

Fri-03-Apr-2020

The Electoral College Upgrade

A quick-study draft into amending the Electoral College in the U.S.

Revised

Quentin Ellis

ELLIQUENT WORKS, LLC & THE JAMII GROUP



The Electoral College Upgrade

*“There are many today who argue that the Electoral College ought to be relegated to a museum with other quaint relics of the past. They argue that it is anti-democratic and has no legitimate place in our government today.
In part, I agree. It is anti-democratic. That is what it was supposed to be.”
– John C. Greene*

The Pertinent Brief Basics



Redesigning the electoral college more reasonably can improve fairness & accuracy in voting. The new model would proportionately increase the number of delegates votes and proportionately distribute electoral votes between candidates. Also, it eliminates electors. Basically, it combines the benefits of the electoral college with fairness of the popular vote.

The allocation of delegate votes among the States would remain based on U.S. Census; this ensures maintaining equitable dominance between small- and large-population centers, a benefit of the electoral college.

As for changes, we would eliminate electors; this would ensure that electors could not defy the popular vote and that the candidate who wins is the one chosen by the electorate. We would multiply the entire college by ten to increase the number of delegates the states have to allocate between the candidates. States would correspondingly allocate each candidate a percentage of their total delegate votes based on the candidates' percentage of the popular vote won in that state.

A majority of 2700 electoral votes would be required to become president. To ensure that a candidate reaches 2700 or more--in event there are more than two candidates and no candidate obtains enough votes to hinder any candidate from reaching 2700--rank-choice voting would be used at the time of voting. This process involves all voters ranking their primary, secondary & tertiary choices when they first vote. And upon tallying the votes, the candidate with the least delegates has their delegate votes reallocated to their secondary choice. If needed, the process repeats eliminating non-viable candidates and reallocating votes until one candidate has 2700 or more delegates. (Weston, 2018)

Advantages that the revamp would have on the current electoral college include:

- It uses combines the democratic parts of popular voting with the population-balancing effect of the electoral college.
- It minimizes the effect of red, blue & swing states.
- Electors cannot defy the popular vote, therefore, no “faithless electors”.
- It resolves the imbalance created by winner-takes-all delegates design.
- It weighs the votes of all parties in each state.

- The minority-party voters are not deprived representation in their state.
- Third-party candidates are represented in the electoral college.
- Voters are not forced to only patronize one of the two major parties.
- The elections would not be dictated by swing states.
- Politicians would be encouraged to campaign to all states, not just electioneering in the states that them the advantage.

NOTE: This quick-study draft provides an actual example of an election perceived in the fashion of this “electoral college upgrade” using real data from the 2016 election on pages 9, 10, 11

The Current Electoral College

This section provides a background on the current design; to save time, one can skip past it. The Electoral College is a process, established by the nation's Founding Fathers, that attempts to balance a president's election through Congress and the vote of the American people. The process consists of the selection of the electors & the counting of the electoral votes by Congress. The Electoral College consists



of 538 electors. A majority of 270 electoral votes is required to elect the President. Your State has the same number of electors as it does Members in its Congressional delegation: one for each Member in the House of Representatives plus two Senators.

Colonies created the Electoral College to give all states and their citizens an equal say in the nation's matters, regardless of size. The 13 colonies initially created the Electoral College, as they wished to vest power in themselves without influence or control by

a central government, reasoning that if the election of the president is based solely on popular vote, only the areas of highest concentration of population will control national elections. It was considered a compromise that promoted democracy, while still allowing the government to function

(<https://www.reference.com/world-view...>).

Allocation Amongst the States

We allocate electoral votes amongst the States based on the Censuses. Every State is allocated several votes equal to the number of senators and representatives in its U.S. Congressional delegation—two votes for its senators in the U.S. Senate plus several votes equal to the number of its Congressional districts. Under the 23rd Amendment of the Constitution, we allocate three electors to the District of Columbia and treat it as a State for purposes of the Electoral College.

Each State (including the District of Columbia for this discussion) decides how to appoint its electors. Currently all States use the popular vote results from the November general election to decide which political party chooses the persons appointed (<https://www.archives.gov/electoral-college>).

