



Mobilization Report: Summer/Fall 2021

A brief overview of EVP mobilizations from July – December, 2021, including randomized controlled trial data from campaigns in Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia



1. Introduction

After mobilizing over 2 million low propensity environmental voters (LPEVs) in [324 different elections](#) during the first half of 2021, EVP's July – December election calendar included a smaller number of elections (57) but most of them consisted of very large mayoral or statewide general elections. For many of these elections – including the high-profile Virginia general election – EVP ran robust direct mail, digital ad, calling, texting, and canvassing campaigns.

This brief report (a) summarizes the July – December elections in which EVP mobilized LPEVs and (b) provides data for 10 specific elections in which randomized controlled trials (RCTs) measured the independent impact of EVP's mobilization campaigns on voter turnout while controlling for all outside variables.

This report includes all of EVP's statistically significant RCT results, all of which revealed a positive impact on voter turnout. For multi-year data showing EVP's cumulative impact on the electorate in each of our states, we invite you to read our [2021 Impact Report](#).

2. EVP Mobilizations (July – December, 2021)

EVP mobilized low propensity environmental voters in 57 different elections during the final six months of 2021.

State	Elections
Alaska	Fairbanks, Juneau, Nome, Sitka, Wasilla
Arizona	Prescott primary, Tucson (primary & general)
Colorado	Statewide general election
Florida	20th Congressional District primary, Gainesville, Jacksonville Port St. Lucie, St. Petersburg primary
Georgia	Atlanta (general & runoff), House District 34, House District 156
Iowa	Des Moines, Iowa City, Cedar Rapids runoff, House District 37
Kansas	Overland Park (primary & general), Topeka, Olathe, Kansas City, Lawrence (primary & general)
Maine	Statewide general election
Massachusetts	Boston (primary & general), Newton primary, Somerville primary
New Hampshire	Manchester (primary & general), Nashua (primary & general), Concord primary, Keene primary, Rye, Bethlehem, Hanover, Nelson, Etna
New Mexico	Albuquerque, Santa Fe
New York	Statewide general election
North Carolina	Durham (primary & general)
Pennsylvania	Statewide general election
Texas	Statewide general election, 6th Congressional District general, House District 10, House District 118
Virginia	Statewide general election, House District 27

3. Local & Congressional Election Impact Data

In the second half of 2021, EVP mobilized voters in dozens of local elections. Although EVP likely increased turnout in all of these elections, we only highlight in this memo those where we can prove from RCTs that EVP was solely responsible for a specific increase in turnout while controlling for all other variables.

In the Boston, MA and Overland Park, KS mayoral elections, EVP had tremendous success using text messages and “[loss aversion](#)” mail to boost turnout by as much as +2.2 percentage points (pp) over our control groups. In Lawrence, KS, our campaigns ultimately led to a +4.0 pp boost in turnout over our control group. These results were not only impactful in the short term – in Boston, we added 1,982 new environmental voters, while in Florida our 244 new voters far outnumbered the 5-vote margin that decided the CD-20 election – but they also contributed to EVP’s ongoing, cumulative impact on the electorate.

Date	City/County	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Turnout ¹	Votes added due to EVP’s efforts ²
Aug 3	Lawrence, KS Primary	Texts, calls	10,920	+2.0pp	218
Sept 14	Boston, MA Primary	Texts, calls	53,740	+1.6pp	860
Nov 2	Atlanta, GA General	Calls, mail, digital	69,007	+0.8pp	552
Nov 2	Boston, MA General	Texts, mail	90,101	+2.2pp	1,982
Nov 2	Lawrence, KS General	Texts, mail	13,642	+4.0pp	546
Nov 2	Overland Park, KS General	Texts, mail	18,747	+1.8pp	337
Nov 2	Florida CD-20 Primary	Texts, calls	6,259	+3.9pp	244

¹ The “Impact on Turnout” data shows the percentage point increase in turnout attributable to EVP’s interventions as measured by randomized controlled trials. For example, an impact on turnout of “+2.2pp” means: (a) turnout was ultimately 2.2 percentage points higher in the “treatment group” of voters targeted by EVP than in the control group of randomly set-aside voters whom EVP did not contact, and (b) that increase in turnout can be directly attributed to EVP’s interventions while controlling for other possible factors that would impact turnout (such as the efforts of other groups or campaigns). All results shown are statistically significant at the p = 0.05 level.

² The “Votes added due to EVP’s efforts” data is the result of “Impact on Turnout” multiplied by the overall number of “LPEVs Targeted” by EVP in a particular election. This shows, for instance, that a +2.2pp increase in turnout among the 90,101 voters whom EVP targeted in Boston, MA led to 1,982 additional environmental voters casting ballots in that election.

4. Statewide Election Impact Data

A. Virginia Absentee Ballot List.

After the June 8 Virginia primary, EVP sought to help low propensity environmental voters sign up for Virginia's "Permanent Absentee Voting List" so their general election ballots would be mailed to them with plenty of time to vote before the November 2 election. Although the impact of our campaign was small (+0.2pp over our control group), it was a statistically significant result at minimal cost, and we're thrilled to have had success with an intervention that will have long-term impacts on voter turnout.

Date	State	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Joining Mail Ballot List	Voters added to Mail Ballot List due to EVP's efforts
July	Virginia Mailed Absentee Ballot List	Texts, calls	257,495	+0.2pp	515

B. Pennsylvania and Virginia General Elections.

The November 2 general elections in Pennsylvania and Virginia could not have been more different. In Pennsylvania, a low turnout general election for judicial and local elections enabled EVP to increase turnout +1.2pp through paid phone banks and volunteer texting alone. In Virginia, on the other hand, a high-profile gubernatorial campaign – where \$137 million was spent by the campaigns alone – led to record-high turnout across the state, yet EVP was still able to cut through the noise and be solely responsible for a +0.5pp increase in turnout among the 574,341 low propensity environmental voters with whom we communicated.

Date	State	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Turnout	Votes added due to EVP's efforts
Nov 2	Pennsylvania General	Texts, calls	417,542	+1.2pp	5,011
Nov 2	Virginia General	Texts, calls mail, digital	574,341	+0.5pp	2,872

5. Conclusion

Each of these 57 voter mobilization campaigns contributed to EVP's multi-year, cumulative impact on the electorate. We are proud of our election-specific results — like the ones highlighted in this report — but we also remain focused on our ultimate goal of creating unstoppable populations of environmental “super voters” who never skip an election. For information on the 1,030,912 super voters we have helped create so far, please visit the [results page](#) of our website. We look forward to building upon these successes throughout the midterm election year of 2022.