

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: 9V Oper costs for new capital projects
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

This package requests federal spending authority and state matching funds for the operations and maintenance costs of the new Pierce County Readiness Center. This will be a 50/50 shared expense between state and federal.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	67,788	67,788	135,576
001-2 General Fund - Basic Account-Federal	67,788	67,788	135,576
Total Cost	135,576	135,576	271,152

Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	1.0	1.0	1.0

Revenue		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Fund</u>	<u>Source</u>			
001 General Fund	0312 Dept of Defense	67,788	67,788	135,576
Total Revenue		67,788	67,788	135,576

Package Description:

The new Regional Pierce County Readiness Center is 50% federally funded and 50% state funded and will be built at Camp Murray at the former CSMS site and open in June of 2016. It will provide office space, drill floor and storage for assigned troops. It will initially draw soldiers from Boeing Field and Port Orchard, however both those facilities will continue to operate. It will provide new usable areas in excess of 80,700 square feet. This center will provide highly efficient and environmentally friendly mechanical and HVAC systems. It will provide several innovative and green technologies qualifying the facility to be LEED silver rated.

Included in the request is the need for one additional Maintenance Mechanic 2.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Agency expects the new facility to be maintained in good operating condition. New facilities take about a year of operation to smooth out all the details, identify warranty issues and maximize operating efficiencies.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: A029 Facilities Management

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Washington Military Strategic Plan Goal 1: Emergency Preparedness, and Goal 5: Modernization of Facilities, Equipment and Systems to increase capabilities to secure Washington State against acts of terrorism and man-made or natural disasters. To strengthen and unify Washington Military Department business processes to maximize efficiency and effectiveness while maintaining flexibility to adapt to a rapidly changing environment. The Pierce County Readiness Center will be a key regional facility for the Pierce and Thurston Counties supporting the overall strategic plan and mission.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The Governor's priority to provide for Healthy and Safe Communities is dependent on having properly maintained National Guard facilities throughout the state in case of terrorist attacks and natural or man-made disasters.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The National Guard will use this facility to improve the safety and preparedness of their personnel to respond to state and national emergencies.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The alternative option would be to try and maintain old, outdated armories. This is costly and not efficient for the National Guard mission. This facility will maximize regional potential for National Guard deployment while being at the headquarters location at Camp Murray.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Not funding this package will result in other facility maintenance being reduced to cover these costs. Facilities maintenance will be delayed to a point where it will cost more in repair costs to restore them to a useable level than it would have been to properly maintain the facilities.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Building maintenance and labor costs are figured using the nationally accepted Building Operators and Managers Association (BOMA) industry standard of \$1.68 per sq ft per year for labor and maintenance. Labor is figured at one Maintenance Mechanic 2 at \$56,216 and operating costs of \$79,361.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These costs are ongoing and are routine operating and facility maintenance costs.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	42,588	42,588	85,176
B Employee Benefits	13,628	13,628	27,256
E Goods\Other Services	79,361	79,361	158,722
Total Objects	135,577	135,577	271,154

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: AB Disaster Recovery
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

Funds are required to administer the recovery efforts from ten presidentially declared disasters in Washington state: 1) November 2006 Severe Storms and Floods, 2) December 2006 Windstorm, 3) December 2007 Severe Storms and Floods, 4) December 2008 Severe Winter Storms and Record Snow, 5) January 2009 Severe Storms and Floods, 6) January 2011 Severe Storms and Floods, and 7) January 2012 Severe Winter Storms and Floods, 8) 2012 Ferry and Colville Storms, 9) 2014 Oso Landslide and 10) 2014 Central Washington Fires. Funding is necessary to complete the projects under the Public Assistance Program and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
05H-1	Disaster Response Account-State	7,436,000	7,436,000	14,872,000
05H-2	Disaster Response Account-Federal	23,202,000	23,201,000	46,403,000
Total Cost		30,638,000	30,637,000	61,275,000
Staffing		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs		21.0	21.0	21.0
Revenue				
<u>Fund</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
05HDisaster Response	0397 Homeland Security	23,202,000	23,201,000	46,403,000
Total Revenue		23,202,000	23,202,000	46,403,000

Package Description:

This decision package supports continued administration of the Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Grant Program activities required in the recovery phase of ten open Presidentially declared disasters: 1) November 2006 Severe Storms and Floods, 2) December 2006 Windstorm, 3) December 2007 Severe Storms and Floods, 4) December 2008 Severe Winter Storms and Record Snow, 5) January 2009 Severe Storms and Floods, 6) January 2011 Severe Storms and Floods, and 7) January 2012 Severe Winter Storms and Floods, 8) 2012 Ferry and Colville Storms, 9) 2014 Oso Landslide and 10) 2014 Central Washington Fires. The funding is required for completion of open projects and close out of the grants. Requirements for staffing, workload and other costs are based upon estimated timeframes for project monitoring, project completion, financial reviews, final inspections, and closure. The Military Department is the state administrative agent for federal recovery funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Federal funds require a 25 percent non-federal match for both the Public Assistance Program and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

During the recovery phase of a disaster the Public Assistance Program provides funds for debris removal, emergency measures, as well as the repair of public infrastructure damaged by the disaster within the declared incident period. The eligible infrastructure is owned

by state, local, and tribal governments, and certain private nonprofit organizations. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program provides funding to local jurisdictions and state agencies to prevent or minimize the effects of future disasters. Without continued funding, further delays will occur for communities and state agencies trying to recover from the effects of these disasters and will leave them more vulnerable to future disasters.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Public safety is enhanced with projects completed under the Hazard Mitigation and Public Assistance Grant Programs. Statewide emergency readiness and recovery efforts after a disaster help protect the citizens of the state as well as aid recovery from economic losses incurred. The Public Assistance Program provides funds for debris removal, emergency measures, and to repair or replace public infrastructure rendered unsafe by a disaster. The infrastructure can be owned by the state, local, tribal governments, and certain private nonprofit organizations. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program provides funding to local jurisdictions and state agencies to prevent or minimize the effects of future disasters. Excellent customer service is required to effectively assist localities affected and recovering from the disasters in maximizing the funding and benefits of these disaster assistance grant programs.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A027 Disaster Response and Recovery**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes, this decision package supports the agency's strategic goal of Emergency Preparedness to minimize the impact of natural disasters and other emergencies on the people, property, environment and economy of Washington State.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Yes, this package supports the Governor's priority for Healthy and Safe Communities by supporting current disaster recovery efforts of local jurisdictions and state agencies as well as improving statewide ability to respond to future natural disasters.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

All state agencies, local jurisdictions, tribal entities, and many private non-profit organizations affected by the disasters are impacted by this funding. The disaster recovery effort provides management of two disaster recovery programs for ten open presidentially declared disasters as well as a pending disaster declaration, including damage and recovery efforts for state agencies and local jurisdictions. If funding is not received projects will not be completed and state agencies will not be reimbursed for recovery and mitigation costs incurred.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

There are no alternatives available. The Department as the administrative agent for these federal funds must continue to manage and pass funding through to all eligible applicants until all projects are completed.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Following all federal disaster declarations, the Governor signs a FEMA State Agreement that defines the cost share the state will contribute to the recovery efforts. The commitments made by the Governor in the FEMA State Agreements for these major disaster declarations include a 25 percent non Federal share as required by the Stafford Act along with the duty to pass through the federal funding to eligible applicants. Non funding would cease recovery activities, eliminating the federal funding for projects currently

underway and would eliminate the ability of the Military Department to manage the disaster recovery programs for public entities.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Salaries and benefits are calculated using the Salary Projection System in BASS. Goods and services and travel for staff are based on historical experience or agency standards per FTE.