Current Allocations

FIGURE A. The allocations below are based on the 2010 Census. They were effective for the 2012 & 2016; They will be effective in the 2020 elections. *Total Electoral Votes: 538; Majority Needed to Elect: 270*

Alabama - 9 votes	Kentucky - 8 votes	North Dakota - 3 votes
Alaska - 3 votes	Louisiana - 8 votes	Ohio - 18 votes
Arizona - 11 votes	Maine - 4 votes	Oklahoma - 7 votes
Arkansas - 6 votes	Maryland - 10 votes	Oregon - 7 votes
California - 55 votes	Massachusetts - 11 votes	Pennsylvania - 20 votes
Colorado - 9 votes	Michigan - 16 votes	Rhode Island - 4 votes
Connecticut - 7 votes	Minnesota - 10 votes	South Carolina - 9 votes
Delaware - 3 votes	Mississippi - 6 votes	South Dakota - 3 votes
District of Columbia - 3 votes	Missouri - 10 votes	Tennessee - 11 votes
Florida - 29 votes	Montana - 3 votes	Texas - 38 votes
Georgia - 16 votes	Nebraska - 5 votes	Utah - 6 votes
Hawaii - 4 votes	Nevada - 6 votes	Vermont - 3 votes
Idaho - 4 votes	New Hampshire - 4 votes	Virginia - 13 votes
Illinois - 20 votes	New Jersey - 14 votes	Washington - 12 votes
Indiana - 11 votes	New Mexico - 5 votes	West Virginia - 5 votes
Iowa - 6 votes	New York - 29 votes	Wisconsin - 10 votes
Kansas - 6 votes	North Carolina - 15 votes	Wyoming - 3 votes

Allocations within Each State

All States, except for Maine and Nebraska have a winner-take-all policy where the State looks only at the overall winner of the state-wide popular vote. Maine and Nebraska, however, appoint individual electors based on the winner of the popular vote for each Congressional district and then 2 electors based on the winner of the overall state-wide popular vote. Even though Maine and Nebraska don't use a winner-take-all system, it is rare for either State to have a split vote; it's happened only once in Nebraska in 2008 & Maine in 2016 (<https://www.archives.gov/electoral-college>).

Potential Problems with Current System

Arguably there are concerns raised with the current electoral college.

- This creates red, blue & swing states.
- Sometimes electors defy the popular vote and do not vote for the candidate their party chose. Sometimes the electors choose to vote for who they want to. According to Fair Vote, there have been 167 “faithless electors” since the electoral college was founded. (Lowry, 2019)
- The “winner-takes-all” per state result deprives minority-party voters of their representation. It forces minority-party individuals to vote with the majority party in that state. Essentially, in a majority-party state, the other party is notionally robbed of their vote.
- Third-party candidates are rarely, if ever, represented in the electoral college’s numbers. Americans are somewhat obliged to patronize the two primary parties (Democrats & Republicans), because only they are positioned to earn delegates.
- The elections are controlled by 13 swing states. This can encourage politicians to skew there electioneering. They ignore certain states as forgone conclusions, while targeting & catering swing states and those issues.

Swing States: Current Electoral College

FIGURE B. Below, looking at the data from the 2016 election between Hilary Clinton & Donald Trump, it is notable that a total of 158 delegate votes were available from these states and Trump obtained 79% of them, though he only obtained 48% of the vote. The “Difference” column is how many more votes Clinton received than Trump or vice versa.

State		Clinton	Trump	Difference	Other	Other	Total
Arizona*	11	1,161,167	1,252,401	91,234	159,597	6.2%	2,573,165
Colorado*	9	1,338,870	1,202,484	136,386	238,866	8.6%	2,780,220
Florida*	29	4,504,975	4,617,886	112,911	297,178	3.2%	9,420,039
Iowa*	6	653,669	800,983	147,314	111,379	7.1%	1,566,031
Maine*	4	357,735	335,593	22,142	54,599	7.3%	747,927
Michigan*	16	2,268,839	2,279,543	10,704	250,902	5.2%	4,799,284
Minnesota*	10	1,367,716	1,322,951	44,765	254,146	8.6%	2,944,813
Nevada*	6	539,260	512,058	27,202	74,067	6.6%	1,125,385
New Hampshire*	4	348,526	345,790	2,736	49,842	6.7%	744,158
North Carolina*	15	2,189,316	2,362,631	173,315	189,617	4.0%	4,741,564
Ohio*	18	2,394,164	2,841,005	446,841	261,318	4.8%	5,496,487
Pennsylvania*	20	2,926,441	2,970,733	44,292	218,228	3.6%	6,115,402
Wisconsin*	10	1,382,536	1,405,284	22,748	188,330	6.3%	2,976,150
Allocated Delegates:	158	33	125		0		46,030,625

