

Office of the Adjutant General

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without adequate funding, the Adjutant General would cease to have the essential administrative support that is required to coordinate and synchronize all efforts of the Adjutant General's Department.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	

Program Goals

A. Are military forces trained and prepared to respond to state and federal missions?
 B. Prepare the state to provide effective and coordinated response and recovery to natural and manmade disasters, to include terrorism.

Program History

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of military forces trained and prepared	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
2. Level of preparedness coordinate response and recovery to diasters	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 526,073	\$ 412,224	\$ 389,349	\$ 365,915	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 526,073	\$ 412,224	\$ 389,349	\$ 365,915	\$ -

State Comptroller Subprograms

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

With reduced or eliminated funding, the agency would incur late fees, loss of credibility from suppliers, missed state and federal deadlines, reduction of turnaround time on reimbursement from the federal government, reduced staff morale, inability to properly follow procurement and travel rules, inability to pay State Active Duty in a timely manner, loss of inventory control and increased deficiency findings from state and federal audits.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General KSA 48-205 through 48-206	Discretionary	No	3

Program Goals

- A. Total number of repeat audit findings on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA)
B. Total amount of late fees paid annually

Program History

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Number of repeat findings on SEFA audits	A	0	0	0	0	0
2. Amount of late fees paid	B	\$ 5,090	\$ 8,415	\$ 2,627	\$ 5,377	\$ -

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 421,060	\$ 464,370	\$ 508,592	\$ 365,725	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 421,060	\$ 464,370	\$ 508,592	\$ 365,725	\$ -

Public Affairs Office

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The public will not be informed or updated on emergencies or disasters, which would have an impact on the Governor's ability to effectively respond to emergencies or disasters. Additionally, a lack of awareness of the activities of the Adjutant General's Department would have a negative impact on recruiting in the Kansas National Guard. The inability to meet recruiting requirements would put the State at risk to lose force structure and vital capabilities needed to respond to emergencies or disasters.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	--------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Program Goals

- A. Staff the Joint Information Center during emergencies that require activation of the State Emergency Operations Center to coordinate and disseminate messages with Emergency Support Function partners via the media and social media platforms.
- B. During educational campaigns (Severe Weather Awareness Week, Suicide Prevention Month, Read the Label Campaign, Sexual Assault Awareness, Kansas Preparedness Month, etc.) content is created and provided through various channels which include social media platforms, internal/external e-mails and news releases to the media.
- C. Publication of agency (Kansas Division of Emergency Management and the Kansas Army and Air National Guard) news and stories to keep the stakeholders in our agency, communities and state engaged and informed on what is happening within the agency.

Program History

The Kansas Militia, was formed Aug. 30, 1855. In 1993, the Division of Emergency Preparedness was redesignated as the Division of Emergency Management.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of times the JIC was staffed during emergencies	A	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
2. Percentage of times content was created for educational campaigns	B	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<i>Output Measures</i>						
3. Percentage of times agency news stories were published	C	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 212,054	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 212,054	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811	\$ -

Administration & Overhead - Human Resources

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Employees will not have direct access to information and technical support for benefits and payroll. There would be no structure for the implementation and administration of agency policies and procedures that ensure the fair and equitable treatment of employees as required by state and federal laws, statutes, regulations and practices. The agency will be vulnerable to equal employment opportunity (EEO) claims and employment lawsuits.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Program Goals

A. 100% of employees received New Employee Orientation (NEO) including enrollment in State Benefits for which they are eligible within two weeks of start date.
 B. Percentage of employees that received a performance review annually.

Program History

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of employees that received new employee orientation	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percentage of employees that received an annual performance review	B	99.5%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 138,655	\$ 171,582	\$ 183,847	\$ 188,819	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 138,655	\$ 171,582	\$ 183,847	\$ 188,819	\$ -

Information Technology

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Adjutant General's Department does not receive IT support from the KS Office of Information Technology Services (OITS). State employees/functions within the department receive IT support from the National Guard (NG) under a memorandum of agreement (MOA) at nominal cost to the state. Reducing the funding used for this purpose would result in the inability to pay for IT support from the NG. Thus the agency would have to secure IT support through other means, which would result in significantly increased costs to the state.