Requirements for staffing, workload and other costs are based upon estimated timeframes for project monitoring, project completion, financial reviews, final inspections, and closure. Federal funds from FEMA require a 25 percent non federal match for the Public Assistance Program and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. The commitments made by the Governor in the FEMA State Agreements for these major disaster declarations include a 25 percent non Federal share as required by the Stafford Act. The state funds requested in this package support the 25 percent share for state agencies and a 12.5 percent State share for local jurisdictions completing their disaster repairs and mitigation projects. The federal spending authority is to pass through the funds from FEMA to eligible applicants.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The February 2006 Severe Storms and Floods closed in SFY 2014. The November 2006 Severe Storms and Floods, December 2006 Windstorm, December 2007 Severe Storms and Floods, December 2008 Severe Winter Storms and Record Snow, January 2009 Severe Storms and Flooding, January 2011 Severe Storms and Floods, 2012 Ice Storms, and 2012 Ferry Colville Storms are expected to close within the 2015-2017 Biennium. The 2014 Oso Landslide and 2014 Central Washington Fires are expected to close within the 2017- 2019 Biennium. All cost estimates are specific to the current disasters and the level of work related to disasters over time have been fairly stable.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	933,000	934,000	1,867,000
B Employee Benefits	334,000	335,000	669,000
E Goods\Other Services	28,000	29,000	57,000
G Travel	76,000	77,000	153,000
J Capital Outlays	15,000	10,000	25,000
N Grants, Benefits & Client Services	29,066,000	29,066,000	58,132,000
T Intra-Agency Reimbursements	186,000	186,000	372,000
Total Objects	30,638,000	30,637,000	61,275,000

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: AC Non-Disaster Mitigation Grants
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

This decision package requests funding to support Federal Non Disaster Mitigation grants. The Military Department is the state administrative agency for federal hazard mitigation grants awarded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Department passes on non-disaster mitigation grant funds awarded to local communities and state agencies. Funds awarded to the Department are used to support the development and review of local mitigation plans and grant applications, to provide technical assistance to local communities, and manage the grant programs.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1	General Fund - Basic Account-State	50,846	50,846	101,692
001-2	General Fund - Basic Account-Federal	6,059,688	8,216,794	14,276,482
Total Cost		6,110,534	8,267,640	14,378,174
Staffing		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
	FTEs	2.2	2.2	2.2
Revenue				
<u>Fund</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001	General Fund 0397 Homeland Security	6,059,688	8,216,794	14,276,482
Total Revenue		6,027,854	8,173,627	14,201,481

Package Description:

The Military Department is the state administrative agency for grants from the Department of Homeland Security Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). We anticipate receipt of awards on behalf of local jurisdictions and state agencies for the Pre-Disaster Mitigation and Flood Mitigation Assistance programs, and we have ongoing grant awards Severe Repetitive Loss programs; each of the programs is described below. The grants to the Military Department provide funding for technical assistance, review mitigation plans, and project and grant management.

Pre Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program: The intent of PDM is to provide a source of funding to states, communities and Indian tribes for mitigation projects designed to reduce injuries, loss of life, and damage and destruction to property as a result of natural hazards. The Military Department has open PDM program management grants for which a 25% state match is required.

Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program: The FMA grant program provides funding to states, Indian tribes and communities for planning and projects that reduce or eliminate the long term risk of flood damage to structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The Military Department has open PDM program management grants for which a 25%

state match is required.

Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) program: The SRL program provides funding to reduce or eliminate the long term risk of flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program and that will result in the greatest savings to the National Flood Insurance Fund. The Military Department has an open SRL program management grant for which a 10% state match is required.

These grant programs promote the implementation of activities designed to reduce injuries, loss of life, and damage and destruction to property from natural hazards. As the State Administrative Agency for federal mitigation grant programs, the Military Department solicits applications from local communities and Indian tribes and submits them to FEMA on their behalf and receives notification of and administers grant awards by providing pass through funds.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

By implementing the mitigation planning initiatives and mitigation projects funded by these federal grant programs, local communities and Indian tribes receiving grants will improve their resistance to and reduce their costs of any future disasters impacts to public infrastructure, health and safety.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: A013 Hazard Mitigation (Supports Prevention)

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes, this package is essential to implement the Military Department's Strategic Plan Goal of Emergency Preparedness to reduce the loss of life and property by lessening the impact of potential Washington State disasters.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Yes, this package supports the Governor's priority to Healthy and Safe Communities, specifically, to reduce preventable loss of life, injury or property. Implementing projects that reduce human suffering and property damage allows communities and tribes to improve their preparedness for, as well as reduce the time it will take to recover from, the next disaster event.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Mitigation projects are completed in an effort to reduce the potential impacts from future disasters. Given this goal, it is anticipated that the impact of future natural disasters, particularly those in flood prone areas, should be reduced, thereby reducing the financial burden on the local and state budgets. FEMA estimates that for every one dollar spent on mitigation, four dollars are saved on future disaster response and recovery. This 4:1 benefit-cost ratio makes our mitigation programs valuable components of our overall emergency management strategies. Additionally, the technical assistance provided by the Military Department increases the capacity and ability of local jurisdictions and Indian tribes to develop mitigation plans and projects that will reduce their vulnerability to future disasters.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

Without federal funding and federal spending authority, these identified plans and projects will not be completed.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Not funding this package would prevent local communities and Indian tribes from completing work on mitigation planning initiatives and mitigation projects for which they have received federal grant funding and prolong their vulnerability to natural hazards. Additionally, it would not allow the Military Department to provide funding to applicants who are successful in obtaining federal grant awards during this biennium.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Salaries and benefits are calculated using the Salary Projection System in BASS. Personal Contracts, goods and services and travel for staff are based on historical experience.

The pass-through funds are based on the actual and projected award of funds in the 2015-2017 biennium.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The federal grant awards are one time expenditures for specific scopes of work as defined in the grant application and grant agreement between the Military Department and the applicant. These grant programs are offered on an annual basis by FEMA; therefore, federal spending authority for future awards will be required in the 2017-2019 biennium and beyond.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	146,748	191,368	338,116
B Employee Benefits	41,132	53,626	94,758
C Professional Svc Contracts	37,625	46,124	83,749
E Goods\Other Services	4,704	6,121	10,825
G Travel	12,588	16,384	28,972
N Grants, Benefits & Client Services	5,828,891	7,903,837	13,732,728
T Intra-Agency Reimbursements	38,846	50,180	89,026
Total Objects	6,110,534	8,267,640	14,378,174

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: AD E911 Modernization to NG911
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Military Department submits this Maintenance Level decision package to address the increased costs of operating Washington State's Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG911) network. This statewide network, which comprises Washington's Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet), connects all people of Washington State with the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP) and emergency first responders throughout the entire state.

