP from 5% to more fully reflect the actual costs, to 6% or 7%, or 1.25 FTE, as recommended by the PRO-Committee. This increased amount will not exceed 7% of the total RSMP budget. The intent is to add additional staffing to reach a total of 1.25 FTE. 1 orange

Discussion/clarification: this will come out of total RSMP budget, not an increase. Concern about how this money is spent – it is being tracked and reported to PRO-C, so we know how much it is really costing to administer the program. Ecology is contributing significant additional staff time. Some of it will continue to be a contribution.

Revote: All green

Recommendations for the S8.B Status and Trends Monitoring:

9. It is important to maintain the integrity of the regional status and trends monitoring program. This program needs to be fully funded to ensure that we can detect regional trends. All green
10. The permit needs to provide a strong, but not exclusive, incentive for permittees to participate in the pay-in approach as the primary means of funding the permit-driven regional status and trends monitoring program in Puget Sound receiving waters. 1 orange

Discussion: allowing an option 2 has been a lot more work for Ecology and with the



administrative costs locked in this can be a concern. This is a compromise alternative. Not expected to be more than a handful of permittees. Impact is not paid for by RSMP – Ecology picks this up, and WDFW has too. Can RSMP pick up these costs? Want to make this work better in the next permit. Still interested in local monitoring that complements the RSMP. Overall, keep the current approach moving forward.

Revote: All green

11. S8.B Status and Trends Monitoring “Option 2” for Puget Sound permittees needs to be better coordinated with the RSMP than what was done for the current permit. All green

a. “Option 2” needs to provide meaningful information to the RSMP. All green

b. ~~“Option 2” should be informed by the recommendations for future RSMP status and trends monitoring.~~ 1 orange

Discussion: clarification – move under #12 below. And learning from this time. Need results and findings and detailed recommendations to inform both RSMP S&T and option 2. Option 2 permittees want the same QAPP as RSMP.

12. Recommendations for future status and trends monitoring are expected in early 2017.

a. Review the existing status and trends data and strategy. All green

b. Evaluate alternative sampling designs and parameters that may be more efficient and provide information that is more specifically directed to stormwater management. All green

c. If strategic, scientifically credible changes are proposed for the approach to the ~~Puget Lowland streams~~ status and trends monitoring that result in reduced funding needs for this RSMP activity, the permit requirements should reflect those reduced costs. 1 orange

Discussion: needed clarification, per discussion above. Example: no continued monitoring of non-detect parameters. Permittees will know what the design will be in advance of making their decisions for participation in the next permit.

Revote: All green

~~c.~~ d. The study design for “Option 2” should reflect the recommendations for future RSMP status and trends monitoring.

Revote: All green

Recommendations for S8.C Effectiveness Studies:

13. The current permits’ S8.C Effectiveness Studies alternatives should be continued in the next permit. All green

Recommendations for S8.D Source Identification and Diagnostic Monitoring:

Note to readers: see revised recommendations for #15 and #16 after the initial set.

14. Ensure that permittees are required to enter IDDE information only one time in order to comply with permit requirements for real time spills and annual reporting. 1 orange

Discussion: clarification, concern that can’t be done. Ecology is going to do whatever can be done to reduce duplication of data entry. How do we get to consistent reporting guidelines? Not there yet.

Revote: All green



15. Retain a reduced S8.D to meet these objectives below on an ongoing basis: 3 orange
Incorporate objectives a&b below into this sentence rather than having them as separate subbullets.
Discussion: Caucus leads foresaw a significant reduction to focus in on this program. Didn't want to completely eliminate this as an RSMP activity. Is analysis Ecology responsibility? Consistent reporting will reduce level of effort. Shouldn't it just be an effectiveness study? Another compromise alternative. We just haven't put enough effort into this yet. Source ID and source control very important to fed and state caucuses (and enviros) as a distinct activity, and was recognized by locals as important too. Where and what are the problems, and what are you doing to address them. Different from other types of effectiveness. More "pre-effectiveness" to identify where effectiveness studies should occur. What is broader SWAMPPS component of source identification? Current work will inform future funding. Concern about adding qualifier for overfunding. Still not understanding SIDIR. Refer to caucus lead proposal for S8.D. All of the RSMP components have evolved from the 2010 Strategy. Will source control be required for Phase 2s? Clearer direction about what this \$ is used for and produces. SIDIR was sidetracked figuring out how to get the data. Want analysis to inform level of reduction.
Revote: 2 orange
Minority concern: Two local jurisdiction caucus members want to ensure this reduction is substantial.
- a. Move from anecdotes to data to set priorities on reducing sources of stormwater pollution, All green
 - ~~a.~~
 - b. Identify the best ways to solve (fix/reduce/eliminate) these problems, and All green
 - c. Use results to inform funding decisions to address common source control issues and reduce pollutants. 1 orange – probably taking this recommendation out; confusing. Discussion: Not sure what this means for this permit cycle versus the next permit cycle. Isn't this true for all of the RSMP components? Does this represent a change or something different for permittees or Ecology to do in the future? Move part of this concept to #17 – should inform effectiveness monitoring.
 - ~~e.~~
 - d. #16 Maintain only the minimum funding level needed to analyze these data. Vote: 2 orange
Discussion: clarification – not sure what minimum funding level means. This is an ongoing need. Expected to be a substantial reduction. This defines the level of reduction. Will be informed by work going on now.
Revote: All green
Despite revote, still want amount allocated to this task to be substantial reduction.
 - a. #17 Move the remainder of S8.D funds to S8.C for source control effectiveness studies. All green
 - b.
 - e. #17.a Use the S8.D analysis/information to inform our effectiveness monitoring work.
16. Use the S8.D funds for ongoing analysis and reporting on sources of pollution, including changes over time in types of sources; geographic distribution; and frequency. The amount of funding needed to do this should be determined through the analyses conducted during the remainder of this permit cycle. 3 orange



~~a. Move the remainder of S8.D funds to S8.C for source control effectiveness studies.~~

New set of S8.D Source ID recommendations for clarity of understanding and re-voting:

15. Retain a reduced scope and budget for S8.D that is focused on using source identification and diagnostic monitoring data to move from anecdotes to data to set priorities on reducing sources of stormwater pollution, and to identify the best ways to solve (fix/reduce/eliminate) these problems.
 - a. Use the S8.D funds for ongoing analysis and reporting on sources of pollution, including changes over time in types of sources; geographic distribution; and frequency.
 - b. The amount of funding needed to do this in the next permit cycle should be determined through the analyses conducted during the remainder of this current permit cycle. In the next permit cycle, maintain only the minimum S8.D funding level needed to conduct the ongoing analyses.
Minority concern: 2 local jurisdiction representatives want to ensure that this is a substantial reduction.
16. Move the remainder of the current S8.D funding allocations to S8.C for source control effectiveness studies.
 - a. Use the S8.D analysis/information to inform our source control effectiveness monitoring work.

Revote on new 15-16 above: all green

Vote on total package of recommendations: all green!