Statutory Basis

**Mandatory
vs.**

**MOE/Match
Rqt.**

**Priority
Level**

Program Goals

- A. Percentage of uptime for all prescribed services
- B. Percentage of all Help Desk tickets responded to within 1 business day
- C. Percentage of all requests for application and/or IT project development reviewed and evaluated and clearly approved or rejected within 28 working days.
- D. Percentage of all approved projects completed within established time and cost parameters
- E. Percentage of customer service feedback is rated "Positive"

Program History

--

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of uptime for prescribed services	A	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%
2. Percentage of Help Desk tickets responded to within 1 business day	B	98.0%	99.0%	99.0%	98.7%	99.0%
3. Percentage of requests for IT projects reviewed within 28 days	C	86.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.3%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>						
4. Percentage of projects completed within established time and cost	D	72.0%	95.0%	95.0%	87.3%	95.0%
5. Percentage of customer feedback rated "Positive"	E	92.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.3%	100.0%

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 212,054	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811	\$ 40,490
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 212,054	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811	\$ 40,490

Civil Air Patrol

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Emergency and other services provided by the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) such as search and rescue and disaster relief would be cost prohibitive if the State were required to purchase the services. The State would have to either pay the CAP or contract those duties that the CAP currently provides.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	KSA 48-3301 through KSA 3304	Mandatory	No	5

Program Goals

A. Agency simply administers the program.
 B.
 C.

Program History

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Outcome Measure #1	1					
2. Outcome measure #2						
3. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars						
<i>Output Measures</i>						
4. Additional Output Measure						
5. Additional Output Measure						

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236

Infrastructure - Army National Guard Facilities

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced or eliminated state funding would result in significantly increased risk for Army facilities. Kansas ARNG facilities are currently rated as "poor" in multiple areas and without acceptable funding levels from the state, we cannot sustain and modernize these facilities in order to support training Soldiers for State and Federal missions. If the condition of our facilities falls below acceptable levels there is risk of losing the units associated with those facilities. The loss of those units would result in the loss of the capabilities they possess for our state during an emergency and a loss of economic impact to our Kansas communities. Additionally, increased state investment in facility maintenance provides additional leverage when pursuing accompanying federal resources.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Program Goals

- A. Fund and support 84 RC & other FED buildings and ground maintenance across the State (1,376,723 sq ft)
 B. Fund and Support 103 Training Site Facilities across the State (753,842 sq ft)
 C. Fund and Support 28 Logistical Facilities across the State (283,170 sq ft)

Program History

Funding supports activities associated with the maintenance of Army National Guard (ARNG) buildings and grounds through sustainment, restoration, and modernization. These efforts are essential to providing community based installations and training sites that by virtue of their geographical dispersion can be leveraged by the Army and the State; and that facilitate communications, operations, training, and equipment sustainment to support the deployment of required forces for assigned State and Federal missions.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Routine Facility WO w/in 60	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Urgent WO w/in 7 days	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
3. Emergency WO w/in 24 hours	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. Preventative WO completed each quarter	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>						
5. Percent of federal \$ per state \$ invested	100	80.0%	80.0%		80.0%	100.0%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>						
7. Lease Renewals/New Leases	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
8. Energy Audits (required 25%)	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
9. A/E Compliance w/ EEP	100	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
10. Building Mgr Training per year	100		2	2	2	2

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,240,134	\$ 1,303,883	\$ 1,790,106	\$ 2,384,714	\$ 1,728,598
Non-SGF State Funds	363,926	483,375	367,136	154,314	-
Federal Funds	14,690,355	18,045,539	23,050,035	18,228,707	18,205,414
Total	\$ 16,294,415	\$ 19,832,797	\$ 25,207,277	\$ 20,767,735	\$ 19,934,012

Air Guard Facilities

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Significant risk is associated with a lack of state funding for Air Guard facilities sustainment and modernization to support State and Federal missions. State funds equals federal financial support and without it Kansas communities will witness an economic impact and degraded emergency response.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Program Goals

A. Provide a trained, professional force ready to serve Community, State and Nation
 B. Provide sustainment, repair and maintenance for Air National Guard licensed facilities
 C. Operate facilities economically, efficiently and timely to be good stewards of state funding

