**NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE (NPV) FAQ** *side 1*

Can the Electoral College be changed without a constitutional amendment? **YES**

* The Founders set up the Electoral College to be reformed without an amendment. They gave states exclusive right to decide how to designate their electoral votes in Article 2 Section 1: “*Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors…*”
* Most states currently award all their electoral votes to the winner within their borders in a method adopted in the 1800’s that replaced earlier methods. (Maine and Nebraska revised their electoral vote laws in the late 20th Century.)
* NPV seeks to give states a new option to update their electoral vote laws by replacing old legislation with new, something states do all the time.

Does the current system protect interests of smaller states over big ones? **NO**

* It *does* protect the interest of any state (big or small) with unpredictable voters.
* Wyoming has three electoral votes, the fewest possible, while the biggest state, California, has 55. Candidates ignore both. Why? Because both are predictable.
* In the last two presidential elections (after primary season,) two rural states, Iowa and Nevada, both with 3 million people and six electoral votes (just like Utah), got 54 presidential campaign events between them. Utah got one. Why? Iowa and Nevada are unpredictable battleground states, Utah isn’t.

Wouldn’t a National Popular Vote let big cities/states dominate elections? **NO**

* Big cities aren’t as big as people think. US Census data reveal that only 1/6 of the population lives in metro centers. They’re balanced out by the 1/6 of the nation that lives in rural areas. 2/3 of the nation lives in suburbs/exurbs, and are split almost evenly between the two major parties. No one geographical group can dominate in every election.
* California and New York went “blue” on the electoral map in 2020, but there were almost 40% of Californians and New Yorkers that voted Republican. They feel just as unimportant in presidential elections as Democrats in Texas, Idaho and Utah when their votes are left behind state borders, unable to fully contribute to their candidate’s national campaign for our country’s only national office.

Does the current Electoral College system favor either political party? **NO**

* Of the 34 presidential elections held over the last 100 years, there have been 13 Republican national popular vote winners and 12 Democratic national popular vote winners. Political dominance of any party goes in cycles. It depends on who comes up with better ideas, expands their base and turns out more voters.
* Under a national popular vote, Utah campaign money can stay in Utah instead of going to other states that may not share our rural concerns. Utah can team up with, not compete against, interests in other rural states like Colorado and Nevada.
* Wherever voters are important, their states are important, when states are important, candidates pay attention. NPV makes every voter worth the attention.

**NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE (NPV) FAQ** *side 2*

Does it really matter which system we use to elect the president? **YES**

* National Security
	+ Under the current system, the outcome of the election can depend on a relatively small number of votes in one unpredictable battleground state. That gives bad actors, domestic or foreign, an unjust advantage over the American people in determining who will be president.
* Unpredictable factors
	+ In close elections, weather can determine the outcome. Studies indicate that sunnier weather in 2000 would have flipped Florida’s electoral votes for Al Gore. Cloudier weather in 1960 may have given the presidency to Richard Nixon instead of John Kennedy. (Another case for vote-by-mail?)
* Minority Rule
	+ In 2004, a shift of 59,393 votes in Ohio (.05% of 121 million votes total) would have elected John Kerry despite President Bush’s nationwide lead of over 3,000,000 votes.
	+ In 2012 a shift of 214,393 votes (.2% of 127 million votes total) would have elected Mitt Romney despite President Obama’s nationwide lead of almost 5,000,000 votes.
	+ In 2000, 537 disputed votes in Florida (.0005% of 101 million votes) determined the presidency for all 282 million Americans.
* National Acceptance
	+ When statewide winner-take-all Electoral College results coincide with nationwide popular vote results, half of the nation might not like it, but they accept it. When the opposite occurs, acceptance is difficult if not impossible to achieve. Our own recent history demonstrates this.

Doesn’t the current system make it harder to detect voter fraud? **NO**

* Under the current state-by-state winner-take-all system, you know exactly where voter fraud would be likely to take place: in unpredictable states, where a very small number of votes can have a huge impact by flipping a state’s entire electoral strength to one candidate or the other. That’s a big incentive for fraud and other mischief. But with a pool of votes as much as 160 million, the amount of fraud required would to rig the outcome, would be so massive it couldn’t go undetected.

Wouldn’t a National Popular Vote election be a logistical nightmare? **NO**

* Nothing changes under a National Popular Vote except this: On election night/week, NPV participating states (totaling at least 270 electoral votes) agree to hold off appointing their electors until one candidate accumulates so many votes nationwide, the remaining votes can’t change the outcome. Once that’s abundantly clear, they choose their electors not from the party of whoever wins the state, but from the party of whoever wins the nation. So when the Electoral College meets in December, the candidate with the most votes in all 50 states and D.C. becomes president. Simple.