FIGURE C. In contrast, if the election is perceived from the modified version of the electoral college being proposed. Each candidate would receive a portion of delegates based on the percentage of the vote won in any given state. Clinton receives a total of 735 delegates and Trump receives 762 delegates. Each candidate receives their equitable portion of the delegate votes. The swing states do not dictate, yet they fairly collaborate with the remaining 38 states, as it should, to choose the president. Thirteen states would not dominate the results of an election with 51 states voting.

Swing States: Electoral College Upgrade

State	Delegates	% Clinton	% Trump	%Other	# of Delegates Gained		
Arizona*	110	45.10%	48.70%	6.20%	55	49	6
Colorado*	90	48.20%	43.30%	8.60%	44	38	8
Florida*	290	47.80%	49.00%	3.20%	139	143	8
Iowa*	60	41.70%	51.10%	7.10%	25	31	4
Maine*	40	47.80%	44.90%	7.30%	20	18	2
Michigan*	160	47.30%	47.50%	5.20%	75	77	8
Minnesota*	100	46.40%	44.90%	8.60%	47	44	9
Nevada*	60	47.90%	45.50%	6.60%	30	27	3
New Hampshire*	40	46.80%	46.50%	6.70%	19	19	2
North Carolina*	150	46.20%	49.80%	4.00%	69	75	6
Ohio*	180	43.60%	51.70%	4.80%	79	94	7
Pennsylvania*	200	47.90%	48.60%	3.60%	96	98	6
Wisconsin*	100	46.50%	47.20%	6.30%	47	47	6
Allocated Delegates:					745	760	75

The previous data comparison of the swing states, using both current & upgraded designs, shows how the electoral college can skew the results of an election when compared to the actual voting desires of the electorate; however, arguments for why we should not eliminate the electoral college are sensible. Greene (2019) explains:

To do away with the Electoral College is to do away with national elections, and also to do away with presidential accountability to all Americans. Why? Because if the election of the president is based solely on popular vote, only the areas of highest concentration of population — i.e., the New York City area and the Los Angeles area, with a few other lesser but still highly populated areas sprinkled in, will control national elections. That's where the greatest concentrations of population are. The areas between the two coasts, already referred to derisively as flyover country, and the Americans who live there, will be effectively unrepresented in such elections.

The object of our constitutional republic is not to make everyone's voice exactly equal, but rather to make everyone's unalienable rights equally secure. The legitimate concerns and even the rights of large segments of the citizens of our nation could easily be ignored and even trampled upon by the largest cities of the nation. And don't think ambitious and unscrupulous politicians wouldn't play that situation like a fiddle.

The need to balance the desires of the population across states is understandable. Cities like New York, Chicago, Houston and Los Angeles have populations greater than some states. Each state has differing

electorate needs; the equilibrium of rural versus urban needs may often necessitate federal level actions. The college serves to balance this. If the popular vote always took precedent, we would run into similar problems: in this case, candidates would only concern themselves with the largely populated centers to earn votes, and the concerns of the less-populated regions would go ignored.

From political science to average Americans, many raise arguments as to why they believe the United States should do away with the electoral college. That is not the purpose of this quick-study draft. This work ponders using the parts of the electoral college that works, i.e. adjustments for states with various population sizes, and revising the parts that are failing, i.e. the winner-takes-all approach to allocating delegates per state.