Program History

This agreement is a contract between the State of Kansas and the United States government for the operation and maintenance of US Government facilities licensed for use by the State of Kansas. This agreement is written pursuant to Public Law 95-224, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-104 and approved by the Adjutant General pursuant to authorities prescribed in K.S.A. 48-204 A.D. Title 32 U.S.C.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Manpower funded/authorized	72	75	78	75	80	
2. Base Population Authorized	94	93	94	94	95	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 967,683	\$ 965,982	\$ 960,521	\$ 1,109,903	\$ 1,066,190
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	5,724,796	5,689,356	6,106,409	6,811,908	6,456,022
Total	\$ 6,692,479	\$ 6,655,338	\$ 7,066,930	\$ 7,921,811	\$ 7,522,212

Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center (KIFC)

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced funding would result in fewer analysts, which would dramatically reduce the awareness of the threats to Kansas, its citizens, governmental institutions, critical infrastructure, key resources and private sector businesses and industry. This will result in increased risk to the items listed above, and reduced ability to prevent or mitigate the effects of naturally-occurring events like emerging diseases or purposeful acts, such as terrorism.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 2017 SB 184	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

A. Create high-value all-source intelligence products to protect life, freedoms and property of the people of Kansas. KIFC is focused on the three primary Kansas Homeland Security (HLS) risk areas:
 B. Terrorism threats, asymmetric warfare threats and transnational criminal organization (TCO) threats;
 C. Biological threats (both manmade and natural pathogens threatening human health, animal health, and plant/crop health)
 D. Cyber-warfare threats and threats to Critical Infrastructure/Key Resources (CIKR)

Program History

Since 2012, KIFC has aggressively sought to search, process, and exploit classified information from national intelligence networks, databases and message handling systems that support Kansas specific HLS intelligence analysis while building trusted partnerships with federal homeland security, intelligence community and law enforcement (LE) agencies to improve KIFC's ability to access threat information impacting Kansas. Gather local and state level threat events and suspicious activity reporting (SAR) for early detection of homeland security threats and for correlation with national level intelligence to develop analysis of persistent threats and long term trends, while protecting the civil liberties and privacy of Kansas citizens. Conduct rigorous intelligence analysis to support Kansas specific homeland security decision making needs at both the strategic and tactical levels. Develop networks of state and local homeland security, public safety, law enforcement and critical infrastructure partners to maximize dissemination of threat reporting and risk assessments and to collect continual feedback for regular reassessment of Kansas intelligence needs.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022
1. Number of threat briefings		106	56	100	87	100
2. Publish Intel Reports to intelligence community		31	53	75	53	50
3. Intel products disseminated to KS intelligence community		13	44	20	26	20

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
State General Fund	\$ 192,307	\$ 222,779	\$ 251,230	\$ 339,454	\$ 569,552
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 192,307	\$ 222,779	\$ 251,230	\$ 339,454	\$ 569,552

Mitigation, Preparedness, Prevention, Response & Recovery

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A reduction in funding would greatly reduce the ability for the State of Kansas to prepare, respond, and recover from natural or unnatural disasters. It is necessary to have state funds in order to receive federal funds. Without State funds these programs would not be able to support their statutory requirements. The inability to serve our state in times of need would be evident during a disaster. Lack of funds to adequately prepare for, respond to, and recover from any disaster could be devastating to our state.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-9	Mandatory	Yes	50% 1

Program Goals

A. Strengthen the State of Kansas' ability to prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from all hazards
 B. Funding provides for KDEM personnel and administrative costs associated with planning, mitigation, response, recovery, training, and exercises.
 C. Enhance statewide preparedness capabilities through collaboration and partnerships.

Program History

The Division was established in 1941 as State Council of Defense evolving to all an all-hazard program in 1974. KDEM was created under the revised statutes of Kansas, KSA Chapter 48, Article 9, (Kansas Emergency Preparedness for Disasters Act); and KSA Chapter 65, Article 57, (Kansas Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act).