In addition, this decision package addresses the need to maintain some legacy elements of the outdated 911 network which must remain in place until such time that all Washington State Counties, and Washington State Patrol PSAPs are fully modernized with NG911 compatible equipment.

This decision package proposal will complete a major milestone in the state's ongoing transition to NG911. Through continued modernization of our ESInet, Washington State will be positioned to accept and route FCC-mandated "Text-to-911" messages in addition to all forms of 911 voice calls. This is made possible by connecting PSAPs with modern NG911 phone systems directly to the NG911 network through a direct Internet Protocol (IP) connection. To ensure the safety and integrity of PSAPs as they connect digitally to the network, this proposal also affords the active monitoring measures, that safeguard against existing and future cybersecurity threats.

These actions improve the safety and security of the people of Washington State through increased resiliency, usability, and reliability of the Washington State 9-1-1 system.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
03F-1 Enhanced 911 Account-State	3,164,000	3,164,000	6,328,000
Total Cost	3,164,000	3,164,000	6,328,000

Package Description:

Current Situation

Beginning in 2009, the state of Washington embarked on a modernization initiative for our statewide 911 system. The transition to NG911 began with the necessary modernization of the statewide 911 network, to move away from the legacy analog 911 telephone network, to a digital ESInet ready to handle modern forms of communication (digital voice, text and imagery). One of the major benefits of NG911 in Washington State is to enable callers to send text messages, photos, and other media, beyond just the voice calls we have today. To date, a great amount of work has been done to ensure that the new digital 911 network is sufficiently sized (bandwidth), reliable and ready to accept other forms of media when available. As anticipated, Washington's NG911 network is significantly more costly than the traditional legacy network, due to it's increased size and capabilities. It was also necessary that during the transition to the new network that we ensure that there is no loss of the ability to receive traditional 911 calls. As most of the state's 69 primary PSAPs still have legacy analog telephone equipment, the state is forced to maintain some legacy elements of the old network until such time that the entire state is fully modernized.

This situation results in even higher network costs until such time that all PSAPs are ready to operate fully on the new network with modernized equipment. These new network costs have pushed the State E911 Coordinator's Office baseline operation costs well beyond the office's current baseline spending authority of \$39,672,000 (SFY 2013-15).

It is projected that the State E911 Office will require an additional \$6,328,000 for increased network costs, which include legacy elements such as traditional phone line circuits, and legacy Automatic Location Information (ALI) database costs - {the information that the 911 system uses to locate callers}. This will result in a total of \$46,000,000 in baseline operating expenses in the FY 2015-17 biennium, based on current and projected costs of the network. The current cost of just the legacy technology based ALI system exceeds \$5,000,000 per calendar year. It is anticipated that the NG911 ALI system will operate at a reduced cost in future biennia once the system and all related components are fully modernized.

Proposed Solution

The State E911 Coordinator's Office is responsible for:

- Ensuring the availability of statewide 911 dialing (Provision of the Washington State 911 Network to include Cyber Security components)
- Ensuring that all Washington State Counties can provide a basic level of 911 service (Financial support to less populace counties)
- To assist with the modernization of PSAP equipment (Financial support to all counties as necessary)

In order to coordinate these activities, this funding request is to increase the State E911 2015-17 biennium baseline spending authority by \$6,328,000 to cover the projected 911 network costs in this ML.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The modernization of 911 telephone equipment statewide by all counties will allow for the decommissioning of the remaining legacy components of the statewide 911 network. Additionally, it will provide primary PSAPs with current reliable telephone equipment capable of receiving digital voice, text messaging, and eventually - imagery. Funding of the cybersecurity measures will result in the 911 network being resilient in the face of real cybersecurity threats, through prevention of active threats and through timely notification of attempted disruptions of the network so that immediate protective measures can be enacted system-wide.

Specific Benefits:

1. Increase the number of PSAPs with NG911 compatible telephone equipment from 8 to 69 by June 30, 2017.
2. Implement full and active cybersecurity network protective measures for all PSAPs connected to the Washington State 911 Network by July 31, 2016 (resulting from ongoing Cyber Security Assessment in SFY15)
3. Terminate remaining legacy network infrastructure by June 30, 2017.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

A028 Enhanced 911

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

This package addresses the Military Department's Strategic Plan for Emergency Preparedness: To increase the number of counties that fully implement NG911 from 0 38 by December of 2018. Which increases the agency's capabilities to save lives, protect property and the environment and meet basic human needs after an incident has occurred..

September 17, 2014

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Yes, Goal #4 Healthy and Safe Communities. The modernization of the State's 911 system is a critical element of public safety statewide. It provides the critical infrastructure for a robust statewide public safety network enterprise.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Impact on clients and services:

The impact is positive. All of the state's residents are dependent on the emergency services accessed through the state 911 system. The Washington State 911 system is the only direct link between the people of this state and the emergency responders. Increasing the usability and reliability of the 911 system has and will save lives. The April 2014 E911 outage we experienced was the direct result of a legacy 911 requirement. Had we been fully NG911 capable, the outage would not have occurred.

Impact on other state programs:

The impact on other state programs would be positive in that the 911 system links the people of Washington State with the myriad of emergency response agencies statewide. This includes the Washington State Patrol, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Department of Health to name a few. Additionally, the Washington State Patrol operates four (4) primary PSAPs within the state, and is a direct recipient of State 911 program support.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The only alternative available is to delay the modernization of the system, which will significantly increase the costs and potentially place Washington citizens at greater risk.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

If not funded, this will result in higher costs to the state as we maintain disparate network components to support both the old legacy and NG911 systems statewide until all systems are modernized and we can decommission and remove the obsolete legacy components. Additionally, modernization will be delayed and personal and property safety could be compromised as funds intended for PSAP equipment modernization will be diverted to pay for the higher network costs.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None are anticipated. RCWs and WACs provide for the basis of the 911 enterprise.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Object N provides for the costs of the Washington State 911 Network, and the costs of implementing necessary network cybersecurity measures.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

Statewide network costs for the 911 system are ongoing and will have impact to future biennia. Initial equipment modernization costs are a one time cost. However, the state 911 program will need to assist lower income counties with eventual equipment life cycle replacement costs in future biennia.

Below are estimated ending fund balances for E911 for 2013-2015 and 2015-2017.

