

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: M4 NG911 Modernization
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Program: Blank

Recommendation Summary Text:

INTRO: The transition to NG911 began in 2009 with modernizing the statewide 911 network from a legacy analog 911 telephone network to an i3-based Emergency Services IP network (ESInet) ready to handle modern forms of communication. When modernization is complete, 'callers' will be able to send text messages, photos, and other media, beyond just the voice calls we have today. Washington State contracted with CenturyLink to provide a transitional ESInet to allow Washington PSAPs to modernize equipment and position themselves to begin operations in an NG911 environment. This transitional ESInet provided a "hybrid" network platform that allowed for both legacy analog 911 equipment and NG911 IP based equipment to operate. The original contract has expired, and has been amended several times to extend the original performance period.

TRANSITION TO ESInet II: Washington State is preparing to release a new Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new statewide ESInet contract to carry the state into the next decade. The RFP release date is scheduled for late September 2015, with an anticipated contract award occurring in the spring of 2016. The state will incur temporary additional expense to maintain two networks because some of the 68 PSAPs still have analog telephone equipment. The state must sustain the both networks through full modernization so that all 911 calls can be answered. We will have higher overall network costs going forward until all PSAPs are ready to operate fully on a new i3-based NG911 compliant network with modernized NG911 equipment.

- The estimated increase in Network costs during transition is \$1.042M.

MODERNIZATION OF TELEPHONE EQUIP IN PSAPs: To fully modernize to digital capability all telephone equipment in statewide PSAPs the state phased expenditures over multiple budget requests based on achievable E911 fund balance. This request funds the remaining 20 counties who need state assistance to replace legacy analog telephone systems to achieve the NG911 capability.

- The anticipated costs (above what has already been allocated) to modernize the remaining PSAPs is approximately \$1.5M.

CRITICAL NEED TO IMPLEMENT CYBER-SECURITY MEASURES: With an IP based 911 network, comes exposure to the same cybersecurity threats faced by every other public data network. The critical nature of the state's 911 network requires that cybersecurity vulnerabilities be identified and actively negated. In 2014, the state engaged a third-party cybersecurity firm to assess our existing NG911 enterprise system. The initial results of the assessment indicate significant risk of network cyber-attacks, which threaten to cripple the statewide NG911 enterprise. To mitigate these risks, firewalls must be implemented at all network access points to shield the enterprise from potential threats, and provide for real-time detection and active countermeasures against threats as they occur. This will give first line protection to the PSAPs and to the Networks that does not exist today.

- The estimated cost to implement an initial statewide firewall cybersecurity solution across the NG911 enterprise is \$4.637M. All totaled, for the current biennium, the E911 program will require an additional \$7.179M (down from our \$8.164M estimate last year of) to offset additional network costs as we transition to a new ESInet contract, to support the remaining counties to modernize equipment, and provide for necessary minimum network cybersecurity measures.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
03F-1 Enhanced 911 Account-State	2,662,828	4,516,050	7,178,878
Total Cost	2,662,828	4,516,050	7,178,878

Package Description:

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. This requested funding serves to:

- a) Reimburse the remaining counties in the state who require replacement of legacy 911 telephone systems in primary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP);
- b) Implement immediate cybersecurity firewall measures within Washington State's NG911 network;
- c) Offset additional costs of transitioning from the state's interim Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) to a fully NG911 capable and enabled ESInet.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

This funding request allows for the modernization of all remaining primary PSAPs in the state, seamless transition from the existing network to a fully NG911 standards compliant and cyber-secure network for the State of Washington, while ensuring that no disruption occurs to the state's ability to answer 911 calls during the transition.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

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?

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.

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

We examined the option of continuing to amend the current ESInet contract and maintaining current technologies. However, this will not allow for any future cost savings, nor allow the state to progress to NG911 due to the current transitional technology in place. These additional funds will allow for a seamless transition to the new network, and afford the state significant cumulative savings over future biennia as overall network costs are anticipated to decrease with the new network contract.