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022
1. Number of training courses conducted	3	87	35	24	49	
2. Number of exercises conducted	3	215	144	75	145	
<i>Output Measures</i>						
4. Number of reviewed County Emergency Operations Plans	1	20	6	57	28	
5. Number of public awareness campaigns	3	6	6	6	6	
	1					
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>						
6. Number of ESF partner meetings	1	4	4	4	4	
7. Maintain KRP	1	1	1	1	1	

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
State General Fund	\$ 939,008	\$ 933,492	\$ 845,469	\$ 834,661	\$ 901,014
Non-SGF State Funds	-	26,724	-	-	-
Federal Funds	6,169,872	3,454,034	4,734,592	3,741,929	4,526,011
Total	\$ 7,108,880	\$ 4,414,250	\$ 5,580,061	\$ 4,576,590	\$ 5,427,025

Crisis City Training & Exercise Facility

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Operations at Crisis City will be curtailed or stopped, leaving large parts of the training venue unusable. This will result in a degradation of Kansas first responder skills, and an increase in local, county, and state agency costs by forcing them to pursue this training outside the state of Kansas.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General KSA 48-928	Discretionary	No	3

Program Goals

A. Ensure maintenance of venues and utilities are in working order.

Program History

The facility opened in October 1, 2009 and provides a state-of-the-art training and exercise facility to for first responders, the private sector, military civil support and emergency managers to apply learning in a practical environment.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Operational & Ready Status 100% 365/24/7	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 40,000
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 40,000

Disaster Recovery Payments

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eligible applicants at the local, state, and Indian Tribes will not receive pass through funds for federally declared disaster which is a violation of the Federal/State Agreement. These funds are associated with eligible reimbursements for disasters.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Mandatory	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-926		Yes	1

Program Goals

A. Provide reimbursement to eligible applicants as a result of a federal disaster declaration.

Program History

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, PL 100-707, signed into law November 23, 1988; amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, PL 93-288.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Reimburse eligible applicants	A					

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,960,684	\$ 3,034,739	\$ 2,855,688	\$ 1,626,600	\$ 3,222,768
Non-SGF State Funds	-	348,766	-	1,096,980	-
Federal Funds	15,879,409	19,501,837	19,656,073	24,333,687	37,602,111
Total	\$ 18,840,093	\$ 22,885,342	\$22,511,761	\$27,057,267	\$ 40,824,879

State Declared Disaster Payments

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding there would be no coordination of resources, causing chaos and potentially more loss. The State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) reduces those risks. During emergencies and disasters, the SEOC facility serves as the nerve center for federal, state, and local coordination, and is necessary to ensure continuity of operations and government in major disasters caused by any hazard. The cost burden of state-only is that there is no federal funding is available.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific KSA 48-926	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

A. Provide funds to supplement resources needed to respond to a governor's state of disaster declaration

Program History

--

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Number of State Declared disasters	A	7	12		10	
2. Number of damage assessments completed	A	181	3		92	
<i>Output Measures</i>						
3. Total state funds paid for State-only declared disasters	A	\$ 613,702	\$699,178		\$ 656,440	

Funding

<i>Funding Source (in X)</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Federally-Declared Disaster Payments

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without federal disaster funding, all response and recovery mission costs will fall onto the state and local levels. This will place a massive cost burden on those affected. Currently when a disaster is federally declared the state must provide 25% and the federal government provides 75%. Of the state's 25% share, 15% is paid by the applicant and 10% is paid with state funds (SGF or State Emergency Funds). The state must commit 25% or the federal share will not be available and provided.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-926	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

A.
B.
C.

Program History

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, PL 100-707, signed into law November 23, 1988; amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, PL 93-288.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Number of federal declaration requests		3			3	
2. Number of federal disaster declarations		3			3	
<i>Output Measures</i>						
3. Number of damage assessments completed		181			181	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Emergency Communications

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This section is vital to public safety communications for the state. It functions as the sole focal point for coordinated efforts to ensure effective and available communications in disasters as well as daily public safety operations. Due to its small size, any appreciable reduction in funding could result in complete elimination of functions essential to the statewide application of public safety

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-937	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

