



SAFE CLEAN
WATER PROGRAM

SIP Programming

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
2025



Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs)

Current Year Budget

- Budget for current year is transferred to Project Developers subject to the Transfer Agreement

Subsequent 4 Year Projections

- Conditional funding for full Project cost
- Watershed Area Steering Committees will verify annually:
 - Project schedule, budget, scope and benefits are consistent with initial proposal
- Projects over budget, behind schedule, or reduced scope or benefits can be subject to discontinued funding

	(FY 25-26) Regional Program Budget	(FY 26-27) Projection	(FY 27-28) Projection	(FY 28-29) Projection	(FY 29-30) Projection
Infrastructure Program (not less than 85%)					
Project 1					
Project 2					
Project 3					
Project 4					
Project 5					
Scientific Studies (up to 5%)					
Special Study					
Monitoring					
Technical Resources Program (up to 10%)					
Feasibility Study 1					
Feasibility Study 2					
Feasibility Study 3					
Watershed Coordinator					
Grand Total					

Strategically planning the recommended SIP

WASCs' recommended SIP should guide towards project completion within available funding, to support the sustainability of the SCW Program.

As potential future costs have not yet been requested by project developers, SIPs do not reflect:

- Potential future O&M funding for IP Projects
- Potential future construction funding for design-only IP Projects
- Potential future design, construction, and O&M costs for TRP Projects
- Uniform cost-escalation estimates for IP Projects
 - Cost-escalation estimates vary across IP Projects and all cost-escalation estimates can be proven wrong by unexpected economic changes
- All projects may face delays that extend timelines and potentially increase budgets

- The theoretical costs to fund **all** future phases of **all** projects exceed the available revenue from the Regional Program alone. Project Developers are responsible for identifying and filling funding shortfalls for the lifespan of the project.
- WASCs therefore must evaluate how to remain flexible to future needs of efforts already underway in the Regional Program. This could include **reserving funds** or encouraging a greater commitment to leverage **match funding**.

Guidance for WASCs



1. Evaluate the uncertainty about potential future needs of projects (not just requested funding) when deliberating new requests



2. Consider reserving funding for future flexibility

3. Support project completion by prioritizing funding projects in final stages

4. Encourage or require developers to pursue leveraged funding



5. Carefully review reporting and request updates from Project Developers on progress, expenditures, and anticipated costs for future phases



6. Consider using the WASC's authority to recommend defunding projects that are at-risk or lagging in-favor of projects that can succeed with additional investments



This could be a pause for one Program Year (redistributing funds across years without changing the total ask), or a recommendation to no longer support a project with Regional Program Funds

Reserving Funds

The SIP projection for the subsequent four years remains fluid because:


- The actual revenue for subsequent years is unknown and subject to change each year due to exemptions, credits, and appeals
- Other Projects or Project Concepts may be submitted, including Projects that have advanced through the TRP
- Economic fluctuations may escalate estimated costs
- Contingencies for programmed projects may be required and/or changed

	Budget	Projections			
	FY25-26	FY26-27	FY27-28	FY28-29	FY29-30
A.1 Anticipated Annual Regional Program Funds Collected	\$17.1M	\$17.1M	\$17.1M	\$17.1M	\$17.1M
A.2 Carryover from Previous SIP	\$3.5M	\$1.4M	\$4.5M	\$17.8M	\$32.2M
A.3. Removed Projects and Unused TRP Funds ⓘ	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
A. Anticipated Regional Program Funds Available (A.1 + A.2 + A.3) ⓘ	\$20.5M	\$18.5M	\$21.6M	\$34.9M	\$49.3M
B.1 Total Allocated in Previous SIP(s)	\$17.3M	\$13.9M	\$3.7M	\$2.7M	\$400k
B.2 Total Recommendation in Current SIP	\$1.8M	\$116k	\$0	\$0	\$0
B. Total Allocated and Recommendation in SIP (B.1 +B.2) ⓘ	\$19.1M	\$14M	\$3.7M	\$2.7M	\$400k
C. Carryover in Current SIP (A - B)	\$1.4M	\$4.5M	\$17.8M	\$32.2M	\$48.9M
D. Percent Allocated (B / A) ⓘ	93%	76%	17%	8%	1%

To mitigate this uncertainty, WASCs should consider reserving 20% of the available funding in any given program year to provide flexibility, increasingly over time, to manage for uncertainty and prioritizing project completion.