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 continue to 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

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Network costs during transition is \$1.042M

*See TRANSITION TO ESInet II in package detail

Modernize the remaining PSAPs \$1.5M

*See MODERNIZATION OF TELEPHONE EQUIP IN PSAPs in package detail

Cyber-Security Measures \$4,636,878

*See CYBER-SECURITY MEASURE (Firewalls) FOR ESInet P.3 of attachment

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

Ongoing

See attachment:

SECO Cyber-Security Measures (Firewalls) for ESInet

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
E Goods\Other Services	2,662,828	4,516,050	7,178,878

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: M1 State Active Duty Response
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Program: Blank

Recommendation Summary Text:

This decision package requests two State Active Duty funding packages to support: Wildland Firefighting Training, and Catastrophic Emergency Response (e.g. Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake/Tsunami) planning assistance for local jurisdictions. This funding allows the Washington National Guard to place soldiers and airmen in state service for short periods of time for state missions that contribute to statewide emergency response preparedness, planning, training and exercise purposes.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	538,152	358,768	896,920
Total Cost	538,152	358,768	896,920

Package Description:

This decision package requests two State Active Duty funding packages to support: Wildland Firefighting Training, and Catastrophic Emergency Response (e.g. Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake/Tsunami) planning assistance for local jurisdictions

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 respond to a natural or man-made disaster. The expectation is that the agency will successfully execute a minimum of one emergency planning assistance pilot test with a local jurisdiction and train 250 soldiers in Wildland Firefighting Training (Red Card) in order to sustain 10*Type II Hand Crews.

Performance Measure Detail

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.

1-2-9: Increase the # of WA NG External Planning & Assistance Outreach projects from 1 per quarter to 1 per month or 12/year in FY16.

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

Yes. This decision package directly supports Governor Inslee's budget priority to ensure public safety.

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 emergency planning, response and recovery with local entities. In addition, the Governor designated The Adjutant General (TAG) as the Homeland Security Advisor for Washington State.

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

The Washington Military Department Emergency Management Division already delivers as much planning and assistance possible within the current level of state employee staffing. Federal law will not allow a state use of National Guard members for any reason unless that is at state expense. Working within Department of Defense channels there is no exception allowed for state use of the National Guard with federal funds. Washington State previously funded firefighting training in the 99-01 biennium that allowed training firefighting capability in advance of the fire season. The Washington National Guard successfully pre-trained firefighting capability to support fire response rapid deployment. The experience with the 2015 Central Washington Fires shows that rapid, thorough response for wildland fires is important. Without National Guard State Active Duty funding the National Guard can only train when activated by the state during the emergency with funding provided by the Disaster Response Account at that time. This just in time training causes a response delay of at least one full week. During 2015 there was not any funding available to pre- train the Washington National Guard in firefighting in advance of the fire season. The National Guard was not employed until well after the fires were out of control and had caused extensive damage.

Washington State and local jurisdictions can only benefit from the expertise of these professionals who serve their state and country in a part time status if the state pays for it in State Active Duty Status.

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

Without this funding the Washington National Guard cannot do any domestic (Washington State) emergency response planning, training or exercising or assist any local jurisdiction with their own emergency response planning.

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 \$896,920 in funding for the activation of state guard personnel. The estimate used for SAD is \$182 per day*per person.

- 1. Wildland Firefighting (REDCARD; Type II Hand Crews) Training: \$431,000
 - a. P&A: 250 soldiers * \$182/day * 6 days = \$273,000
 - b. Training: Wildland Firefighting Training Contract Package = \$36,600
 - c. Logistics, Lodging and Transportation = \$25,000
 - d. Boots/Liners/Socks: 250*\$385.60=\$96,400
- 2. Catastrophic Planning Support for Local Jurisdictions: \$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

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	538,152	358,768	896,920

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: M2 Cascadia Planner
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Program: Blank

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Military Department submits this budget request to fund a Washington State CSZ Catastrophic Planning Program Manager. This funds a planner to establish a Washington statewide Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) catastrophic planning program. Catastrophic incidents such as the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake are radically different from other major disasters (e.g., wildfires and floods) requiring focused educational engagement to understand the differences, and to prepare plans and procedures to adapt to those differences. This decision package seeks to fund the development, coordination, and execution of detailed interagency state government enterprise planning for CSZ catastrophic emergency/disaster planning responsibilities. Initial staffing of a single planning manager is necessary to provide capacity to focus on interagency enterprise planning for the potential CSZ hazard. This will improve the state's ability to prepare, respond and recover from a CSZ catastrophic incident by providing initial staffing for the coordination of state government planning efforts with state, local, and federal agencies, tribes, businesses, schools, non-governmental entities, and the public.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State		98,600	98,600
Total Cost		98,600	98,600
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	.0	1.0	.5

Package Description:

The Military Department submits this budget request for the establishment of a statewide Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) catastrophic planning program to be managed by a State CSZ Catastrophic Planning Program Manager. Catastrophic incidents such as the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake are radically different from other major disasters such as wildfires and floods in many ways and require a focused educational engagement to understand the differences and to prepare plans and procedures to adapt to those differences.