SFY 2013-15 Expenditure and Revenue Calculations and Assumptions

Beginning Fund Balance – 03F E911	16,594,363	As of 7/1/13
Est'd Current Fund Balance	17,746,835	As of 6/30/14
Est'd Revenues	51,096,000	2013-15
Military Department	(10,842,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
WA State Patrol	(3,480,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
E911 Program	(47,672,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
Total Expenditures	(61,994,000)	
Est'd Fund Balance	5,696,363	As of 6/30/15

SFY 2015-17 Expenditure and Revenue Calculations and Assumptions

Est'd Beginning Fund Balance	5,696,363	As of 7/1/15
Est'd Revenues	52,740,000	2015-17
E911 Program-Baseline	(46,000,000)	2015-17 Appropriation
E911 Program-Supplemental	(10,000,000)	2015-17 Appropriation
Total Expenditures	(56,000,000)	
Est'd Fund Balance	2,436,363	As of 6/30/17

Object Detail

		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
N	Grants, Benefits & Client Services	3,164,000	3,164,000	6,328,000

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: Q1 OFM 15% Reduction Impacts
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

This decision package is to provide OFM with options to reduce the Military Department General Fund - State budget by 15%. The total agency reduction would be \$2,128,950.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1	General Fund - Basic Account-State	(1,064,475)	(1,064,475)	(2,128,950)
001-2	General Fund - Basic Account-Federal	11,171	11,171	22,342
Total Cost		(1,053,304)	(1,053,304)	(2,106,608)
Staffing		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
	FTEs	-55.0	-55.0	-55.0
Revenue				
<u>Fund</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001	General Fund	11,171	11,171	22,342
	0312 Dept of Defense			
Total Revenue		11,171	11,171	22,342

Package Description:

This decision package is to provide OFM and the Governor with options for reducing the Military Department budget by up to 15% of the carry forward budget for the 2015-2017 budget process. Reductions in the Military Department will span all facets of our operations from the Emergency Management Division, the Army Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division, the Air Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division and the Administration Division which includes the Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology units.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This decision package is to provide OFM and the Governor with options for reducing the Military Department budget by up to 15% of the carry forward budget for the 2015-2017 budget process. Reductions in the Military Department will span all facets of our operations from the Emergency Management Division, the Army Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division, the Air Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division and the Administration Division which includes the Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology units. These reductions are ranked in priority order. Should a decision be made to not reduce the agency by the full amount of the decision package, the highest priority functions should be retained.

1. Eliminate state maintenance funds for Army Guard facilities by 19 out of 39 FTEs and \$435,587.
 - reduce facilities maintenance to basic and emergency work only
 - armories would begin to incur large equipment replacement costs due to lack of preventative maintenance
 - poorly maintained armories will lose value each year due to lack of preventative maintenance
 - armories will be closed due to lack of funds.
 - guardsman will be lost due to the inconvenience of travel due to armory closures
 - reduction in force will limit the responsiveness to disasters such as the Oso mudslide and Central Washington Fires
 - federal funding will be reduced due to the lack of state matching funds
2. Eliminate state maintenance funds for Air Guard facilities by ten out of 26 FTEs and \$141,722.
 - reduce facilities maintenance to basic and emergency work only
 - facilities would begin to incur large equipment replacement costs due to lack of preventative maintenance
 - poorly maintained armories will lose value each year due to lack of preventative maintenance
 - facilities will be closed due to lack of funds.
 - guardsman will be lost due to the inconvenience of travel due to armory closures
 - reduction in force will limit the responsiveness to disasters such as the Oso mudslide and Central Washington Fires
 - federal funding will be reduced due to the lack of state matching funds by \$1.7M
3. Eliminate support for the agency's IT network and telecommunications support by three out of 14 FTEs and \$490,983
 - state network functions will severely curtail the department's ability to provide network support
 - reduce the responsiveness for the Web-EOC function which provides rapid response and support to Governor declared disasters
 - SharePoint functions which house all employee time sheets, leave forms and other personnel documents will no longer be supported
 - applications such as the Purchase Order System, the Contracts Management System, and other specialized systems with connections to DES/OFM financial and personnel systems will no longer be supported
 - delays in retrieval of all agency data through the Vault will be delayed impacting responses to public disclosure requests
 - GIS services which support the implementation of the Emergency Services Common Operating Picture and is used to support the EOC during recent disasters will be severely curtailed
 - all non-EOC related server and desktop support and customer service support will be eliminated
 - elimination of the Emergency Warning System used for emergency communications
4. Eliminate the Risk Management/Safety function in Human Resources by one out of one FTEs and \$224,832.
 - eliminate emergency program support
 - eliminate the safety program and risk management support
 - eliminate employee/employer enhancement programs such as an "Employer of Choice" and wellness
 - severely delay responses to OFM, unions and public records requests
 - reduce or eliminate training programs such as new employee orientation, first aid and CPR, driver's safety and others
 - reduce support to the Lean program
5. Reduce Accounting activities by three out of ten FTEs and \$371,484
 - delays in payments resulting in interest and penalty charges and complaints from vendors and local sub-recipients of pass through grants
 - delays in billings to grantors such as the National Guard Bureau resulting in the loss of federal capital funding of up to \$1.5 M in missed opportunities from other states who can't execute and the inability to meet OFM yearend closing schedules
 - higher error rates, more audit issues and delayed or inaccurate financial reporting
 - delayed payments to reservists on state active duty
 - errors in leave balances
 - delayed reconciliation of payroll accruals
 - reduce support to the Lean program
6. Eliminate support for the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) by one out of one FTEs and \$172,000
 - reduction of full-time support to the SERC, LEPC's, WSP and Ecology related SERC program
 - reduce level of effort provided to SERC degrading the ability to respond to hazardous materials incidents

- eliminate community education and training programs that address mitigation, emergency preparedness, disaster response and long term disaster recovery
7. Eliminate the planned repurposing of the funds for the External Affairs function in EMD by one out of five FTEs and \$136,000
 - reduce our efforts in coordinating the state's Continuity of Operations Plans
 - reduce our ability coordinate catastrophic events occurring in Washington State
 8. Eliminate the Director's Office Administrative staff by half, which saves one out of two FTEs and \$134,000
 - delays in processing materials, such as requests for Disaster and Emergency Proclamations, that flow through the EMD's Director's Office
 - since the work needs to be continued, the tasks will need to be shared with other overly burdened areas which will reduce the effectiveness of disaster and emergency response
 - reduced effectiveness of EMD's ability to respond to disasters due to requiring EMD's management to take on additional administrative functions
 9. Shift environmental workload to shift funding from state funds to federal funding sources by \$22,342.
 - reduce state work by 15% shifting funding to federally reimbursable activities
 - work in these areas will no longer be performed

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Reductions in the Military Department will span all facets of our operations from the Emergency Management Division, the Army Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division, the Air Guard Facility Maintenance and Operations Division and the Administration Division which includes the Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology units. These reductions are ranked in priority order above. Should a decision be made to not reduce the agency by the full amount of the decision package, the highest priority functions should be retained.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: A017 Overhead and Administration
A026 Disaster Preparedness and Readiness
A027 Disaster Response and Recovery
A029 Facilities Management

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

No, this package will have a devastating impact on the ability for the Military Department to implement its strategic plan goals for Emergency Preparedness:

The strategic goals for **prevention** of acts of terrorism, **protection** from terrorism and manmade or natural disasters, **response** to protect the lives, property and the environment and meet basic human needs after an incident, **recovery** in the restoration, reconstitution and rebuilding of Washington State communities affected by disasters and **organizational excellence** of maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization while maintaining flexibility to adapt to a rapidly changing environment will all be impacted by this decision package.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