Leveraging Funds

- The SCW Program Goals emphasize the need to leverage other funding sources to **maximize the impact** of the SCW Program
- WASCs must delineate between the projects that will proceed to (or continue with) construction and/or O&M phases via SCWP funds and which will need to **rely on leveraged funds**
- SCWP leverage funding resources:
 - Watershed Coordinators - Technical Assistance
 - Regional Coordination - Quarterly Funding Memos and Funding Database



SIP Tool Integration

Similar to previous years, the SIP Planning Tool has a long-term planning scenario to help WASCs consider the needs of possible returning projects.



The screenshot shows the SIP Planning Tool interface. At the top, there are three dropdown menus: 'Select Watershed Area' (set to 'Central Santa Monica Bay'), 'Select Call for Projects' (set to 'FY25-26'), and 'Funding Scenarios'. The 'Funding Scenarios' dropdown is open, showing a list of options: 'All Considered Projects', 'Baseline', 'All Considered Projects', 'Shared', 'All Considered Projects + Washington PMR', and 'All Considered Projects + Potential Future IP Costs'. The last option is highlighted with a yellow box. Below the dropdown, the text 'Stormwater Investment Review' is visible. At the bottom, there is a table with columns for 'Budget' and 'Projections' (FY25-26, FY26-27, FY27-28, FY28-29, FY29-30).

- Potential future scenarios include various estimations such as construction, O&M, and inflation costs
- Potential future scenarios assume 50% cost share for estimated IP construction costs

FY25-26 SIP

Preparation for SIP Deliberation

The WASC has a variety of tools and resources available to assist with SIP deliberations including: [SIP Tool](#), meeting minutes, presentation slides, applications, SS peer review summaries, PMRs, and more

In advance of SIP Deliberations:


- A Summary of Resources document is posted on the WASC events webpage and shared with the WASC
- When applicable, WASC members are asked to rank project submissions and PMRs
- Applicants, PMR and continuing Project Developers are invited to answer questions, if needed



FY25-26 SIP Requirements

Percent allocations for each project type are evaluated over a rolling 5-yr period each year.

- At least 85% for IPs (based on total **funding allocated** over 5-year period)
- No more than 10% for TRPs (based on annual **revenue generated** by Watershed Area over 5-year period)
- No more than 5% for SS (based on annual **revenue generated** by Watershed Area over 5-year period)



Required Disadvantaged Community Ratio

- At least 110% of the ratio of the disadvantaged community population to the total population in each Watershed Area
- WASCs can determine disadvantaged community benefits on a project-by-project basis

All Projects 5-Year Distribution	
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY (DAC) ALLOCATION	
Required DAC Ratio	30%
Required Funding for DACs FY25-30 (110%)	\$15,082,526
Funding Allocated for DACs FY25-30	\$17,037,385

FY25-26 SIP

Outcome of SIP Deliberation

Based on all information available, WASC priorities, and funding availability, the WASC has the discretion to:

1. Program newly submitted concepts and studies
2. Program some or no additional funding requests per PMR
3. Reallocate annual funding projections
Note: Public Works staff reached out to Developers to confirm annual funding allocations
4. Omit from recommended SIP any continuing projects that no longer meet SCWP goals as approved in previous adopted SIP

FY25-26 SIP

- All SIPs, once approved by the WASCs, are reviewed by the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) for achievement of program goals.
 - ROC can elect to return a SIP with comments to a WASC for further deliberation, or...
 - ROC can submit the SIPs to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for action.

Thank you

QUESTIONS?

Contact

www.SafeCleanWaterLA.org

SafeCleanWaterLA@pw.lacounty.gov

833-ASK-SCWP