This decision package seeks to fund the development, coordination of and performance of detailed interdependency planning across state government for CSZ catastrophic emergency/disaster planning responsibilities. This will improve the state's ability to prepare, respond and recover from a CSZ catastrophic incident by using industry best practices and lessons learned to guide state planning efforts and facilitate coordination with state, local, and federal agencies, tribes, businesses, schools, non-governmental entities, and the

public.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The state CSZ catastrophic planning program advances the preparation of state government for a catastrophic incident. The Emergency Management Council's Seismic Safety Committee in the Resilient Washington Report recommends many enterprise priority actions that involve state agencies. This initial staffing allows the department to:

- " Increase the # of state government priority recommendations in the Resilient Washington Report to be completed.
- " Increase the # of state government catastrophic level plans coordinated with federal and local jurisdiction plans.
- " Increase the # of state government catastrophic level plans that include private and public non-profit organizations in the catastrophic planning process.
- " Develop processes and procedures that allow state government to quickly incorporate and work with unfamiliar organizations that would be involved in responding to catastrophic disasters. Some federal agencies would never deploy to and respond within the state except of a disaster the size of a catastrophic emergency/disasters such as a CSZ earthquake.
- " Develop procedures that allow state government to additionally quickly incorporate and work with emergent organizations that are only present in large catastrophic emergency/disasters (e.g., Regional Coordination Centers).

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, 2017
3. Ensure the State Cascadia Subduction Zone plan is coordinated and de-conflicted with the FEMA Region X Cascadia Subduction Zone plan by December 31, 2017
4. Add 25 major private sector stakeholders to the State Catastrophic Planning Team by July 31, 2018
5. Add 15 private non-profit stakeholders to the State Catastrophic Planning Team by July 31, 2018

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

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 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?

Yes, Results Washington priority #4 Healthy and Safe Communities and #5 Efficient, Effective, and Accountable Government. Preparation for the CSZ earthquake/tsunami and other catastrophic incidents, catastrophic planning, and exercises are essential to establishing better Customer Confidence in state government. The ability of government to perform in all conditions, including catastrophic conditions, ensures the continuation of services that are critical to resident services for a modern society. Without good government functions including police, fire, water, wastewater, transportation services, debris removal, etc. the fabric of our state's society will suffer severe degradation and delay economic recovery.

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. State lead in catastrophic planning is a lynch pin to spurring catastrophic planning in local jurisdictions and acts as a trigger for increased hazard knowledge and preparation in local jurisdictions. With state catastrophic planning in place, local communities have a solid link to attach their planning efforts. The synergy generated between state and local government can advance the cause of preparing for catastrophic disasters and is most likely lost without the state generating the initiating action.

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 are 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. These plans can assist additional action by agencies and their stakeholders to examine extreme contingencies and prepare for them. Interaction between state agencies and local jurisdictions can improve implementation of the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Preservation Act, helping communities prepare by excluding development in potential catastrophic hazard areas.

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

State government operated with a federal grant supported catastrophic planner from September 2010 to April 2015. Funding for the catastrophic planning is currently funded with federal Emergency Management Performance Grant and matching state funds for the two FTEs currently performing these activities. 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 state 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 Super-Storm 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, preparedness and will impact local jurisdictions throughout most of the state through not providing the planning for them to leverage into local planning activities. Statewide catastrophic planning will continue at a slow rate, exposing the state to additional risk of not being prepared for catastrophic incidents, specifically the CSZ earthquake/tsunami. 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 be significantly reduced 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 using the most recent WSFE pay scale for Range 60 with 35% of the salary as the benefits calculation.

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		70,000	70,000
B Employee Benefits		24,600	24,600
E Goods\Other Services		2,500	2,500
G Travel		1,500	1,500
Total Objects		98,600	98,600

Agency: 245 Military Department
Decision Package Code/Title: M3 Armed Security-National Guard
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Program: Blank

Recommendation Summary Text:

This request is for funding to contract private armed security guards to provide personnel protection for Washington National Guard Recruiting Centers, and the Bremerton Youth Academy This will provide a secure environment for service members conducting day to day operations. Events occurring in many locations throughout the nation last year (described below) indicate a serious real world threat for community based military facilities and a need to provide security at these locations.

