

**REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES**

**Study on Regional
Criminal Justice Training
Academy Fees:
Training Services Provided to
Non-Governmental Agencies
or Organizations**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 59

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2004**

MEMO TO: The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Jr.
Chairman
House Appropriations Committee

The Honorable John H. Chichester
Chairman
Senate Finance Committee

Item 430 #2L, of the 2004 Appropriations Act (see *Appendix A*), directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to prepare a report on fees assessed by all regional criminal justice service training academies for services provided to non-governmental agencies. Additionally, the report shall include options for recovering any cost of the state-supported training services provided to non-governmental agencies. The results of our study are hereby submitted for your review.

Sincerely,

Leonard G. Cooke
Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted by Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, with assistance from the following individuals and organizations:

Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police

Virginia Sheriffs' Association

Cardinal Regional Criminal Justice Academy

Richard L. Schumaker, Director

Central Shenandoah Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy

William L. Flink, Director

Central Virginia Regional Criminal Justice Academy

Ron Staton, Acting Director

Crater Criminal Regional Criminal Justice Academy

Steve Mahoney, Director

Hampton Roads Regional Academy of Criminal Justice

Vince Ferrara, Director

New River Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy

Martin Alford, Director

Northern Virginia Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy

Gary L. Bullard, Director

Piedmont Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy

Charles E. Long, Director

Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy

Edward J. Evers, Director

Southwest Regional Law Enforcement Academy

Debra Hughes, Acting Director

This study was staffed by the following members of the Department of Criminal Justice Services:

Ronald E. Bessent, Program Administrator of Training and Development

John C. Byrd, Program Manager

***Item 430 L -- Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy Fees:
Training Services Provided to Non-Governmental Agencies***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Memo of Transmittal	ii
	Acknowledgements	iii
I.	Authority for Study	5
II.	Executive Summary	6
III.	Background	8
	A. Purpose and Design	8
	B. Goals and Objectives	8
	C. Criminal Justice Training Academy Design	9
	D. Regional Academy Funding History	9
IV.	Findings	11
	A. Issue Statement	11
	B. Survey Results	11
	C. Conclusion	12
V.	Recommendations	14
VI.	Appendices	16
	<i>Appendix A:</i> Item 430 Appropriations Act	17
	<i>Appendix B:</i> Questionnaire Regarding Regional Academy Fees	20
	<i>Appendix C:</i> Funding Chart for Regional Training Academies	26

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

In the 2004 Appropriations Act, the General Assembly designated \$914,585.00 from the General Fund and \$941,797.00 from the Regional Academy Special Fund for training services provided by the ten regional criminal justice training academies. Additionally, the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) was directed to prepare a report on the fees assessed by the regional academies for training services provided to non-governmental agencies. (See *Appendix A.*)

Under Title 9.1, Chapter 1, *Code of Virginia*, DCJS is given the authority to make grants and provide technical assistance to state agencies, local governments, and regional and non-profit organizations for certain specified purposes. Under Subparagraph B.1.a of the 2004 Appropriations Act, the Criminal Justice Services Board is directed to adopt rules for the distribution of funds allocated to the regional academies. (See *Appendix A.*)

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) was directed by the 2004 Session of the General Assembly to study the fees assessed by regional criminal justice training academies for training provided to non-governmental agencies and to determine if these fees fully cover training costs. The results of this study and any recommendations are to be submitted to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

In order to comply with the directives for this study, DCJS conducted interviews with representatives of the Virginia Chiefs of Police Association, the Virginia Sheriffs' Association, selected regional academy directors, and surveyed all regional academies. In addition, past and current funding formulas and allocations were reviewed. In Budget Year FY 2004-2005, the regional academies will receive \$914,585 in General Fund monies and approximately \$1,451,455 from Special Fund monies. This represents a total decrease of \$274,385 in state funding since 1998. These funds are distributed based on the officer population of local agencies served. Money authorized and distributed by DCJS is not solely based on being a member of the academy. Private police and state agencies are not counted in the total officer population for determination of state funding.

