


# Why Connecticut should adopt Equal Voice Voting

<http://www.equalvoicevoting.com>



## All Connecticut voters should matter!



30.9% of eligible voters did not vote in 2016!

62.7% of eligible voters were NOT represented in the Electoral College in 2016!

Only 37.3% of eligible voters were represented in the Electoral College in 2016!

Simple Truth: It takes three registered voters to equal one viable presidential ballot!

### Equal Voice Voting Formula:

1. Count the state's popular vote.
2. Determine Popular Vote Value (PVV).  
Divide the state's popular vote by the state's electoral votes (Connecticut has seven).
3. Divide a candidate's state votes by the PVV to determine the number of electoral votes won.

### 2016 Example:

1. Connecticut's popular vote = 1,675,934
2. 1,675,934 divided by 7 = 239,419 (Popular Vote Value)
3. Candidate votes divided by the PVV:
  - a. Clinton = 897,572 divided by 239,419 = 4 (adjusted whole number value)
  - b. Trump = 673,215 divided by 239,419 = 3 (adjusted whole number value)

Connecticut had approximately 2,178,169 registered voters in 2016. Since Clinton won the state's election with 897,572 votes, the remaining 1,280,597 registered voters were NOT represented in the Electoral College! Something must be done to correct the problem.

### Equal Voice Voting will:

- Abolish the all-or-nothing approach for electoral vote allocation.
- Provide total popular vote representation.
- Retain and respect the Electoral College.
- Not require a Constitutional amendment.
- Modify how Oregon translates popular votes into electoral votes.
- Encourage greater voter engagement.
- Be easy to implement (simple math).

<b>Equal Voice Voting (EVV)</b>	
<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires no constitutional amendment.</li> <li>2. Is easy to understand.</li> <li>3. Eliminates campaign focus on swing states. Makes Oregon matter!</li> <li>4. Can be adopted by individual states, requiring no compact with others.</li> <li>5. Aligns closely to the state's popular vote results.</li> <li>6. Adheres to the federalist form of governance for each state.</li> <li>7. Provides representation for every viable candidate within each state.</li> <li>8. Causes candidate campaigns to include rural areas as well as population centers.</li> <li>9. Encourages news media and political parties to shape their rhetoric on actual voting results.</li> <li>10. Encourages citizens to vote (and be counted) because their vote matters.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires state legislators to serve all constituents beyond political party loyalists for presidential elections.</li> </ol>
<b>National Popular Vote (NPV)</b>	
<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires no constitutional amendment.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ignores our republic's federalist form of governance, abusing individual state autonomy for presidential elections.</li> <li>2. Voter recount provision is not established.</li> <li>3. Causes campaign attention to focus on more populated states (Not Oregon).</li> <li>4. Magnifies the voting disparity between popular vote and Electoral College results.</li> <li>5. Could discourage voter turnout.</li> <li>6. Requires an interstate compact before it can be implemented.</li> <li>7. State withdrawal from the compact could cause NPV to be disrupted, negatively impacting other NPV compact states.</li> <li>8. Ignores the constitution admonishment to not form an interstate compact. (Article I, Section 10)</li> <li>9. May require U.S. Congressional approval before it can be enacted.</li> </ol>