The Modified Electoral College Made Simple

1. **The new arrangement of the electoral college would keep the vote distribution based on the census numbers.**
2. **Do away with electors to safeguard the electorates voting desires and refrain electors from defying the popular vote or rigging the system with superdelegates.**
3. **Using the current allocations of delegates, multiply the entire electoral college by ten. This would keep the proportion of electoral votes intact but give more electoral votes to each state to allocate to candidates. For example, Vermont would increase from having 3 electoral votes to allocate to having 30 and Illinois from 20 to 200. There would be a total of 5380 total possible votes to win.**
4. **Citizens would vote as usual. The candidate who reaches 2700 or more votes is the winner. OR, the candidate who gains the highest total of electoral votes is the winner.**
5. **To ensure that a candidate reaches 2700 or more--in event there are more than two candidates and no candidate obtains enough votes to hinder any candidate from reaching 2700--rank-choice voting would be used at the time of voting. This process involves all voters ranking their primary, secondary & tertiary choices when they first vote. [\[A short video explaining rank choice voting from Newsy...\]](#) The link's address is included in the references if you cannot access it here.**
6. **Moreover, if the candidate with the highest delegate total is chosen--as opposed to a race to 2700--rank-choice voting is unnecessary. However, a minimum threshold of the winning candidate earning at least 40% of the total delegates should be necessary.**



In the modified electoral college, all states become purple states. As oppose to delegates being allocated as they have in the past, each candidate would get a percentage of each states' electoral college; one party would not get all the electoral votes. The electoral votes are proportionately ascribed to the candidates based on the percentage of the population that voted for them in each state.

For example, the democrat wins 60% of the vote in Illinois, the republican 35% and the third-party candidate 5%. Instead of the democrat getting all 20 votes in the old college, 200 electoral votes would be allocated as follows (remember, the new college is multiplied by 10):

- ❖ *The Democrat would get 60% (120 votes).*
- ❖ *The Republican would get 35% (70 votes).*
- ❖ *The third-party would get 5% (10 votes).*

Proportionately distributing the electoral in this manner is more reasonable and fairer to all voters and candidates. This encourages everyone to vote, even in a majority party state. In the traditional system, the other party's vote is theoretically cancelled out by the majority party, and their voice is not represented in the electoral college. This reason has been quoted by persons as reasons why they do not vote. In this modified system, every party's voice is represented in each states' electoral numbers, including third-party participants who rarely earn electoral votes. Also, it makes all the states purple; it minimizes the sway of swing-states.

Another result of the modified version, the electoral college and popular vote should be congruent and reflect the actual voting desires across the American electorate. Primarily, the electoral college would still serve the purpose of balancing the states; states with larger populations, such as Texas, California and New York would not overshadow the smaller states in a popular-vote election. Secondly, the proportional distribution of votes would create fairer elections for individual voters, in which each party's votes are reflected in the electoral college--encouraging more voters. Because even if one party is larger and outvotes the other, the minority parties would still add to their candidates' overall electoral total. This is far better than being discouraged to vote because one believes & knows their party is not large enough to win the state in a winner-takes-all situation.

The Electoral College Upgrade is a more reasonable way to provide elections. It could improve equality & precision in the electorates voting desires. The new model would proportionately increase the number of delegates votes and proportionately distribute electoral votes between candidates. Also, it eliminates electors. The major areas of the revamp include:

1. Do away with electors
2. Continue to use census data to decide how many delegates each state receives.
3. Multiply the whole system by 10.
4. Voters may need to vote using a rank-choice process
5. The candidate that reaches 2700 becomes president.
6. If not a race to 2700, then the candidate with the highest delegate total would win, so long as they meet a minimum threshold.
7. The suggested threshold is 40% of the total delegates

Essentially, it combines the benefits of the electoral college with fairness of popular voting; as separate voting systems, both the popular vote and electoral college have parts that skew equitability in voting across the states that creates problems.

Other Movements to Change the Voting Process.



National Vote Interstate Compact

Willie James Innman reported on the National Vote Compact in February of 2019, in a Newsy story. State legislatures across the country consider changing the way the electoral votes are assigned. Here is how the vote compact would work. The states would link their electoral college votes to the winner of the national popular vote. Over the past decade, 16 states have joined the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact. The National Popular vote states account for 172 electoral college votes. Colorado is the most recent state to consider and would bring that total up to 181. The pact only goes into effect if the participating states total 270 electoral votes or more. It is currently 74 electoral votes away from its goal. Once enough states join the agreement totaling at least 270 electoral college votes, those state legislatures across the country consider changing the way the electoral votes are assigned. That agreement aims to change the way states award their electoral votes to ensure that the presidential candidate who gets the most votes nationwide ends up in the White House.

Popular Vote

This study assumes most persons are clear on how the popular vote works, so this will not expound on that movement.