No. This decision package does not support the Governor's priorities of Healthy and Safe Communities or Efficient, Effective and Accountable Government.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The Military Department houses the Washington Army National Guard and the Washington Air National Guard. The Military Department is the central agency in state government responsible for coordinating statewide emergency management planning, response and recovery with local entities.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

As directed by the Office of Financial Management, no other options were considered.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Not approving this package would leave the Military Department in tact to perform its vital functions of providing the capabilities for the **prevention** of acts of terrorism, **protection** from terrorism and manmade or natural disasters, **response** to protect the lives, property and the environment and meet basic human needs after an incident, **recovery** in the restoration, reconstitution and rebuilding of Washington State communities affected by disasters and **organizational excellence** of maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization while maintaining flexibility to adapt to a rapidly changing environment will all be impacted by this decision package.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

The requested package includes salaries and benefits. Benefits were calculated at 35% of direct salaries.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The costs are ongoing and will impact future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	(780,225)	(780,225)	(1,560,450)
B Employee Benefits	(273,079)	(273,079)	(546,158)
Total Objects	(1,053,304)	(1,053,304)	(2,106,608)

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: Q2 EMD Catastrophic Planner
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Military Department submits this proposal for a budget request for establishment of a statewide catastrophic planning program to be managed by a State Catastrophic Planning Program Manager. This decision package works to resource the coordination of and interdependency planning across state government for catastrophic emergency/disaster planning responsibilities. This action improves state government performance by using industry best practices and lessons learned to guide state planning efforts and facilitate coordination with state agencies, boards, and commissions in order to prepare, respond, and recover from catastrophic incidents. Catastrophic incidents are different from major disasters in many ways and require a focused educational engagement to understand the differences and to prepare plans and procedures to adapt to those differences

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	89,000	89,000	178,000
Total Cost	89,000	89,000	178,000
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	1.0	1.0	1.0

Package Description:

Current Situation

The state of Washington is vulnerable to a potentially catastrophic disaster arising from earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, an accident at one of the Fixed Nuclear Facilities, or any number of terrorist attack scenarios. Within the last few years, Washington State Emergency Management Division (EMD) has developed a greater realization of the potential scope and impact of a Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake/tsunami as a result of EMD's participation in Regional Catastrophic Planning activities, collaboration with FEMA Region X in developing their Catastrophic Plan, and crafting the Catastrophic Incident Annex (CIA) to the WA State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. This requires significantly expanded capacity to coordinate overall plans and core capability/function-specific annexes with a large array of stakeholders at the state, federal, and local levels. There is also linkage to coordinating state agency Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP), which will be even more critical in a catastrophic disaster.

A survey of two states with similar vulnerability to a truly catastrophic disaster, California and Florida, revealed that both state emergency management organizations have included a full-time catastrophic planner on their staffs.

This critical planning function is currently performed by a project employee funded by Regional Catastrophic Planning Grants, which is scheduled to end in SFY15.

Proposed Solution

The State Catastrophic Planning Program Manager is responsible for:

- Coordinating and managing the State Catastrophic Planning Team.
- Preparing and updating state Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) Catastrophic Incident Annex (CIA).
- Analysis of potential catastrophic hazards; identifying potential impacts, and developing/coordinating hazard-specific appendices to the CEMP CIA.
- Developing and coordinating Catastrophic Contingency Option appendices to the CIA; detailed descriptions of potential actions and organization which support specific functions during a catastrophic response.
- Vertical and horizontal integration and synchronization of catastrophic plans: federal, state, and local
- Providing outreach to state agencies, regional organizations, and local jurisdictions to support statewide catastrophic planning

In order to coordinate these planning activities to state government, this funding request is to employ:

1. One Program Manager/Planner (EMPS3-Range 58).

We are requesting an annual budget to support the Program Manager and minimal travel, goods, and services. The budget for this program would provide salaries, benefits, travel, and supplies for one FTE to develop, test, validate, and improve plans and procedures for state government catastrophic planning; ultimately leading to a state that is better prepared for catastrophes and disasters. Funding for this FTE position increases statewide readiness and instills citizenry confidence in state emergency preparation, governmental response, and societal recovery.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The state catastrophic planning program should advance the preparation of state government for a catastrophic incident. We expect to develop processes and procedures that allow state government to quickly relate to far more and unfamiliar organizations that respond to catastrophic disasters. We will also establish procedures that allow flexibility to adapt to emergent organizations that maybe necessary to effect efficient and effective response and recovery in local jurisdictions, allow the state to adapt to radically different time and quality standards for disaster response and establish procedures for closer public and private sector interface by building necessary contacts, contracts and understandings in advance of the incident. Objectives focus on building detailed coordinated catastrophic level plans at the state level, coordinating those plans with federal and local jurisdiction plans, and engaging private and public non-profit organizations in the catastrophic planning process.

Specific Benefits:

1. Increase state government emergency preparedness through the development of Catastrophic Planning Contingency Options from 0 to 31 by Dec 31, 2019.
2. Increase state government emergency preparedness for the Cascadia Subduction Zone incident by completing an appendix (plan) to the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan Catastrophic Incident Annex by July 31, 2016
3. Ensure the State Cascadia Subduction Zone plan is coordinated and deconflicted with the FEMA Region X Cascadia Subduction Zone plan by December 31, 2016
4. Add 25 major private sector stakeholders to the State Catastrophic Planning Team by July 31, 2017
5. Add 15 private non-profit stakeholders to the State Catastrophic Planning Team by July 31, 2017

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A026 Disaster Preparedness/Readiness**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

September 17, 2014

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes, this program is specifically intended to enhance the state's overall preparedness capability for catastrophic disasters and emergencies. This program strongly supports the department's strategic planning themes of readiness and public safety. The Military Department Strategic Plan has several related goal statements, objectives, and strategies, focused on catastrophic preparedness and planning. These include Emergency Preparedness, Continuous Improvement, and Communications and Outreach. These items are programmed to be tracked in the implementation of the Division Strategic Plan.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Efficient, Effective, and Accountable Government. Preparation for catastrophic incidents, planning, and exercises are essential to establishing better Customer Confidence in state government.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Impact on clients and services:

Impact is positive. Many of the state's residents are dependent on the services provided by state agencies for critical services and support. A vibrant state catastrophic planning program in concert with state continuity programs ensures those critical services are available during and after periods of catastrophic disaster.

Impact on other state programs:

The impact on other state programs would be positive in that the program is building collaborative actions to ensure parameters for catastrophic preparation, response and recovery operations are defined in sufficient detail that critical interdependencies between state agencies will be identified, and the plans built to ensure that each state agency, board, council, and commission will know what is expected and they can build supporting plans and update continuity plans.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

State government has operated with a federal grant supported catastrophic planner since 2010. This federal grant ends in State FY15 and replacement federal grant funding is not available. State general funding to the Emergency Management Division has been reduced by over 50% during the last seven years. This high priority function competes with other high priority functions within the division and department, supports department and division strategic goals and if funded with current resources, would eliminate one or more high priority programs currently funded by available resource. This approach is similar to successful programs in other states across the nation (Florida, Louisiana, California, Oregon, etc.), applies lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina and SuperStorm Sandy, and installs the best practices for emergency planning from the national and international experience.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Not funding this program will negatively impact state government readiness. Statewide catastrophic planning will slow extensively. Currently state agencies rely on EMD to provide the leadership in catastrophic planning and provide the bulk of thought and planning framework necessary to prepare the state for a catastrophic incident. Current resources will continue product development in a piecemeal manner and additional research will end due to the lack of resources. When the catastrophic incident occurs, the state will lack adequate plans to respond to various aspects of the incident. This has the potential to result in additional fatalities to residents, delay recovery, and cost the state billions of dollars in revenue generation.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None are anticipated.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Object A and B were calculated in SPS.