A. Maintain readiness to provide statewide interoperable communications

Program History

The function of emergency communication was established in 2007 due to the Governor's Executive Order establishing Interoperability in Kansas. One personnel reported to the Adjutant General and the Kansas Department of Transportation provided personnel and two deployable Communication on Wheels (COW) to support the state's 800 MhZ radio system. Later, the Office of Emergency Communications was established within the military division of the Adjutant General's Department and the personnel and equipment from KDOT was transferred to this office. In 2017, the Office was transferred to KDEM and is located within the Response & Recovery Bureau.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022
1. All requests for training/information are responded to within 1 business	A	99.0%	99.0%	100.0%	99.3%	100.0%
2. Percentage of time deployable communications capabilities are available for response.	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>						
3. Deployable communications capabilities are able to respond within 12 hours.	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) activations are provided with Emergency Support Function #2 (ESF2) support.	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
State General Fund	\$ 195,556	\$ 320,089	\$ 486,776	\$ 110,548	\$ 60,091
Non-SGF State Funds	580,732	569,794	272,929	224,823	322,604
Federal Funds	82,635	26,093	3,062	-	-
Total	\$ 858,923	\$ 915,976	\$ 762,767	\$ 335,371	\$ 382,695

Radiological, Biological & Nuclear

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced or eliminated funding would inhibit the state's ability to properly prepare and exercise for an event and the State would be in non-compliance with Kansas Regulations. Additionally, if the State does not plan and successfully pass an evaluated exercise, nuclear plants in the State can lose their license to operate.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-9, 40-48	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

A. Provide outreach to ingestion pathway counties, update incident specific plan and calibrate and distribute radiological equipment

Program History

1970s: To meet requirements of the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), a Radiological Systems Management section was established. Responsibilities included inspection, repair, calibration, and exchange services for over 70,000 radiological detection, as well as identification, and computation instruments in Kansas. The construction of two nuclear power plants – the Wolf Creek Generating Station near Burlington, Kansas, and the Cooper Nuclear Station in southeast Nebraska – required increased planning activities to protect the public from a potential release of radioactive material into the environment. The Kansas Statute that governs this section is Chapter 48 Article 9 Section 40-48, which is the Kansas Nuclear Safety Emergency Management Act

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of outreach to local emergency planning committees and industry	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
<i>Output Measures</i>						
2. Percentage of	1	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	
3. Conduct of annual nuclear power plant exercise	1	1	1	1	1	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,798	\$ 50,853	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,462
Non-SGF State Funds	650,578	604,008	617,707	586,301	905,197
Federal Funds	278,961	244,802	320,226	68,246	368,982
Total	\$ 936,337	\$ 899,663	\$ 937,933	\$ 654,547	\$ 1,292,641

State Active Duty

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas National Guard would be unable to perform the duties as ordered by the Governor in the event of an emergency.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	--------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Program Goals

A.
B.
C.

Program History

State laws passed in 1885 created the Kansas National Guard from resources of the State Militia. As a joint State/Federal agency, the dual mission of the Kansas National Guard is mandated in Article 8, Constitution of Kansas and Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution. A 1903 Congressional Act formalized Federal/State authorities in U.S.C. Titles 32, 10, and 5. K.S.A. 48-209 authorizes the Governor to place retired members of the Kansas National Guard on State duty for short periods of time to fulfill essential public safety service to Kansas. K.S.A. 48-253 provides authorities for the State to assist funding the KNG marksmanship programs. A major share is now federally funded including pay, travel, equipment and training.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. Percentage of all approved State Active Duty missions filled by KSNG per KDEM requirements		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
2. Percentage of guardsmen assigned		92.9%	90.8%	100.0%	94.6%	
<i>Output Measures</i>						
3. Percentage of qualified guardsmen		78.3%	74.1%	87.5%	80.0%	

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000

State Emergency Operations Center

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State Emergency Operations Center is the visual and operational hub to coordinate the state's response and recovery actions to support local governments. Care and upkeep is of the utmost importance. Without a properly maintained facility, the State's ability to respond to and recover from incidents would be greatly diminished. Additionally, without the State Emergency Operations Center, the ability to coordinate efforts with other State and Federal Agencies is eliminated

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-928	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

A. Sustain and enhance state operational readiness and response capabilities

Program History

The Division was established in 1941 as State Council of Defense evolving to an all-hazards program in 1974. KDEM was created under the revised statutes of Kansas, KSA Chapter 48, Article 9, (Kansas Emergency Preparedness for Disasters Act); and KSA Chapter 65, Article 57, (Kansas Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act).

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
1. SEOC 24/7/365 readiness						

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -