Office of Regulatory Management

Economic Review Form

Agency name	Department of Elections	
Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) Chapter	1VAC20-100-10; 1VAC20-100-50	
citation(s)		
VAC Chapter title(s)	Ranked Choice Voting: Definitions; Ballot Treatment;	
	Ranked Choice Voting Tabulation	
Action title	RCV Batch Elimination Amendments	
Date this document	7/5/2024	
prepared		
Regulatory Stage	Final - Exempt	
(including Issuance of		
Guidance Documents)		

Cost Benefit Analysis

Complete Tables 1a and 1b for all regulatory actions. You do not need to complete Table 1c if the regulatory action is required by state statute or federal statute or regulation and leaves no discretion in its implementation.

Table 1a should provide analysis for the regulatory approach you are taking. Table 1b should provide analysis for the approach of leaving the current regulations intact (i.e., no further change is implemented). Table 1c should provide analysis for at least one alternative approach. You should not limit yourself to one alternative, however, and can add additional charts as needed.

Report both direct and indirect costs and benefits that can be monetized in Boxes 1 and 2. Report direct and indirect costs and benefits that cannot be monetized in Box 4. See the ORM Regulatory Economic Analysis Manual for additional guidance.

Table 1a: Costs an	d Benefits of the Proposed C	hanges (Primary Option)	
(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)	The direct & indirect costs & benefits listed below only apply to the current amendments to 1VAC20-100. The initial regulation regarding ranked choice voting (RCV) became effective on 12/03/2021. Therefore, the economic review only addresses the economic impact of the changes to RCV currently being made and not to RCV as a whole as this is not a brand-new regulatory chapter.		
	Direct Costs: The are no mo amendments as these change	netizable direct costs associated with the es are procedural.	
	Indirect Costs: There are no the amendments as these cha	monetizable indirect costs associated with inges are procedural.	
	Direct Benefits:		
	 While most of the procedural changes do not have any direct or indirect monetizable benefits, these amendments will increase efficiency in RCV elections. Batch elimination saves time for local election officials by reducing the number of tabulation rounds by eliminating multiple candidates at once which is it mathematically impossible for those candidates to be elected. ELECT cannot quantify the specific amount of time it will save local election officials at this time. However, we can provide the following overview: The average cost of an officer of election is \$150 per day The average general registrar makes \$31hr On average election officials work 18 hours on Election Day, starting from 5am – 11pm without RCV RCV tabulation can take multiple days By allowing for batch elimination localities can save on average \$398 a day for as many days as it takes to tabulate RCV results 		
	Indirect Benefits: There are no monetizable indirect benefits associated with the amendments as these changes are procedural.		
(2) Present			
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
	(a) 0.00	(b) 0.00	
(3) Net Monetized Benefit	+\$398 savings per day for every day not required to tabulate results if multiple candidates can be eliminated at once.		

(4) Other Costs &	Costs:
Benefits (Non-	• There are no non-monetized costs for this regulation.
Monetized)	
	Benefits:
	These amendments increase RCV tabulation efficiency and make
	tabulation more concise.
(5) Information	Department of Elections Staff; Arlington County General Registrar;
Sources	Maine RCV Tabulation Process; NYC Tabulation Process.

Table 1b: Costs an	d Benefits under the Status (Quo (No change to the regulation)	
(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)	Direct Costs: Local election officials would have to spend more time going through multiple tabulation rounds without batch elimination. • We cannot quantify directly how much time it would take local election officials to conduct multiple tabulation rounds and timing could be impacted by the number of seats on an active ballot • It could cost localities an average of \$398 a day to tabulate RCV results if localities do not have the ability to remove candidates who are mathematically impossible to be elected. Indirect Costs: There are no monetizable indirect costs associated with the amendments as these changes are clarifying and procedural Direct Benefits: There are no monetizable direct benefits associated with the amendments as these changes are clarifying and procedural Indirect Benefits: There are no monetizable indirect benefits associated with the amendments as these changes are clarifying and procedural		
(2) Present			
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
	(a) 0.00	(b) 0.00	
(3) Net Monetized Benefit	-\$398 a day on average for every day needed to tabulate results		
(4) Other Costs & Benefits (Non- Monetized)	With batch elimination election officials can potentially take less time tabulating results.		
(5) Information Sources	Department of Elections Staff		

Table 1c: Costs and Benefits under Alternative Approach(es)

(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)	N/A	
(2) Present		
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits
(3) Net Monetized	(a)	(b)
Benefit Benefit		
(4) Other Costs & Benefits (Non-		
Monetized)		
(5) Information Sources		