Figures D & E, on the following pages, use the results from the 2016 election to give ensample as to how the Modified Electoral College would apply with real numbers from an actual election. Numbers from other past elections could be tested to hypothesize the legitimacy of this voting model.

Results from 2016 Election

State	Clinton (D)	Trump (R)	Others	Clinton %	Trump %	Others %	Total '16 Votes
U.S. Total	65,853,516	62,984,824	7,801,446	48.20%	46.10%	5.70%	136,639,786
13 Swing States	21,433,214	22,249,342	2,348,069	46.60%	48.30%	5.10%	46,030,625
Non-Swing States	44,420,302	40,735,482	5,453,377	49.00%	45.00%	6.00%	90,609,161
Alabama*	729,547	1,318,255	75,570	34.40%	62.10%	3.60%	2,123,372
Alaska*	116,454	163,387	38,767	36.60%	51.30%	12.20%	318,608
Arizona*	1,161,167	1,252,401	159,597	45.10%	48.70%	6.20%	2,573,165
Arkansas*	380,494	684,872	65,269	33.70%	60.60%	5.80%	1,130,635
California*	8,753,788	4,483,810	943,997	61.70%	31.60%	6.70%	14,181,595
Colorado*	1,338,870	1,202,484	238,866	48.20%	43.30%	8.60%	2,780,220
Connecticut*	897,572	673,215	74,133	54.60%	40.90%	4.50%	1,644,920
Delaware*	235,603	185,127	20,860	53.40%	41.90%	4.70%	441,590
District of Columbia*	282,830	12,723	15,715	90.90%	4.10%	5.00%	311,268
Florida*	4,504,975	4,617,886	297,178	47.80%	49.00%	3.20%	9,420,039
Georgia*	1,877,963	2,089,104	125,306	45.90%	51.00%	3.10%	4,092,373
Hawaii*	266,891	128,847	33,199	62.20%	30.00%	7.70%	428,937
Idaho*	189,765	409,055	91,435	27.50%	59.30%	13.20%	690,255
Illinois*	3,090,729	2,146,015	299,680	55.80%	38.80%	5.40%	5,536,424
Indiana*	1,033,126	1,557,286	144,546	37.80%	56.90%	5.30%	2,734,958
Iowa*	653,669	800,983	111,379	41.70%	51.10%	7.10%	1,566,031
Kansas*	427,005	671,018	86,379	36.10%	56.70%	7.30%	1,184,402
Kentucky*	628,854	1,202,971	92,324	32.70%	62.50%	4.80%	1,924,149
Louisiana*	780,154	1,178,638	70,240	38.40%	58.10%	3.50%	2,029,032
Maine*	357,735	335,593	54,599	47.80%	44.90%	7.30%	747,927
Maryland*	1,677,928	943,169	160,349	60.30%	33.90%	5.80%	2,781,446
Massachusetts*	1,995,196	1,090,893	238,957	60.00%	32.80%	7.20%	3,325,046
Michigan*	2,268,839	2,279,543	250,902	47.30%	47.50%	5.20%	4,799,284
Minnesota*	1,367,716	1,322,951	254,146	46.40%	44.90%	8.60%	2,944,813
Mississippi*	485,131	700,714	23,512	40.10%	57.90%	1.90%	1,209,357
Missouri*	1,071,068	1,594,511	143,026	38.10%	56.80%	5.10%	2,808,605
Montana*	177,709	279,240	40,198	35.70%	56.20%	8.10%	497,147
Nebraska*	284,494	495,961	63,772	33.70%	58.70%	7.60%	844,227
Nevada*	539,260	512,058	74,067	47.90%	45.50%	6.60%	1,125,385
New Hampshire*	348,526	345,790	49,842	46.80%	46.50%	6.70%	744,158
New Jersey*	2,148,278	1,601,933	123,835	55.50%	41.40%	3.20%	3,874,046
New Mexico*	385,234	319,666	93,418	48.30%	40.00%	11.70%	798,318
New York*	4,556,124	2,819,534	345,795	59.00%	36.50%	4.50%	7,721,453
North Carolina*	2,189,316	2,362,631	189,617	46.20%	49.80%	4.00%	4,741,564
North Dakota*	93,758	216,794	33,808	27.20%	63.00%	9.80%	344,360
Ohio*	2,394,164	2,841,005	261,318	43.60%	51.70%	4.80%	5,496,487
Oklahoma*	420,375	949,136	83,481	28.90%	65.30%	5.70%	1,452,992
Oregon*	1,002,106	782,403	216,827	50.10%	39.10%	10.80%	2,001,336
Pennsylvania*	2,926,441	2,970,733	218,228	47.90%	48.60%	3.60%	6,115,402
Rhode Island*	252,525	180,543	31,076	54.40%	38.90%	6.70%	464,144
South Carolina*	855,373	1,155,389	92,265	40.70%	54.90%	4.40%	2,103,027
South Dakota*	117,458	227,721	24,914	31.70%	61.50%	6.70%	370,093
Tennessee*	870,695	1,522,925	114,407	34.70%	60.70%	4.60%	2,508,027
Texas*	3,877,868	4,685,047	406,311	43.20%	52.20%	4.50%	8,969,226
Utah*	310,676	515,231	305,523	27.50%	45.50%	27.00%	1,131,430
Vermont*	178,573	95,369	41,125	56.70%	30.30%	13.10%	315,067
Virginia*	1,981,473	1,769,443	231,836	49.80%	44.40%	5.80%	3,982,752
Washington*	1,742,718	1,221,747	401,179	51.80%	36.30%	11.90%	3,365,644
West Virginia*	188,794	489,371	34,886	26.50%	68.60%	4.90%	713,051
Wisconsin*	1,382,536	1,405,284	188,330	46.50%	47.20%	6.30%	2,976,150
Wyoming*	55,973	174,419	25,457	21.90%	68.20%	10.00%	255,849