Since training costs exceed the state funding provided, all regional academies assess their member agencies, both public and private, a per-officer-membership fee. Seven of the ten regional academies provide training services to non-governmental agencies. Of the seven, five charge the same fee for both private and public agencies. However, six of the seven also receive in-kind services such as instructor assistance, equipment, supplies, and facilities to supplement what they receive in membership fees. While most academies have not calculated the dollar value of these in-kind services received, they believe the costs of the services would be substantial and having to pay for them would place an additional burden on public agency members. Only one regional academy, New River, reported receiving no in-kind services from their private agency members.

While it appears that most (five) of the seven academies providing services to private agencies are subsidizing the costs of these services with state funds, that is not likely to be the case once the in-kind support from the private agencies is taken into account. However, because the academies generally do not document the value of in-kind services received, it is difficult to definitively show equity in the fees assessed private and public agencies. As a result, DCJS makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation A: Regional academies providing services to non-governmental agencies should distinguish these services in a separate line item in their budgets. The cost of providing training to these agencies should be determined separately from other agencies supported with state funds. Any additional costs to provide training to non-governmental agencies should be reflected in their fee structure minus any value for in-kind and other non-revenue services provided.

Recommendation B: All regional academies should accurately document the value of any in-kind services, equipment, supplies, facilities, or other services received from all member agencies. This documentation should be included in the academies' annual audits. If the value of these services, along with the fees charged, are not sufficient to cover the cost of providing training to non-governmental agencies, the fees charged to them should be adjusted to cover any cost deficit. Documentation of annual audits, including the value consideration for in-kind and other non-revenue services, should be provided to DCJS.

Recommendation C:

C1. Since it would be very difficult to determine the amount of state funds, if any, that may have been used to support private agency training, it is recommended that the Commonwealth not pursue recovery of past differences in membership fees.

C2. Recommendations A and B should be instituted. Any discrepancies between membership fees for private agencies and the value of in-kind services, and the actual costs of training during an independent audit, should be reported to DCJS. The difference reported would be withheld by DCJS from the State General Fund appropriations for that academy. DCJS should develop a policy for obtaining the audit reports, withholding General Fund appropriations when necessary, and a process for redistribution of these funds to the non-offending academies.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Purpose and Design

The purpose of this study is to assess the usage of training services provided to non-governmental law enforcement agencies by state-funded regional criminal justice training academies. Additionally, this study reviewed the fee structure used by the regional academies to determine if these fees fully covered the costs of providing training to non-governmental agencies. By examining this information, the study will attempt to identify if public funds are being used to subsidize training for non-public agencies and, if so, what should be done to recover these costs.

In conducting this study, the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) consulted with the Virginia Chiefs' and Sheriffs' Associations and regional training academy directors. Additionally, a survey was sent to all regional academies in an attempt to determine training costs, academy budgets, percent of officer population membership fees assessed, the difference (if any) in fees charged to public and private agencies, what in-kind services may be provided, and potential benefits or drawbacks experienced with non-governmental agencies. The results of this survey are located in *Appendix B* of this report.

B. Study Goals / Objectives

Item 430 L of the 2004 Appropriations Act directed DCJS to “. . . prepare a report on fees assess by all regional criminal justice service training academies for training services provided to non-governmental agencies or organizations.” The specific objectives of this study focused on:

- ◆ identification of membership fees assessed to both public and non-governmental agencies;
- ◆ costs of training;
- ◆ assessment of whether fees charged to non-governmental agencies fully recognize the costs of training provided; and
- ◆ whether options are needed to recover the costs of the state-supported training services provided to non-governmental agencies.

The primary focus of this study was to determine the academies' fee structures and assess whether they were fair and equitable. In addition, the following secondary objectives were identified and addressed:

- ◆ any in-kind services provided by non-governmental agencies; and
- ◆ any ancillary benefits provided by non-governmental agencies that may extend beyond the basic fees.

C. Criminal Justice Training Academy Designs

The Virginia criminal justice training delivery system is a decentralized, locally controlled network of independent and regional academies. There are six state agencies and 18 local departments with their own training academies which are classified as independent academies and receive no state funds.

There are ten regional academies located throughout the Commonwealth which are partially state funded. In addition, several of the regional academies operate satellite facilities to reduce the distance travelled to training sites by students. Each of the regional academies is run by a training director who reports to a board comprised of representatives from the academy's member agencies (usually chiefs, sheriffs, and agency administrators). Membership in regional academies is comprised of both public and non-governmental agencies. Public agencies are members through charter agreement while non-governmental agencies are contractual members. The regional academies provide a variety of training including basic, in-service, and specialized courses to all their member agencies.