Impact on Local Partners

Use this chart to describe impacts on local partners. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 2: Impact on Local Partners

(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)	See Table 1a. The direct & indirect costs & benefits for local partners consists of the same information contained in Table 1a as localities primarily administer ranked choice voting elections.		
(2) Present	P	Di ca vati di Ca	
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
	(a) 0.00	(b) 0.00	
(3) Other Costs & Benefits (Non- Monetized)	Batch elimination allows localities to spend less time tabulating RCV results		
(4) Assistance			
(5) Information Sources	Department of Elections Staff; Arlington County General Registrar; Maine RCV Tabulation Process; NYC Tabulation Process.		

Impacts on Families

Use this chart to describe impacts on families. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 3: Impact on Families

Tuble 5: Impact on				
(1) Direct & Indirect Costs &	Direct Costs: The are no monetizable direct costs associated with the amendments			
Benefits				
(Monetized)	Indirect Costs: There are no monetizable indirect costs associated with the amendments			
	Direct Benefits: There are no monetizable direct benefits associated with the amendments			
	Indirect Benefits: There are no monetizable indirect benefits associated with the amendments			
(2) Present				
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits		
	(a) 0.00	(b) 0.00		
(3) Other Costs &	The amendments may provide tabulation results more efficiently to			
Benefits (Non-	members of the public.			
Monetized)	1			
(4) Information Sources	Department of Elections Staff			
	l .			

Impacts on Small Businesses

Use this chart to describe impacts on small businesses. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 4: Impact on Small Businesses

I	
(1) Direct &	Direct Costs: The are no monetizable direct costs associated with the
Indirect Costs &	amendments
Benefits	
(Monetized)	Indirect Costs: There are no monetizable indirect costs associated with
	the amendments
	Direct Benefits: There are no monetizable direct benefits associated with
	the amendments
	Indirect Benefits: There are no monetizable indirect benefits associated
	with the amendments

(2) Present Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs (a) 0.00	Direct & Indirect Benefits (b) 0.00	
(3) Other Costs &	There are not costs or benefits for sm	nall businesses associated with the	
Benefits (Non- Monetized)	amendments.		
(4) Alternatives	There are no alternatives		
(5) Information Sources	Department of Elections Staff		

Changes to Number of Regulatory Requirements

Table 5: Regulatory Reduction

For each individual action, please fill out the appropriate chart to reflect any change in regulatory requirements, costs, regulatory stringency, or the overall length of any guidance documents.

Change in Regulatory Requirements

VAC Section(s) Involved*	Authority of Change	Initial Count	Additions	Subtractions	Total Net Change in Requirements
1VAC20-	(M/A): (D/A):				
100-50	(M/R):	12	1		+1
	(D/R):			Grand Total of	(M/A):
				Changes in Requirements:	(D/A): (M/R): +1
				requirements.	(D/R):

Key:

Please use the following coding if change is mandatory or discretionary and whether it affects externally regulated parties or only the agency itself:

(M/A): Mandatory requirements mandated by federal and/or state statute affecting the agency itself

(D/A): Discretionary requirements affecting agency itself

(M/R): Mandatory requirements mandated by federal and/or state statute affecting external parties, including other agencies

(D/R): Discretionary requirements affecting external parties, including other agencies

Cost Reductions or Increases (if applicable)

VAC Section(s) Involved*	Description of Regulatory Requirement	Initial Cost	New Cost	Overall Cost Savings/Increases
1VAC20-100-50	Provides for batch elimination	N/A	+\$398 per day on average to specifically tabulate results	+\$398 per day on average to specifically tabulate results ELECT cannot assess a
				percentage of overall savings at this time as an batch elimination has not been used yet and RCV is not widely adopted.

Other Decreases or Increases in Regulatory Stringency (if applicable)

VAC Section(s)	Description of Regulatory	Overview of How It Reduces
Involved*	Change	or Increases Regulatory
		Burden
1VAC20-100-50	Provides for batch elimination	Reduces the burden on the number of tabulation rounds a locality must complete if multiple candidates can be eliminated at once due to it being mathematically
		impossible for them to be elected.

Length of Guidance Documents (only applicable if guidance document is being revised)

Title of Guidance	Original Word	New Word Count	Net Change in
Document	Count		Word Count
N/A			

^{*}If the agency is modifying a guidance document that has regulatory requirements, it should report any change in requirements in the appropriate chart(s).