FIGURE D. Results from the 2016 Presidential Election. In each state, candidates receive percentages of the voters. Each state has voters from all parties; yet, this is ignored in the electoral college results. Some states are blue, neglecting republicans and third-party voters; others are red, neglecting third-party voters and democrats. The 13 swing states dictate the results.

The 2016 Election Recounted with using the Modified Electoral College

Electoral College Votes	Upgraded	Trump		Clinton		Other	
Alabama - 9 votes	90	62%	57	34%	30	4%	3
Alaska - 3 votes	30	51%	16	37%	11	12%	3
Arizona - 11 votes	110	49%	55	45%	49	6%	6
Arkansas - 6 votes	60	60%	37	34%	20	6%	3
California - 55 votes	550	32%	176	61%	336	7%	38
Colorado - 9 votes	90	43%	38	48%	44	9%	8
Connecticut - 7 votes	70	41%	28	54%	39	5%	3
Delaware - 3 votes	30	42%	12	53%	17	5%	1
District of Columbia - 3 votes	30	4%	1	91%	28	5%	1
Florida - 29 votes	290	49%	143	48%	139	3%	8
Georgia - 16 votes	160	51%	83	46%	73	3%	4
Hawaii - 4 votes	40	30%	12	62%	25	8%	3
Idaho - 4 votes	40	59%	24	28%	11	13%	5
Illinois - 20 votes	200	39%	77	56%	113	5%	10
Indiana - 11 votes	110	57%	64	38%	41	5%	5
Iowa - 6 votes	60	51%	31	42%	25	7%	4
Kansas - 6 votes	60	57%	35	36%	21	7%	4
Kentucky - 8 votes	80	62%	50	33%	26	5%	4
Louisiana - 8 votes	80	58%	47	38%	30	4%	3
Maine - 4 votes	40	45%	18	48%	20	7%	2
Maryland - 10 votes	100	34%	33	60%	61	6%	6
Massachusetts - 11 votes	110	33%	36	60%	67	7%	7
Michigan - 16 votes	160	48%	77	47%	75	5%	8
Minnesota - 10 votes	100	45%	44	46%	47	9%	9
Mississippi - 6 votes	60	58%	35	40%	24	2%	1
Missouri - 10 votes	100	57%	57	38%	38	5%	5
Montana - 3 votes	30	56%	18	36%	10	8%	2
Nebraska - 5 votes	50	59%	30	34%	17	7%	3
Nevada - 6 votes	60	46%	27	48%	30	6%	3
New Hampshire - 4 votes	40	47%	19	47%	19	6%	2
New Jersey - 14 votes	140	41%	58	56%	78	3%	4
New Mexico - 5 votes	50	40%	20	48%	24	12%	6
New York - 29 votes	290	37%	105	59%	174	4%	11
North Carolina - 15 votes	150	50%	75	46%	69	4%	6
North Dakota - 3 votes	30	63%	19	27%	8	10%	3
Ohio - 18 votes	180	52%	94	44%	79	4%	7
Oklahoma - 7 votes	70	65%	46	29%	20	6%	4
Oregon - 7 votes	70	39%	27	50%	36	11%	7
Pennsylvania - 20 votes	200	49%	98	48%	96	3%	6
Rhode Island - 4 votes	40	39%	15	54%	23	7%	2
South Carolina - 9 votes	90	55%	51	41%	36	4%	3
South Dakota - 3 votes	30	62%	20	32%	9	6%	1
Tennessee - 11 votes	110	61%	68	35%	38	4%	4
Texas - 38 votes	380	52%	198	43%	163	5%	19
Utah - 6 votes	60	46%	29	28%	16	26%	15
Vermont - 3 votes	30	30%	9	57%	18	13%	3
Virginia - 13 votes	130	44%	57	50%	66	6%	7
Washington - 12 votes	120	36%	43	52%	63	12%	14
West Virginia - 5 votes	50	69%	35	27%	13	4%	2
Wisconsin - 10 votes	100	47%	47	47%	47	6%	6
Wyoming - 3 votes	30	68%	21	22%	6	10%	3
Total -538 votes	5380		2515		2568		297

FIGURE E. (above) In the modified Electoral College, multiplied by 10, the electoral votes per state still serve to balance unequal concentrations of population. However, each state gives a share of its electoral votes to each party's candidate, as opposed to one party receiving all in any state. It makes all states purple, minimizes the swing effect. Both candidates' delegate totals complement the amount of the popular vote they won. Also, the distribution of total delegates allocated to candidates is proportionate to the amount of popular vote won in state. A more accurate, fairer representation of voter's desires is obtained.

Current Electoral College

State		Clinton	Trump	Won By	Other	Other	Total
Arizona*	11	1,161,167	1,252,401	91,234	159,597	6.2%	2,573,165
Colorado*	9	1,338,870	1,202,484	136,386	238,866	8.6%	2,780,220
Florida*	29	4,504,975	4,617,886	112,911	297,178	3.2%	9,420,039
Iowa*	6	653,669	800,983	147,314	111,379	7.1%	1,566,031
Maine*	4	357,735	335,593	22,142	54,599	7.3%	747,927
Michigan*	16	2,268,839	2,279,543	10,704	250,902	5.2%	4,799,284
Minnesota*	10	1,367,716	1,322,951	44,765	254,146	8.6%	2,944,813
Nevada*	6	539,260	512,058	27,202	74,067	6.6%	1,125,385
New Hampshire*	4	348,526	345,790	2,736	49,842	6.7%	744,158
North Carolina*	15	2,189,316	2,362,631	173,315	189,617	4.0%	4,741,564
Ohio*	18	2,394,164	2,841,005	446,841	261,318	4.8%	5,496,487
Pennsylvania*	20	2,926,441	2,970,733	44,292	218,228	3.6%	6,115,402
Wisconsin*	10	1,382,536	1,405,284	22,748	188,330	6.3%	2,976,150
Allocated Delegates:	158	33	125		2,348,069	5.1%	46,030,625

Modified Electoral College

State	Delegates	% Clinton	% Trump	%Other	# of Delegates Gained		
Arizona*	110	45.10%	48.70%	6.20%	55	49	6
Colorado*	90	48.20%	43.30%	8.60%	44	38	8
Florida*	290	47.80%	49.00%	3.20%	139	143	8
Iowa*	60	41.70%	51.10%	7.10%	25	31	4
Maine*	40	47.80%	44.90%	7.30%	20	18	2
Michigan*	160	47.30%	47.50%	5.20%	75	77	8
Minnesota*	100	46.40%	44.90%	8.60%	47	44	9
Nevada*	60	47.90%	45.50%	6.60%	30	27	3
New Hampshire*	40	46.80%	46.50%	6.70%	19	19	2
North Carolina*	150	46.20%	49.80%	4.00%	69	75	6
Ohio*	180	43.60%	51.70%	4.80%	79	94	7
Pennsylvania*	200	47.90%	48.60%	3.60%	96	98	6
Wisconsin*	100	46.50%	47.20%	6.30%	47	47	6
Allocated Delegates:					745	760	75