D. Regional Academy Funding History

Prior to 1982, 90 percent of all funding to the original seven regional academies was provided by the state using federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) funds. However, as the LEAA program was phased out, the General Assembly agreed to provide 60 percent of the fund amounts lost provided that the local governments involved came up with the remaining 40 percent. The appropriation was made to DCJS to be distributed to the regional academies.

As a result, in 1987, DCJS developed a formula for distribution of funds to the academies. The formula established a base amount for each academy predicated on essential expenses. The remaining funds were then distributed based on a three-year average of each academy's officer population. The total state allocation for FY 1987-1988 was \$965,954.

In 1988, two additional regional academies, Cardinal in Salem and Rappahannock in Fredericksburg, were approved for state funding. The General Assembly appropriated approximately \$84,000 and \$90,000, respectively. These funds were specifically designated and not subject to the formula used for the other seven academies. Also at that time, the General Assembly increased funds for the other seven regional academies by \$143,818.

Because Cardinal and Rappahannock academies continued to grow in officer population served, they asked to be included in the DCJS formula for fund distribution. In 1990, the formula was revised with a new base amount for all nine regional academies based on the \$1,283,625 total appropriation, with any increase or decrease of funds applied by a three-year average officer population. Instead, funding was decreased to \$1,125,408.

In 1997, the Crime Commission conducted a study on Funding of Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies. (See **HD 63, 1997**.) This study recommended that state funding to the nine regional academies be increased to \$2,127,971 and dispersed solely on the basis of

officer population. Additionally, it was recommended that a \$1 fee be assessed on all convictions for traffic offenses, misdemeanors, and felonies. The proceeds from this increase in fines would be placed in a special fund for allocation to the regional training academies. As a result of the recommendations, the 1997 General Assembly passed legislation creating a special criminal justice training fund through the \$1 fee assessment on convictions. In order for the fund to adequately accumulate, distribution of money from this fund was deferred until the 1998 budget cycle.

Also in 1997, a tenth regional academy was created. The Piedmont Regional Academy was recognized by the General Assembly, and \$63,562 of General Fund money was appropriated. Thus, the total General Fund appropriation for regional academies equaled \$1,188,970. Beginning with the 1998 budget cycle, DCJS changed the distribution formula to be based solely on officer population to comply with the Crime Commission's recommendation.

For the past three years, both of the regional academy funds have sustained budget cuts. The General Fund allocation for FY 2004-2005 is \$914,585, a \$274,385 cut since 1998. The current amount in the Special Fund for distribution is \$1,451,455 after a budget reduction of \$172,765. A chart of each academy's state funding allocation for FY 2004-2005 is located in *Appendix C*.

IV. FINDINGS

A. Issue Statement

The regional criminal justice training academies are composed of a variety of diverse agencies. While all ten provide training for local police departments, sheriffs' offices, and regional jails, many also provide training for private or non-governmental agencies. These latter agencies may be industry-related such as railroad police, or planned community private police departments, or non-state funded private colleges and universities. While training services provided to these private agencies are contractual and fee-based, because regional academies are partially state-funded, the question has been raised as to whether state funds are subsidizing training for private agencies.

In order to attempt to answer the question, DCJS surveyed all ten regional academies regarding their budgets, training costs, fees, and non-governmental agency membership. For the purposes of this study, a non-governmental agency was defined as “. . . any agency that is funded solely by private funds to include, but not limited to: private companies, private gated-communities, railroad police, non-state-funded institutions of higher learning, private jails, or any other agency not funded by local or state funds.”

B. Survey Results

According to survey results, regional academies have total operating budgets ranging from a low of \$221,341 at Piedmont to a high of \$2.97 million at Northern Virginia. While the average total budget is \$886,719, six out of the ten academies have budgets under \$600,000.

Determining training costs per officer was difficult to ascertain. Most academies, 70 percent, simply took their total budget and divided by their officer population. However, three academies did not provide a cost noting variables such as type of class, class size, class duration, and different resource requirements. Those that did provide a cost per officer gave a range of \$207 per officer to \$1,247. On the average, it was reported that training costs per officer were approximately \$500.

