



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.
 - 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.
2. Maintain the current level and allocation of funding in the current permit.
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.
4. Continue invoicing permittees in the spring of each year.
5. Continue to maintain funds for each of the RSMP components in separate accounts.
 - 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.
6. Continue distributing and posting RSMP quarterly budget and progress reports.
7. Continue to use the Pooled Resources Oversight Committee (PRO-Committee) to oversee RSMP expenditures and contracting decisions.
8. Increase the percentage of total budget allocated for administering the RSMP from 5% to 6% or 7%, or 1.25 FTE, as recommended by the PRO-Committee.

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.
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.
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.
 - a. "Option 2" needs to provide meaningful information to the RSMP.
 - b. "Option 2" should be informed by the recommendations for future RSMP status and trends monitoring.
12. Recommendations for future status and trends monitoring are expected in early 2017.
 - a. Review the existing status and trends data and strategy.
 - b. Evaluate alternative sampling designs and parameters that may be more efficient and provide information that is more specifically directed to stormwater management.
 - 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.

Recommendations for S8.C Effectiveness Studies:

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



Recommendations for S8.D Source Identification and Diagnostic Monitoring:

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.
15. Retain a reduced S8.D to meet these objectives on an ongoing basis:
 - d. Move from anecdotes to data to set priorities on reducing sources of stormwater pollution,
 - e. Identify the best ways to solve (fix/reduce/eliminate) these problems, and
 - f. Use results to inform funding decisions to address common source control issues and reduce pollutants.
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.
17. Move the remainder of S8.D funds to S8.C for source control effectiveness studies.