The terror threat level in the U.S. homeland is high, and the situation is getting steadily worse. There have been more U.S.-based jihadist terror cases in 2015 than in any full year since 9/11. Recent national events have highlighted the deliberate targeting of military personnel across the nation (e.g., Rochester plot to shoot US Military personnel 2014, Aurora plot to attack National Guard Armory 2015, Fort Riley plot to explode 1000 pound bomb at a military base, Chattanooga shooting at a Recruiting Center followed by an armed assault at a Naval readiness center 2015)

Since September 11, 2001 DOD and NORTHCOM has raised and lowered the Force Protection Condition (FPCON) Level several times based on information garnered from our Intelligence partners. We are currently at the highest FPCON level since the days following the New York attacks. In the last five months there have been no fewer than five calls for those who support Jihad to conduct "lone-wolf" attacks specifically targeting Military Personnel and/or Law Enforcement. Publications from terrorist organizations continue to highlight incidents that have occurred within the US, as tools to inspire others to act.

While the Washington State Fusion Center (WSFC) is currently unaware of any specific or credible information indicating any threat directed at governmental facilities, the absence of specific information does not discount the possibility that violent criminal or terrorist activity could manifest at these facilities. The FBI has said authorities have hundreds of open investigations of potential ISIS-inspired extremists that cover all 56 of the bureau's field offices in all 50 states.

National Guard Recruiting Centers are operated by small amounts of personnel in separate facilities throughout the state. The Washington State Youth Academy complex of facilities house at-risk 16-18 year old youth for an educational (high school) credit recovery and life intervention program with (24/7) 22-week residence at the facility. Stationing of armed security guards will support a safe working environment for the youth, staff, and National Guard Soldiers and Airmen at community-based facilities.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	664,440	664,440	1,328,880
Total Cost	664,440	664,440	1,328,880

Package Description:

This decision package requests funding for contracted armed security guards at 12 Military Department facilities during core business hours and 24/7 coverage for the Washington Youth Academy Operations at the Bremerton National Guard Readiness facility.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

100% of the State-Owned/Leased Community Based Facilities have armed security guard presence at each location. These facilities unlike a large military installation (e.g., Joint Base Lewis McChord) are single facilities located statewide without security gates or a security barrier. An investment in on-site armed security guards will protect department personnel, the public in close proximity (e.g. Recruiting Centers) and youth in residence for the Washington Youth Academy.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

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 having facilities that provide a safe working environment for staff you directly contribute to their availability to assist citizens during emergencies.

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

Yes. This decision package directly supports Governor Inslee's Goal #4 Healthy and Safe Communities and Goal #5 Efficient, Effective and Accountable Government.

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

A significant number of real world events happened throughout the nation last year that indicate community-based individual facilities found in the Armed Forces Reserves/National Guard are increasingly the target for "lone wolf" actors to commit violence. A variety of events, some based on the increasing terrorism threat and others just disturbed psychological individuals indicate a need to secure these facilities with armed security.

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

The Washington Military Department explored the possibility of fulfilling this security function in house with Full-Time Employees. This alternative proved not only more costly for Washington State but increased Washington State civil liability through a program that would be difficult to manage or supervise. Costs associated with equipment, initial hiring costs and annual training requirements coupled with travel to combined training sites will require increased staffing levels beyond what is minimally required in order to

maintain the basic service requested.

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

Without this funding the Washington National Guard would have to consider reducing recruiting footprint to provide safe working environments. This could be reduced by decreasing access to the general public for recruiting purposes. The cost of this regression is likely to degrade operational readiness for State disaster response as well as National Defense support requests domestically or abroad

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

No

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

No

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

- 1. Contracted Armed Security at National Guard Recruiting storefronts
 - a. Armed Security (1 per facility) at 9 Army National Guard standalone storefronts: (40 hours x 52 weeks) = 2080 x 9 x \$21 = \$393,120
 - b. Armed Security (1 per facility) at 2 Air National Guard standalone storefronts: 2080 x 2 x \$21 = \$87,360
- 2. Contracted Armed Security (1) at Bremerton Readiness Center/Youth Academy
 - a. Armed Security for Youth Academy 24/7 security during Youth Academy course: 365 days x 24 hours x \$21 = \$183,960

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>
E Goods\Other Services	664,440	664,440	1,328,880