Seventy percent of the regional academies reported training officers from non-governmental agencies. The total number of officers trained in this category is 461, averaging about 66 officers per academy. Central Virginia Regional Academy had the highest non-governmental officer population with 216, while New River had the lowest with six. This represents, on the average, less than five percent of the academies' total officer population. Again, for the purposes of this study, agencies supported by state, local, or federal funds were not considered to be non-governmental agencies even though they may not be factored into the DCJS funding formula.

All seven regional academies that train non-governmental officers report that they charge a fee to these agencies for training services. Likewise, all reported that the fee is based on a per-officer charge. Five of the seven regional academies reported that the fees charged to non-

governmental agencies are the same amount charged to governmental agencies. Only two indicated that they charge non-governmental agencies more than public agency members. According to the academies, these fees plus the state funding cover all of their training costs. The average per officer fee charged to non-governmental agencies is \$286, while the average per officer fee charged to public members is \$265. The average difference is \$21 more per officer for non-governmental agencies.

However, the fee structure becomes less significant when in-kind services are considered. Six of the seven regional academies reported that private agencies provide in-kind services. These services range from instructor support to surplus equipment, supplies, firing ranges, and other training facilities. The value of these services can range from \$500 to millions of dollars. For example, Central Virginia Academy indicated that they use the firing training range of private member Babcox and the Wilcox Police Department at no cost. Given that the academy does not have its own firing range, it would cost them well over a million dollars to build a similar facility. While four academies indicated their membership fees to local agencies would not increase if these in-kind services were not available, most (five) indicated more in-kind services would be required from local member agencies. Additionally, the academy directors feel that there are other benefits to private agency membership. Besides the in-kind services mentioned, other benefits such as diversity of experience and public-private cooperation add to the total academy experience. For example, the Norfolk Southern Railroad Police Department provides free courses on railroad safety and railroad law and enforcement to other member departments.

The regional academies that provide training to private agencies feel that the non-financial benefits and in-kind services these agencies contribute more than compensates for any increase in fees they may charge. Some of the academy directors indicated that they could not afford to lose their private members as the services and facilities they provide cannot be replaced without substantial expense to the academy.

C. Conclusion

Seven out of the ten regional academies provide training services to non-governmental/private agencies. While all seven charge membership fees, most (five academies) do not charge higher membership fees to these private agencies. While on the surface this appears to indicate that state funds might be subsidizing training for private agencies, our study reveals that in all but one academy these private agencies provided a myriad of in-kind services. Some of these services cannot be easily replaced and are of substantial value to the academy and its local government members. In these cases, the additional services and facilities more than make up for any difference in a higher training fee. The one regional academy that reported receiving no in-kind services (New River) also indicated that they charge the same fee per officer for both private and public member agencies. In this one case, some adjustment may be in order.

One area of concern is that the academies do not document the value of in-kind services, equipment, or facilities provided by private or public agencies. Public members often provide in-kind services in the form of instructors and training assistance. Because of the lack of documentation on the value of these services, it is difficult to determine how much additional

value is provided by private versus public agency members. At a minimum, the academies that receive in-kind support from their members should document the value of these services. Additionally, New River Regional Academy should re-examine its fee structure for its non-governmental agency members.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation A:

While all seven regional academies providing training services to non-governmental agencies reported that the fees charged to these agencies fully cover all their training costs, there appears to be some discrepancy. Since most (five of the seven academies) charge the same fee for both private and public members, and much of their training costs are subsidized by state funds, and since actual training costs are difficult to determine, we cannot say for certain that membership fees fully cover all training costs.

Recommendation A: Regional academies providing services to non-governmental agencies should distinguish these services in a separate line item in their budgets. The cost of providing training to these agencies should be determined separately from other agencies supported with state funds. Any additional costs to provide training to non-governmental agencies should be reflected in their fee structure minus any value for in-kind and other non-revenue services provided.

Recommendation B:

It is obvious that there are substantial contributions of in-kind and other non-revenue services provided by non-governmental agencies. Many of these services would be difficult and very expensive to replace. These services often more than make up for lack of differences in fee charges. However, the academies do not track these services and document their value. This makes it difficult to justify charging the same membership fees for private and public agencies.

