



Virginia Department of Planning and Budget **Economic Impact Analysis**

**6 VAC 20-30 Rules Relating to Compulsory in-Service Training Standards for Law-Enforcement Officers, Jailors or Custodial Officers, Courtroom Security Officers, Process Service Officers and Officers of the Department of Corrections, Division of Operations
Department of Criminal Justice Services
Town Hall Action/Stage: 5722 / 10165 Proposed
June 24, 2026**

The Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) has analyzed the economic impact of this proposed regulation in accordance with § 2.2-4007.04 of the Code of Virginia (Code) and Executive Order 19. The analysis presented below represents DPB’s best estimate of the potential economic impacts as of the date of this analysis.¹

Summary of the Proposed Amendments to Regulation

The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) proposes to revise regulatory text to implement Chapter 37 of the 2020 General Assembly Special Session I (Chapter 37)² and to establish in-service training for dispatchers.

Background

Chapter 37 mandated in part that DCJS establish compulsory in-service training standards regarding (i) relevant state and federal laws; (ii) awareness of cultural diversity and the potential for bias-based profiling as defined in Code §52-30.1; (iii) de-escalation techniques; (iv) working with individuals with disabilities, mental health needs, or substance use disorders; and (v) the lawful use of force, including the use of deadly force, as defined in Code §19.2-83.3, only when necessary to protect the law-enforcement officer or another person. In this action, DCJS proposes to amend the regulatory language to comply with the statute.

DCJS proposes several approaches to comply with Chapter 37, including expanding an existing topic (e.g., “cultural diversity” topic would now also cover “awareness of bias-based

¹ See Code § 2.2-4007.04 (A).

² <https://legacylis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?202+ful+CHAP0037>

policing”); renaming an existing topic (e.g., “legal training” would now be called “relevant state and federal law”); adding a new topic (e.g., “working with individuals with disabilities, mental health needs, or substance use disorders”); etc. However, the total hours of required training would remain unchanged (i.e., every other year the following training hours apply: 40 hours for law-enforcement officers and corrections officers, 24 hours for jailors, and 16 hours for courtroom security officers and process service officers).

In addition to the mandated changes, DCJS also proposes to establish 24 hours of training every other year for dispatchers. This new training would include two hours on cultural diversity and awareness of bias-based policing, four hours on relevant state and federal law, and 18 hours on career development/elective topics.

Estimated Benefits and Costs

The changes proposed to comply with Chapter 37 do not affect the total hours of training for affected parties: law-enforcement officers and corrections officers; jailors; and courtroom security officers and process service officers. These changes, however, would reallocate some of the training hours from current topics to the topics required to be covered by the legislation. Moreover, DCJS believes that the criminal justice training academies have already started covering the subjects mandated by the legislation. Thus, the main impact of those changes appears to be ensuring the regulatory text complies with current Virginia law. In addition, the proposal is expected to provide consistency in training across all entities because the legislation does not specify the number of training hours for each mandated topic. Finally, while changing the training hours among different topics may affect the quality of overall training, there is no information to ascertain that effect.

On the other hand, the proposal to establish 24 hours of in-service training for dispatchers every other year is new and would increase the number of trainees attending the training academies. According to DCJS, the trainers at the academies are pooled from the same entities that are subject to the training as part of their regular duties. Similarly, the trainees receive the training as part of their time on the job. Training is typically offered and attended on site where the employee works or at the employer’s academy of record. Consequently, there is no additional financial cost to the trainees or their employers and there is no additional financial benefit to the trainers beyond their regular compensation. Thus, the proposed changes are not expected to

create any financial impact for trainees, trainers, or their employers. The main impact of this change appears to be to reduce the time trainers and trainees can devote to their regular duties. On the other hand, the time devoted to learning or teaching on training topics is expected to improve the knowledge of dispatchers on the subjects covered (i.e., cultural diversity and awareness of bias-based policing, relevant state and federal law, and career development/elective topics) and improve the quality of service they provide.

Businesses and Other Entities Affected

According to DCJS, there are 39 regional and independent criminal justice academies in the Commonwealth. Currently, the numbers of entities required to complete in-service training every other year are 23,892 law enforcement officers, 7,659 jailors/custodial officers, 6,302 courtroom security officers, 6,185 civil process service officers, and 5,250 Department of Corrections officers. Additionally, there are 3,961 dispatchers that would be subject to the training requirements under this proposal. No regulated entity appears to be disproportionately affected.

The Code requires DPB to assess whether an adverse impact may result from the proposed regulation.³ An adverse impact is indicated if there is any increase in net cost or reduction in net benefit for any entity, even if the benefits exceed the costs for all entities combined.⁴ As noted above, the discretionary change to establish training for dispatchers may reduce the time spend on regular tasks but is also expected to improve quality of their service. Thus, no adverse impact is indicated on their employers or the public.

Small Businesses⁵ Affected:⁶

The proposed amendments do not adversely affect small businesses.

³ See Code § 2.2-4007.04 (D).

⁴ Statute does not define “adverse impact,” state whether only Virginia entities should be considered, nor indicate whether an adverse impact results from regulatory requirements mandated by legislation. As a result, DPB has adopted a definition of adverse impact that assesses changes in net costs and benefits for each affected Virginia entity that directly results from discretionary changes to the regulation.

⁵ Pursuant to § 2.2-4007.04 of the Code of Virginia, small business is defined as “a business entity, including its affiliates, that (i) is independently owned and operated and (ii) employs fewer than 500 full-time employees or has gross annual sales of less than \$6 million.”

⁶ See Code § 2.2-4007.04 (A.2). and Code § 2.2-4007.1 (C).

Localities⁷ Affected⁸

The proposed amendments potentially affect all 132 localities as some of the trainees and trainers working at 39 regional and independent criminal justice academies are employed by localities. However, the proposed changes do not appear to create any direct financial costs for the local governments. Also, no locality is expected to be disproportionately affected.

Projected Impact on Employment

The proposed amendments are not expected to affect employment.

Effects on the Use and Value of Private Property

No impact on the use and value of private property nor on real estate development costs is expected.

⁷ “Locality” can refer to either local governments or the locations in the Commonwealth where the activities relevant to the regulatory change are most likely to occur.

⁸ Code § 2.2-4007.04 defines “particularly affected” as bearing disproportionate material impact.