Object E used when appropriate.

Objects G allows program manager to travel when necessary for professional development, emergency management seminars, and

conduct interstate coordination when appropriate.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs for this program are continuing and have impact to future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	67,000	67,000	134,000
B Employee Benefits	17,000	17,000	34,000
E Goods\Other Services	1,500	1,500	3,000
G Travel	3,500	3,500	7,000
Total Objects	89,000	89,000	178,000

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: Q3 EMD COOP Manager
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Military Department submits this proposal for a budget request for establishment of a statewide continuity program to be managed by a State Continuity Program Manager. This decision package works to resource the coordination of and interdependency planning across state government for emergency/disaster Continuity of Government (COG) and Continuity of Operations (COOP) responsibilities. This action improves state government performance by using industry continuity best practices to guide state agencies, boards, and commissions ensuring state government development, refinement, and exercising of their continuity planning, processes, and procedures to ensure delivery of essential services after disasters and emergencies. Update to the Revised Code of Washington is recommended to assign COOP coordination to the Military Department. Additional recommended change to the State Constitution should be researched and coordinated to align COG guidance with current societal conditions.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	89,000	89,000	178,000
Total Cost	89,000	89,000	178,000
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	1.0	1.0	1.0

Package Description:

Current Situation

Chapters 40.10 (Microfilming of records to provide continuity of civil government) and 42.14 Revised Code of Washington (Continuity of Government act) amplify requirements in Article 2 of the Washington Constitution providing for continuity of state government. Each of these chapters captures portions of common business continuity practices but do not establish a Continuity of Operations program for civil government in Washington State. It may be inferred that the Legislature intends that state government should be able to continue to perform after an attack (RCW 42.14) and an emergency (40.10) through the use of those terms in the referenced legislation.

Governor Gregoire issued Directive 07-06 to direct updates or development of Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) for Executive Branch agencies (EMD collected agency plans but did not review and provide feedback for gaps or quality.) and Directive 12-20 to strengthen Executive Branch COOP and begin development of a continuous Continuity Program. Governor Inslee supported these concepts with the issuance of Directive 13-02.

Washington State government does not have a government-wide continuity program. The state does not have a broad COOP and relies on the development of separate agency COOP plans with the underlying premise that if state agencies can operate, then state government can operate. Lessons learned from recent large-scale emergency incidents (e.g. January 2012 Snowstorm) show that not all agencies have established robust continuity plans, varying proficiency, and inconsistent capability to deliver essential services. Governor's Directives emphasize the importance of continuity planning but do not remain in effect long-term. Statutory change to

RCW 38.52 and the minimum investment in a Continuity Planning manager provides critical capacity necessary to sustain dedicated focus on this important Public Safety area.

Proposed Solution

Agency sponsored legislation to provide for changes to RCW 38.52 - the Emergency Management Act to assign responsibility for the state continuity program to the Military Department.

These new responsibilities include:

- Development and coordination of a state government Continuity of Operations Plan.
- Identification of state government essential functions in conjunction with agency and branch continuity managers.
- Identification of appropriate business continuity activities to support state government essential functions.
- Produce general procedures for common actions among state government agencies and branches.
- Assist state agencies and branches with COOP development and exercises.
- Review agency and branch COOP for gaps and assist in resolving gaps.
- Benchmark continuity practices and implement best practices.
- Recommend improvements to state agency and branch COOP
- Track currency and update status for state agency COOP
- Assist the Interagency Continuity of Operations Committee (COOP) with development and implementation of statewide continuity projects.
- Report COOP status to state government senior executives through the Results Washington program.

In order to coordinate these new activities to state government, this funding request is to employ:

1. One Program Manager/Planner (EMPS3-Range 58).

We are requesting an annual budget to support the Program Manager and minimal travel, goods, and services. The budget for this program would provide salaries, benefits, travel, and supplies for one FTE to develop, test, validate, and improve plans and procedures for state government continuity planning; ultimately leading to a state that is better prepared for catastrophes and disasters. Funding for this FTE position increases statewide readiness and instills citizenry confidence in state emergency preparation and governmental response.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The state continuity program continues the basic performance outcomes directed by the Governor in Directive 13-02. In this directive the Governor instructed agencies, boards, councils, and commissions to identify points of contact for continuity of operations and information technology disaster recovery. These points of contact form the Interagency Continuity of Operations Committee. The Governor also directs each executive branch agency, board, council, and commission to report updates and exercising of the organization plan each year beginning in 2013. In addition, each agency, board, council, or commission was to evaluate their continuity plan using the Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuity Assistance Tool for Non-Federal Entities by April 20, 2013. Each of these performance objectives is designed to ensure that the agency, board, council, or commission identifies gaps in their continuity planning and performance and that those gaps are closed through an ongoing process of plan update and exercise.

Specific Benefits:

1. Increase state agency, board, council, and commission emergency preparedness (Continuity of Operations) to 100% by June 30, 2015.
 - a. Increase the number of agency, boards, councils, and commissions (34) that annually exercise COOP plans by December 31, 2014 to 100%.
 - b. Increase the number of agency, boards, councils, and commissions (34) that complete COOP plan updates by June 30, 2015 to 100%.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A026 Disaster Preparedness/Readiness**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes, this program is specifically intended to enhance the state's overall preparedness capability for disasters, emergencies, and catastrophic incidents. This program strongly supports the department's strategic planning themes of readiness and public safety. The Military Department Strategic Plan has several related goal statements, objectives, and strategies, which this package supports. These include Emergency Preparedness, Continuous Improvement, and Communications and Outreach. Specifically this item is included in the Military Department Results Washington reporting to the Governor.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Goal #4 Healthy and Safe Communities and Goal #5 Efficient, Effective, and Accountable Government. COOP planning and exercises are tracked in Results Washington Goal #5.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Impact on clients and services:

Impact is positive. Many of the state's residents are dependent on the services provided by state agencies for critical services and support. A vibrant state continuity program ensures those critical services are available during and after periods of disaster and emergency.