Recommendation B: All regional academies should accurately document the value of any in-kind services, equipment, supplies, facilities, or other services received from all member agencies. This documentation should be included in the academies' annual audits. If the value of these services, along with the fees charged, are not sufficient to cover the cost of providing training to non-governmental agencies, the fees charged to them should be adjusted to cover any cost deficit. Documentation of annual audits, including the value consideration for in-kind and other non-revenue services, should be provided to DCJS.

Recommendation C:

The language in the Appropriations Act directing DCJS to conduct this study specifies that the report include options for recovering the costs of the state-supported training services provided to non-governmental agencies. Considering that it is difficult to determine actual training costs, and if fees charged in combination with in-kind services actually cover all training costs, it is virtually impossible to identify whether state funds supported training to private agencies. The only academy that can be clearly identified for potentially subsidizing private

agency training services is New River. This is the only regional academy that indicates receiving no in-kind services from their private members. Furthermore, they indicate that their training cost per officer is \$507, but their per-officer fee for all agencies is only \$225. Technically, there is a \$282 difference which should be added to the private agencies' membership fees. However, New River has only one private agency with six officers. This is less than one percent of their officer population. At worst, only \$1,710 is in question and is a very small percent of the academy's state allocation.

1. Since it would be very difficult to determine the amount of state funds, if any, that may have been used to support private agency training, it is recommended that the State not pursue recovery of past differences in membership fees.
2. Recommendations A and B should be instituted. Any discrepancies between membership fees for private agencies and the value of in-kind services, and the actual costs of training during an independent audit, should be reported to DCJS. The difference reported would be withheld by DCJS from the State General Fund appropriations for that academy. DCJS should develop a policy for obtaining the audit reports, withholding General Fund appropriations when necessary, and a process for redistribution of these funds to the non-offending academies.

Appendices

Appendix A

Department of Criminal Justice Services (140)

430.	Financial Assistance for Administration of Justice Services (39000)	66,559,178 67,424,428
	Financial Assistance to Localities for Administration of Justice Services (39001)	66,559,178 67,424,428
Fund Sources:	General	25,496,512 26,361,762
	Special	100,000 100,000
	Trust and Agency	10,000,000 10,000,000
	Dedicated Special Revenue	6,405,261 6,405,261
	Federal Trust	24,557,405 24,557,405

Authority: Title 9.1, Chapter 1, *Code of Virginia*.

A. This appropriation includes an estimated \$12,000,000 the first year and an estimated \$12,000,000 the second year in federal funds pursuant to the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968, as amended. Of these amounts, nine percent is available for administration and the remainder is available for grants to state agencies and local units of government. The remaining federal funds are to be passed through as grants to localities, with a required 25 percent local match. Also included in this appropriation is \$829,930 the first year and \$829,930 the second year from the General Fund for the required matching funds for state agencies.

B. The Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance out of this appropriation to state agencies, local governments, regional and nonprofit organizations for the establishment and operation of programs for the following purposes and up to the amounts specified:

1.a. Regional training academies for criminal justice training: \$914,585 the first year and \$914,585 the second year from the General Fund, and an estimated \$941,797 the first year and an estimated \$941,797 the second year from non-General Funds. The Criminal Justice Services Board shall adopt such rules as may reasonably be required for the distribution of funds and for the establishment, operation, and service boundaries of state-supported regional criminal justice training academies.

1.b. The Board of Criminal Justice Services, consistent with [§9.1-102](#), *Code of Virginia*, and § 6VAC-20-20-61 of the Administrative Code, shall not approve or provide funding for the establishment of any new criminal justice training academy from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2006.

2. Virginia Crime Victim-Witness fund: \$5,124,059 the first year and \$5,124,059 the second year from dedicated special revenue.

3. Court Appointed Special Advocate programs: \$928,750 the first year and \$975,000 the second year from the General Fund.