Figures B & C (seen earlier, repeated for effect). In the traditional Electoral College, Trump wins most of the delegates in the thirteen swing-states, and the difference between delegates allocated is disproportionately large due to "winner-takes-all" by state. Even though both each candidate receives nearly half of the total 46 million votes in those states: Clinton - 21,433,214 (46.5%); Trump: 22,249,342 (48.3%). However, the 158 delegates are lopsided, allocating 79% of the delegates to Trump and 21% to Clinton. The current system doesn't reflect the true nature of the voters' voices.

In the modified Electoral College, Trump still gains more delegates from the thirteen swing-states, yet the allocation of the delegates is proportionate; Clinton receives 46% of the delegates and Trump 48%. All candidates receive delegates from each state. Even third-party candidate vote totals are acknowledged, receiving 5% of delegate count. The swing states do not dictate, yet they fairly collaborate with the remaining 38 states, as it should, to choose the president. Thirteen states would not dominate the results of an election with 51 states.

References

- Ask Media Group, LLC. (2020). What Is the Purpose of the Electoral College? Reference.com. Retrieved October 31, 2019, from <https://www.reference.com/world-view/purpose-electoral-college-c9f12a8548d434ee>
- Chinni, Dante. (2016). Democrats' Popular Vote Advantage Is Growing But That May Not Equal Election Wins. NBC News. Retrieved Nov 10, 2019, from <https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/popular-vote-advantage-democrats-continues-grow-n691266>
- Greene, John C. (2019). The Wise Purpose of the Electoral College. American Thinker. Retrieved December 12, 2019, from https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2019/04/the_wise_purpose_of_the_electoral_college.html
- Harper, Timothy. (2007). *The Complete Idiot's Guide to The U.S. Constitution*. New York: Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
- Innman, Willie James. (2019). Move Toward National Popular Vote Gains Momentum. Newsy. Retrieved Feb 28, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/national-popular-vote-gains-momentum/>
- Liebergen, Stephanie. (2018). Another State Wants To Elect US Presidents By Popular Vote. Newsy. Retrieved Nov 10, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/connecticut-signs-on-to-the-national-popular-vote-compact/>
- Lowry, LeeAnne. (2019). Faithless Electors' Aren't Anything New, But Now They Have More Sway. Newsy. Retrieved June 28, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/faithless-electors-aren-t-new-but-now-have-more-sway/>
- Lowry, LeeAnne. (2019). Maine Senate Passes Bill To Join National Popular Vote Compact. Newsy. Retrieved June 28, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/maine-senate-votes-yes-to-national-popular-vote-compact/>
- Lowry, LeeAnne. (2019). Oregon Is One Step Closer To Joining National Popular Vote Movement. Newsy. Retrieved Nov 10, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/oregon-poised-to-join-national-popular-vote-compact/>
- Maddow, Rachel. (2016). Long reach to find precedent for 2016 popular vote gap in US past. NBC News. Retrieved Nov 10, 2019, from <https://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow/watch/long-reach-to-find-precedent-for-2016-popular-vote-gap-in-us-past-816737347527>
- The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (2019). Electoral College. National Archives. Retrieved October 31, 2019, from <https://www.archives.gov/electoral-college>
- Wasserman, David. (2016). 2016 National Popular Vote Tracker: <https://t.co/j58GaxfPmH>. Retrieved December 12, 2019, from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/hillary-clinton-popular-vote_n_58599647e4b0eb58648446c6
- Weston, Ethan. (2018). Maine's Testing Out Its Ranked Voting System In Tuesday's Primary. Newsy. Retrieved June 28, 2019, from <https://www.newsny.com/stories/maine-to-use-ranked-voting-system-in-tuesday-s-primary/>

Note about a Quick-Draft Study: The quick draft study is meant to be a brief conglomeration of information related to a plan of action. It is meant to provide background information to inform action, policy, etc. The quick draft study is not meant to be original research, parts of the study have been borrowed from other works without taking any steps to rephrase or restate the information. The references are included to show respect to the original authors' work. The information is intentionally used with the intention of repeating not paraphrasing the original voice of the borrowed works