Impact on other state programs:

The impact on other state programs would be positive in that the program is building collaborative actions to ensure that critical interdependencies between state agencies will be identified and plans built to ensure that each state agency, board, council, and commission will know who is dependent on their services and have in place a method to ensure that those essential services will continue.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

State government has operated without an integrated continuity program since inception of the state. For the last ten years, informal gatherings of some state agency representatives resulted in some continuity of operations planning but no consistent program. Current laws (RCW 40.10 and 42.14) do not effectively address the issues faced by state government in the 21st century. The current assignment of continuity coordination as an additional duty within the Military Department is not sufficient to effectively and efficiently perform the work. These issues were most recently demonstrated in the 2012 winter storm that occurred over the greater Puget Sound. Many agencies found gaps in their planning and procedures, resulting in Governor Gregoire issuing Directive 12-20 to improve continuity of government operations in state government. This approach is similar to successful programs in other states across the nation and installs the best practices for business continuity planning from our nation's successful businesses.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Not funding this program will negatively impact state government readiness. Multiple state governors have recognized the need to direct that Continuity of Operations be conducted by single agencies. That work has begun in separate agencies and this modest resource investment allows the next critical step in establishing the development of interagency continuity planning to better ensure the delivery of essential services during emergency/disaster events by creating an overall program. Without this funding for dedicated staff, there will continue to be fragmented extra duty staff resourcing.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

Agency sponsored legislation to update RCW 38.52 - the Emergency Management Act to assign responsibility for the state continuity program to the Military Department supports the concept of having a standing and consistent continuity program for the state, which enhances state government preparedness.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Objects A & B were determined by using the SPS system.

Object E used when appropriate.

Objects G allows program manager to travel when necessary for professional development, emergency management seminars, and conduct interstate coordination when appropriate.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs for this program are continuing and have impact to future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	67,000	67,000	134,000
B Employee Benefits	17,000	17,000	34,000
E Goods\Other Services	1,500	1,500	3,000
G Travel	3,500	3,500	7,000
Total Objects	89,000	89,000	178,000

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: Q4 National Guard-Emergency Response
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

This decision package requests three State Active Duty funding packages to support: Wildland Firefighting Training, planning assistance for local jurisdictions, and cybersecurity education, outreach and assessment. This funding allows the Washington National Guard to place personnel in state service to enable essential programs for assisting resource constrained jurisdictions and requirements through emergency response preparedness, planning and execution capabilities.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	660,272	325,208	985,480
Total Cost	660,272	325,208	985,480

Package Description:

- 1) **Wildland Firefighting (REDCARD) Training: \$364,100**
 - a. P&A: 250 soldiers * \$182/day * 5 days = \$227,500
 - b. Training: Wildland Firefighting Training Contract Package = \$36,600
 - c. Logistics, Lodging and Transportation = \$25,000
 - d. Boots: 250*300=\$75,000
- 2) **Planning Support: \$465,920**
 - a. 90 Days of assistance package design and synchronization * \$182/day * 1 planner = \$16,380
 - b. 15 Days of package testing at a small jurisdiction *182/day = \$2,730
 - c. 15 Days of package finalization = \$2,730
 - d. 5 Days of training * 4 soldiers *182/day = \$3,640
 - e. 2 engagements per month (2 weeks onsite, 2 weeks prep): 600 Days on task * 4 solders * \$182/day = \$440,440
- 3) **Cybersecurity Assistance: \$155,460**
 - a. 10 medium assessments * 15,000/assessment. = \$150,000
 - b. 10 Days of cybersecurity planning work (augmenting CEMP planning) * 182/DAY = \$1,820
 - c. 20 Days of cybersecurity outreach as directed = \$3,640

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This request is for National Guard members to rapidly assist the entire state in planning, preparation and response. There is a dire need for planning assistance in smaller jurisdictions, for cybersecurity planning and assessments and to ensure our Guard can deploy effectively as Wildland Firefighting Strike Teams. However, the Washington National Guard does not currently receive any funding for state service. National Guard personnel can only be placed into state service, as in any other state's National Guard, when it is at state expense. Currently, Washington State only provides funds for facilities maintenance and in response to costs incurred from bringing National Guardsmen on State Active Duty in response to emergencies (e.g. SR 530 Slide, Wildland Fire response).

- There are two limiting factors to rapidly deploying Guardsmen in support of Wildfires: certification training at the Strike Team level and regulatory personal protective equipment (PPE). Wildland Firefighting Strike Team certification training is a five day

program that certifies Guardsmen at a level that can be more readily sourced and employed by incident managers. Additionally, each firefighter must have properly sized boots which meets nationally recognized standards for Wildland Firefighting.

- Emergency Management Planning Assistance (EMPA) will entail the development and pilot testing of programs assisting small, resource constrained jurisdictions with developing emergency response preparedness, planning and response capabilities that will enable them to better withstand a natural or man-made disaster (e.g. SR 530 Landslide). The National Guard has extensive planning experience and National Incident Management System (NIMS) training and experience and can provide a great deal of assistance to local jurisdictions (e.g., Darrington and others) to help with emergency preparedness.
- The National Guard can readily assist the state by providing cybersecurity-specific planning, education and outreach throughout the state, as well as assessments or PEN-tests to critical infrastructure.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Development of a training program that can be used to assist small, resource challenged jurisdictions with emergency preparedness, response and planning assistance to strengthen their capabilities to withstand a natural or man-made disaster. The expectation is that the agency will successfully execute at least one pilot test with a jurisdiction that involves Wildland Firefighting Training (Red Card), planning assistance for local jurisdictions, and a cybersecurity education event, outreach and/or assessment.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A026 Disaster Preparedness/Readiness**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes, this package addresses the following strategic plan goals:

Goal #1: Increase state capability to prepare for, respond to, recover from and mitigate disasters and emergencies by 2018.

1-2: Increase the Washington National Guard's ability to plan, prepare, and respond to Domestic Operational mission requirements in Washington State by 30 Sep 15.

1-2-9: Increase the # of WA NG External Planning & Assistance Outreach projects from 1 per quarter in FY13 to 1 per month or 12/year in FY15.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Yes. This decision package directly supports two priorities found in Governor Inslee's 2013-15 budget priorities (under General Government) for (1) ensuring public safety and (2) ensuring the safety of Washington's information technology systems and data.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The Military Department is the central agency in state government responsible for coordinating statewide planning, response and recovery with local entities. In addition, the Governor has designate TAG as the primary official and the Military Department as the lead agency for cybersecurity planning, preparation and response. This proposal supports these requirements.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The state realized in 2014, that training Guardsmen to be able to quickly respond to our frequent wildfires is better than just-in-time training that arrives a week late. This package continues that decision and adds opportunities to leverage the Guard's extensive planning and cybersecurity talent pool.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Without this funding the Washington National Guard will be severely limited in its ability to engage with and further assist the state or local jurisdictions in emergency preparedness, planning, training, or exercises for enhanced emergency preparedness and cybersecurity.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

The requested package includes \$950,604 in funding for the activation of state guard personnel. The estimate used for SAD is \$250 per day per person.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The costs are ongoing and will impact future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
N Grants, Benefits & Client Services	660,272	325,208	985,480

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: Q5 E911 Modernization to NG911
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Military Department submits this decision package for the next phase in modernization of the statewide Enhanced 9-1-1 (E911) system to the Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG911) standard. The requested funding will be used to reimburse counties for the costs of the replacement of 911 telephone systems in the remaining Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP) in the state that are operating with outdated and incompatible legacy phone systems. In addition, a portion of these funds will be used to enact cybersecurity measures within Washington State's NG911 network. This will result in the statewide 911 network being resilient in the face of real cybersecurity threats, through prevention of active threats and through timely notification of attempted disruptions of the network so that immediate protective measures can be enacted system-wide.

