Feb. 1, 2017

Re: HB 231, relative to allocation of electoral votes

To: Madame Chair Rep. Griffin and members of the Election Law committee

I regret that another commitment prevents me from testifying in person at today's hearing on this bill to allocate New Hampshire's electoral vote on a proportional basis, such as the system used in Maine. On behalf of the League of Women Voters NH, a non-partisan organization committed to direct election of the President, I urge you to **vote Inexpedient to Legislate on HB 231.**

Recently I testified in support of HB477 that would use the National Popular Vote Compact to allocate electors. I still urge you to consider voting in favor of that bill. While it may seem that both of these bills would accomplish similar results, in fact they would not.

Proportional electoral votes would, like the existing Electoral College, still have an imbalance in the power of each person's vote. A voter in California would still cast a ballot with much less effect than a voter in little New Hampshire because of the way electoral votes are weighted (2 senate seats + Congressional House districts=number of electoral votes in the state).

More to the point, however, is that **if many or all states used the proportional allocation system, the likelihood of one candidate achieving the required 270 electoral votes to win the Presidency is greatly reduced.** Any election with one or more strong third party candidates participating is quite likely to come up with lesser electoral votes for either of the front runners, thus throwing the election of the President into the House of Representatives. I hope you agree with me that such an outcome is so far removed from the direct election of the President that we want to avoid it if at all possible.

My research on the internet yielded the data on the next page. The link to the method used contains math that is beyond me at this point, but it is a calculation method that has been used in many elections, here and abroad. **The research shows that the outcomes, even in several permutations, all indicate that last November's election would have ended up in the House of Representatives for a definitive vote if proportional electoral balloting had been used.**

While I admit that NH becoming a proportional allocation state along with only Maine and Nebraska would not likely change the outcome of the next election, I believe it is "a road down which we should not go."

Please consider the possible ultimate effect and vote **Inexpedient to Legislate on HB 231.**

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Tentarelli, president League of Women Voters New Hampshire
contact: home phone 763-9296   email: LWV@kenliz.net

Politics Stack Exchange is a question and answer site for people interested in governments, policies, and political processes. http://politics.stackexchange.com/questions/13319/who-would-have-won-the-presidency-if-all-states-electors-were-allocated-proport

(The following calculations appear on that website, quoted exactly below. They were made by a participant on the site who seems to have spent a great deal of time doing the math; submitted Nov. 14)

> I calculated the vote allocation using the Webster/Sainte-Laguë https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Webster/Sainte-Lagu%C3%AB_method method (based on results as of November 9, 2016) applied to each individual state:
>
> - Clinton **263**
> - Trump **262**
> - Johnson **10**
> - Stein **2**
> - McMullin **1**
>
> In the spirit of the Electoral College giving less populous states a boost in the vote, I altered the formula to award 2 votes per state to the winner of the popular vote, and the remainder allocated via Webster/Sainte-Laguë:
>
> - Trump **269**
> - Clinton **259**
> - Johnson **7**
> - Stein **2**
> - McMullin **1**
>
> For comparison, here I applied Webster/Sainte-Laguë to the entire United States population without splitting them based on state:
>
> - Clinton **256**
> - Trump **255**
> - Johnson **17**
> - Stein **1**
> - McMullin **1**
> - *Other* **8** *(these were not separated in the data source)*