



Mobilization Report: Winter/Spring 2021

A brief overview of EVP mobilizations from January – June, 2021, including randomized controlled trial data from campaigns in Georgia, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia



1. Introduction

Beginning with the January 5th US Senate runoffs in Georgia, the Environmental Voter Project (EVP) got right back to work mobilizing voters after the 2020 Presidential election. During just the first six months of 2021, EVP called, texted, mailed, and sent digital ads to over 2 million low propensity environmental voters (LPEVs) in 324 different local, state, and federal elections across the country.

Although most of these winter and spring elections were too small to for us measure EVP's impact with statistical certainty – for instance, EVP targeted only 211 voters in the February 9th Georgia House District 90 special election – we nevertheless continued to treat every election as an important opportunity to build good voting habits and consistently grow the political power of the environmental movement.

This brief report summarizes the elections in which EVP mobilized LPEVs from January – June, 2021, providing a glimpse of both the breadth and depth of our year-round voter turnout work. Additionally, the report provides data for six specific elections in which randomized controlled trials measured the independent impact of EVP's mobilization campaigns on voter turnout.

In early 2022, we will also release updated multi-year data showing EVP's cumulative impact on the electorate in each of these states, revealing how many of the low propensity environmental voters we've mobilized are now voting so consistently that they have cast ballots in their most recent federal, state, and even local elections.

2. EVP Mobilizations (January - June, 2021)

EVP mobilized low propensity environmental voters in 324 different elections during the first six months of 2021.

State	Elections
Alaska	Anchorage (general & runoff)
Arizona	Goodyear, Phoenix
Colorado	Colorado Springs, Fort Collins, Grand Junction, Parker
Florida	Coral Gables (general & runoff), Gainesville, North Miami (primary & general), 62 additional local & county elections
Georgia	US Senate runoffs, House District 34, House District 90, House District 156, Griffin Judicial Circuit District Attorney, 9 additional county elections
Maine	Portland, Senate District 14
Massachusetts	19th Suffolk House District (primary & general), Newton, 193 additional town elections
Nevada	Boulder City
New Hampshire	House District Hillsborough 21, 5 different town elections
New Mexico	1st Congressional District
New York	New York City (primary), 5 Hudson Valley county elections (primaries), Westchester County (primary)
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State Primary
Texas	6th Congressional District (primary & general), House District 10, House District 118, Amarillo, Arlington, Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth (general & runoff), Garland, Irving, Lubbock, Plano, San Antonio (general & runoff)
Virginia	King William County, Senate District 38, Virginia State Primary

3. Local Election Impact Data

In the Spring of 2021, some of America’s largest cities held mayoral elections, including New York City (the country’s largest city) and San Antonio (the seventh largest). As is often the case in lower-turnout municipal elections, EVP was able to have a significant impact on voter turnout solely through low-cost texting and calling campaigns.

In the Westchester County (NY) June 22nd primary, EVP increased our target audience’s turnout by +0.8 percentage points (pp) over the control group just through our volunteer texting campaign. In the San Antonio, TX mayoral election – where we conducted both volunteer phonebanking and texting campaigns – we increased turnout +1.4pp over the control group. And in New York City’s high-profile mayoral primary election, our volunteers delivered over half-a-million text messages and tens of thousands of phone calls, ultimately increasing turnout +1.8pp over our control group and leading to almost 10,000 additional environmentalists casting ballots in the election.

Date	City/County	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Turnout ¹	Votes added due to EVP’s efforts ²
May 1	San Antonio, TX	Texts, calls	22,301	+1.4pp	312
June 22	Westchester County, NY	Texts	63,669	+0.8pp	509
June 22	New York City, NY	Texts, calls	553,470	+1.8pp	9,962

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 “+0.8pp” means: (a) turnout was ultimately 0.8 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 +1.4pp increase in turnout among the 22,301 voters whom EVP targeted in San Antonio, TX led to 312 additional environmental voters casting ballots in that election.

4. Statewide Election Impact Data

A. Georgia January 5th US Senate Runoffs.

\$937 million were spent in Georgia’s two January 5th US Senate runoff elections.³ Even amidst that flood of spending and a record-high turnout, the Environmental Voter Project – spending just \$550,000 in texting, calling, direct mail, and digital ads – was able to increase turnout among our targets by +0.9pp over our control group, bringing 3,444 new environmental voters to the polls. This was in addition to the [cumulative impact](#) we’ve had on the Georgia electorate, helping turn 66,929 LPEVs into consistent voters since 2017.

B. Pennsylvania May 18th State Primary.

Pennsylvania’s May 18th primary included a few high-profile mayoral elections but otherwise consisted of low-salience ballot measures and judicial elections. EVP used the primary to continue building good voting habits among 404,675 of the state’s LPEVs (+0.8pp), while also running an experiment to measure the impact of three different messages on various subgroups of environmental voters. The results are detailed in our [May 2021 Experiment Report](#).

C. Virginia June 8th State Primary.

The Virginia June 8th primary was a higher-profile election, with active primaries for Governor, other statewide offices, and a number of state legislative seats. EVP’s volunteer texting and calling campaigns boosted turnout +0.7pp over our control group, while also providing the first of many high-value touch points with our Virginia voter targets leading up to the state’s November general election.

Date	State	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Turnout	Votes added due to EVP’s efforts
Jan 5	Georgia US Senate Runoffs	Texts, calls, mail, digital	382,643	+0.9pp	3,444
May 18	Pennsylvania Primary	Texts	404,675	+0.8pp	3,237
June 8	Virginia Primary	Texts, calls	273,513	+0.7pp	1,915

³ www.ajc.com/news/the-results-are-in-ga-senate-races-shatter-donation-spending-records/JPTDBYWUKJBGPK4ZIMAU4YNTDU/

5. Conclusion

Each of these 324 voter mobilizations 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 over 730,000 super voters we have helped create so far, please visit the [results page](#) of our website. We look forward to building upon our winter and spring efforts throughout the remainder of 2021 and into the midterm election year of 2022.