C. 1. Out of this appropriation, \$19,439,828 the first year and \$20,258,828 the second year from the General Fund is authorized to make discretionary grants and to provide technical assistance to cities, counties or combinations thereof to develop, implement, operate and evaluate programs, services and facilities established pursuant to the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders (§[53.1-182.1](#), *Code of Virginia*) and the Pre-Trial Services Act (§[19.2-152.4](#), *Code of Virginia*). Funding for local-responsible offenders shall be limited to programs, services and facilities targeting those offenders specified in §[19.2-303.3](#), *Code of Virginia*. Funds for pre-trial programs or other alternatives to incarceration programs shall be limited to those established or expanded pursuant to Paragraph E 2 of Item 64. Out of these amounts, the Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to expend no more than five percent per year for state administration of these programs.

2. The Department of Criminal Justice Services, in conjunction with the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court and the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission, shall conduct information and training sessions for judges and other judicial officials on the programs, services and facilities available through the Pre-Trial Services Act and the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders.

3. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall provide an annual report on its progress in implementing the Pre-Trial Services Act and the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders to the Chairmen of the House Courts of Justice, Health, Welfare and Institutions, and Appropriations Committees and Senate Courts of Justice, Rehabilitation and Social Services, and Finance Committees.

D. In the event the federal government should make available additional funds pursuant to the Violence Against Women Act, the Department shall set aside 33 percent of such funds for competitive grants to programs providing services to domestic violence and sexual assault victims.

E. Subject to the conditions stated in this Item and with the prior written approval of the Director of the Department of Planning and Budget, there is hereby re-appropriated the unexpended balances remaining in the appropriations made in the Financial Assistance for Administration of Justice Services program on June 30, 2004 and June 30, 2005. These re-appropriations shall be used only for the purposes of the original appropriation for grants made by the Criminal Justice Services Board. This provision shall apply to funds obligated to and in the possession of state agency sub-grantees and the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

F. From such federal funds as may be available, the Department shall provide a grant of up to \$500,000 each year to the Department of Juvenile Justice for regional and state-wide training and technical assistance to localities in the development and evaluation of programs established under the Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act.

G. The Department shall provide a grant of up to \$1,300,000 the first year and \$1,300,000 the second year from federal funds to the Department of Corrections to continue intensive substance abuse treatment services in correctional facilities.

H. 1. Out of this appropriation, \$1,490,000 the first year and \$1,490,000 the second year from the General Fund and \$1,710,000 the first year and \$1,710,000 the second year from such federal funds as are available shall be deposited to the School Resource Officer Incentive Grants Fund established pursuant to §[9-171.1](#), *Code of Virginia*. Localities shall match these funds based on the composite index of local ability-to-pay. The Department shall give priority to localities requesting school resource officers in high schools.

2. The Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to expend \$357,285 the first year and \$357,285 the second year from the School Resource Officer Incentive Grants Fund to operate the Virginia Center for School Safety, pursuant to §[9.1-110](#), *Code of Virginia*.

I. Out of this appropriation, \$520,000 the first year from the General Fund and \$1,560,000 in the first year from such federal funds as are available and \$520,000 the second year from the General Fund and \$1,560,000 the second year from such federal funds as are available are included to support drug court programs statewide.

J. The department shall provide a grant of up to \$2,000,000 the first year and up to \$2,000,000 the second year in federal grant funds to the Department of Corrections to develop and implement the initial phases of an integrated offender management system, the first phase of which shall be the purchase and implementation of a system to replace the current offender time-computation system.

K. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods, with a focus on distance learning and computer-based training, for entry level and in-service training for criminal justice officers. In determining the feasibility of alternative training delivery methods, the Department shall consider the quality of training provided, cost effectiveness, and the impact upon local units of government. The Department shall consult with affected local governments, state and local public safety agencies, training organizations, and higher education institutions, including the Virginia Community College System. The results, including details on potential cost savings and cost avoidance, shall be reported to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by December 1, 2004.

L. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall prepare a report on fees assessed by all regional criminal justice training academies for training services provided to non-governmental agencies or organizations. The report shall include an assessment of whether fees charged non-governmental agencies or organizations fully recognize the total cost of training provided. The report shall also provide options for recovering the cost of the state-supported training services provided to non-governmental agencies or organizations by regional criminal justice training academies. The Department shall consult with affected local governments and government and non-government public safety agencies or organizations that utilize the regional criminal justice training academies. The results shall be reported to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by December 1, 2004.

QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING REGIONAL ACADEMY FEES FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

The Department of Criminal Justice Services has been tasked by the General Assembly to study fees charged by regional criminal justice academies to non-governmental agencies providing law enforcement or jail services. For the purpose of this study, non-governmental agencies are defined as any agency that is funded solely by private funds to include, but not limited to: private companies, private gated communities, rail road police, non-state funded institutions of higher learning, private jails, or any other agency not funded by local or state funds.

1. What is your total academy budget? Average: \$886,719.00
2. What is your actual training cost per officer? Avg. \$506.00
 Training cost is defined as costs directly related to the training itself such as: instructor cost, materials, academy overhead/operation, development cost, etc. It would **not** include any ancillary expenses such as: uniforms, awards, travel not associated directly with academy's training delivery, conference or membership fees, etc.
3. **Do you train officers from non-governmental/private organizations and agencies?**
 Yes 70% (7) No 30% (3)
4. If yes, how many officers are employed by these organizations? (Please list these organizations and how many officers are employed by each)
Total: 479 Avg. 66
5. Approximately what percent (%) of your total officer population do these organizations comprise? Avg. 3.6%
6. Do you charge a training fee to these organizations?
Yes 7 No _____
7. If yes, is this fee:
_____ a flat fee per agency?
7 based on a per officer charge?
8. Is your fee the same for all organizations/agencies? Yes 5 No 2
9. If no, do you charge a different amount for non-governmental organizations?
Yes 2 No _____
10. A. Does this cover all your costs for delivery of training to these agencies?
 Yes 7 No 2
B. If no, how do you make up the difference?
Tuition, dorm fees, other fees

11. How much is your fee to non-government agencies? Avg. \$286.00
12. How much is your fee to member governmental agencies? Avg. \$\$265.00
13. Do non-governmental agencies provide in-kind (non-monetary) services to support the academy?
Yes 6 No 1
14. If yes, what types of in-kind services are provided?
Instructional support (6); range facility (2); surplus equipment (3); misc. supplies (2)
15. If in-kind services are provided by non-governmental agencies, place an annual dollar amount on those services provided to the academy.
\$500.00 - \$1,000.00 (8); minimal (1); Millions in range facilities (1)
16. If in-kind services were not provided by non-governmental agencies, would members of your academy from state and local units of government have to pay an increased membership fee? Yes 2 No 4
If so, how much would this increase be? \$150/officer
17. If in-kind services are not provided by non-governmental agencies, would additional in-kind services be required of your governmental members?
Yes 5 No 2
18. What benefits, if any, do academies receive by training personnel of non-governmental organizations? Instructional support (6); donated equipment and supplies (4); diversity in officer population (2); public/private cooperation (3); additional revenue (2); reduced fees to government agencies (1); firearms range (1).
19. What disadvantages exist? None (6)
20. Do you receive any other services from non-governmental agencies that could not be received otherwise? Yes 3 No 5 If yes, explain.
Auditorium facilities; driver training area; firearms range; free Railroad Safety courses

FY 2004-2005 Regional Academy Funding

Academy	Off.Pop. percent	GF Alloc.	SF Alloc.	Tot. Alloc. 04-05	Tot 0
Cardinal	7.52per cent	\$ 68,751	\$ 109,108	\$ 177,859	\$
Central Shenandoah	10.57per cent	\$ 96,661	\$ 153,403	\$ 250,064	\$
Central Virginia	9.67per cent	\$ 88,456	\$ 140,381	\$ 228,837	\$
Crater	7.76per cent	\$ 70,926	\$ 112,561	\$ 183,488	\$
Hampton Roads	17.27per cent	\$ 157,911	\$ 250,607	\$ 408,518	\$
New River	3.62per cent	\$ 33,070	\$ 52,482	\$ 85,552	\$
Northern Virginia	14.62per cent	\$ 133,731	\$ 212,232	\$ 345,962	\$
Piedmont	4.39per cent	\$ 40,156	\$ 63,729	\$ 103,885	\$
Rappahannock	17.44per cent	\$ 159,507	\$ 253,139	\$ 412,646	\$
Southwest	7.15per cent	\$ 65,415	\$ 103,814	\$ 169,229	\$
Total	100.00 percent	\$ 914,585	\$ 1,451,455	\$ 2,366,040	\$ 2