The requested funding will complete a major milestone in the state's ongoing transition to NG911. Through modernization of 911 telephone equipment statewide, Washington State will be primed to accept "Text-to-911" messages in addition to 911 voice calls. This is made possible by connecting the modern NG911 phone systems directly to the NG911 network through a direct Internet Protocol (IP) connection.

These actions improve the safety and security of the people of Washington State through increased resiliency, usability, and reliability of the Washington State 9-1-1 system.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
03F-1 Enhanced 911 Account-State	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000
Total Cost	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000

Package Description:

Current Situation

Beginning in 2009, the state of Washington embarked on a modernization initiative for our statewide 911 system. The transition to NG911 began with the necessary modernization of the statewide 911 network, to move away from the legacy analog 911 telephone network, to a digital Emergency Services IP network (ESInet) ready to handle modern forms of communication. The realization of NG911 in Washington State means that callers will be able to send text messages, photos, and other media, beyond just the voice calls we have today. To date, a great amount of work has been done to ensure that the new digital 911 network is sufficiently sized (bandwidth), reliable and ready to accept new media when available. As anticipated, the NG911 network is significantly more costly than the traditional legacy network, due to its increased size and capabilities. It was also necessary that during the transition to the new network that we ensure that there is no loss of the ability to receive traditional 911 calls. As most of the state's 69 primary PSAPs still have legacy analog telephone equipment, the state is forced to maintain some legacy elements of the old network until such time that the state is fully modernized.

This situation results in even higher network costs until such time that all PSAPs are ready to operate fully on the new network with modernized equipment. These new network costs have pushed the State E911 Coordinator's Office baseline operation costs well beyond the office's current baseline spending authority of \$39,672,000 (SFY 2013-15).

With the advent of a new IP based 911 network, comes the exposure to the same cybersecurity threats faced by every other public data network. The criticality of the state's 911 network requires that cybersecurity vulnerabilities be recognized and actively mitigated.

For the coming biennium, the E911 program will require an additional \$10,000,000 to continue the modernization of the PSAPs who will replace obsolete phone equipment and software, and to implement necessary cybersecurity safeguards across the statewide 911 enterprise. It is recommended that the State E911 Office biennial baseline spending authority be increased by \$10,000,000

Proposed Solution

The State E911 Coordinator's Office is responsible for:

- Ensuring the availability of statewide 911 dialing (Provision of the Washington State 911 Network to include Cyber Security component)
- Ensuring that all Washington State Counties can provide a basic level of 911 service (Financial support to less populace counties)
- To assist with the modernization of PSAP equipment (Financial support to all counties as needed.)

In order to coordinate and accomplish these activities, this funding request will be used to reimburse counties for the costs of equipment replacement that are necessary to complete our state's transition to NG911, and to enact active 911 network cybersecurity safeguards to protect the infrastructure.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The modernization of 911 telephone equipment statewide by all counties will allow for the decommissioning of the remaining legacy components of the statewide 911 network. Additionally, it will provide primary PSAPs with current reliable telephone equipment capable of receiving digital voice, text messaging, and eventually - imagery. Funding of the cybersecurity measures will result in the 911 network being resilient in the face of real cybersecurity threats, through prevention of active threats and through timely notification of attempted disruptions of the network so that immediate protective measures can be enacted system-wide.

Specific Benefits:

1. Increase the number of PSAPs with NG911 compatible telephone equipment from 8 to 69 by June 30, 2017.
2. Implement full and active cybersecurity network protective measures for all PSAPs connected to the Washington State 911 Network by July 31, 2016 (resulting from ongoing Cyber Security Assessment in SFY15)
3. Terminate remaining legacy network infrastructure by June 30, 2017.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A028 Enhanced 911**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Yes. This package addresses the Military Department's Strategic Plan for Emergency Preparedness: To increase capabilities to save lives, protect property and the environment and meet basic human needs after an incident has occurred.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Yes, Goal #4 Healthy and Safe Communities. The modernization of the State's 911 system is a critical element of public safety

statewide. It provides the critical infrastructure for a robust statewide public safety network enterprise.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Impact on clients and services:

The impact is positive. All of the state's residents are dependent on the emergency services accessed through the state 911 system. The Washington State 911 system is the only direct link between the people of this state and the emergency responders. Increasing the usability and reliability of the 911 system has and will save lives. The April 2014 E911 outage we experienced was the direct result of a legacy 911 requirement. Had we been fully NG911 capable, the outage would not have occurred.

Impact on other state programs:

The impact on other state programs would be positive in that the 911 system links the people of Washington State with the myriad of emergency response agencies statewide. This includes the Washington State Patrol, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Department of Health to name a few. Additionally, the Washington State Patrol operates four (4) primary PSAPs within the state, and is a direct recipient of State 911 program support.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

We looked at continuing the current level of authorized funding and maintaining current technologies. Seeking additional funds affords the state significant cumulative savings over the next 2 biennia and improves public safety by making E911 response more effective and efficient.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

If not funded, this will result in higher costs to the state as we maintain disparate network components to support both the old legacy and NG911 systems statewide until all systems are modernized and we can decommission and remove the obsolete legacy components. Additionally, modernization will be delayed and personal and property safety could be compromised as funds intended for PSAP equipment modernization will be diverted to pay for the higher network costs.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None are anticipated. RCWs and WACs provide for the basis of the 911 enterprise.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Object C provides for the costs of implementing necessary network cybersecurity measures.

Object N provides for reimbursement of counties and WSP for NG911 capable phone system replacement.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

Statewide network costs for the 911 system are ongoing and will have impact to future biennia. Initial equipment modernization costs are a one-time cost. However, the state 911 program will need to assist lower income counties with eventual equipment life-cycle replacement costs in future biennia.

Below are estimated ending fund balances for E911 for 2013-2015 and 2015-2017.

SFY 2013-15 Expenditure and Revenue Calculations and Assumptions

Beginning Fund Balance – 03F E911	16,594,363	As of 7/1/13
Est'd Current Fund Balance	17,746,835	As of 6/30/14
Est'd Revenues	51,096,000	2013-15
Military Department	(10,842,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
WA State Patrol	(3,480,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
E911 Program	(47,672,000)	2013-15 Appropriation
Total Expenditures	(61,994,000)	
Est'd Fund Balance	5,696,363	As of 6/30/15

SFY 2015-17 Expenditure and Revenue Calculations and Assumptions

Est'd Beginning Fund Balance	5,696,363	As of 7/1/15
Est'd Revenues	52,740,000	2015-17
E911 Program-Baseline	(46,000,000)	2015-17 Appropriation
E911 Program-Supplemental	(10,000,000)	2015-17 Appropriation
Total Expenditures	(56,000,000)	
Est'd Fund Balance	2,436,363	As of 6/30/17

Object Detail

	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
N Grants, Benefits & Client Services	4,000,000	4,000,000	8,000,000
Total Objects	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000