



Mobilization Report: Summer/Fall 2023

A brief overview of EVP mobilizations from July – December 2023, including randomized controlled trial data from campaigns in Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia

1. Introduction

In the second half of 2023, the Environmental Voter Project (EVP) ran robust voter mobilization campaigns in 108 elections across 17 states, ultimately communicating with over 1.8 million low propensity environmental voters (LPEVs) in the final six months of the year alone.

EVP mobilized voters in significant statewide elections – such as those in Virginia and Maine – as well as in dozens of small municipal elections from the North Slope of Alaska down to central Florida.

This brief report (a) summarizes the elections in which EVP mobilized LPEVs from July – December 2023 and (b) provides data for 13 specific elections in which randomized controlled trials measured and proved the independent impact of EVP’s mobilization campaigns on voter turnout while controlling for outside variables.

We have also released [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 since 2015 are now voting so consistently that they have cast ballots in at least their most recent federal, state, and even local elections.

2. EVP Mobilizations (July – December 2023)

EVP mobilized low propensity environmental voters in 108 different elections during the final six months of 2023.

State	Elections
Alaska	Sitka municipal general, Wrangell municipal general, Petersburg municipal general, North Slope municipal general, Matanuska-Susitna municipal general, Ketchikan Gateway municipal general, Haines municipal general, Fairbanks municipal general, Bristol Bay municipal general
Arizona	Tucson mayoral primary, Tucson municipal general, Prescott mayoral general, 21 different school district elections in Maricopa County
Colorado	Colorado state general, Englewood City Council general
Florida	Lake Helen municipal primary, Ponce Inlet municipal primary, Port Orange municipal primary, Orlando mayoral general
Georgia	Chatham County Commissioner District 2 special, Savannah mayoral general
Kansas	Wichita mayoral primary, Wichita mayoral general, Wyandotte County Board of Public Utilities general
Iowa	Des Moines municipal general, Warren County Auditor special
Louisiana	Louisiana state general, Louisiana state runoff
Maine	Maine state general
Massachusetts	Amesbury municipal primary, Attleboro municipal primary, Boston municipal general, Braintree municipal primary, Brockton municipal primary, Chicopee municipal primary, Framingham municipal primary, Gloucester municipal primary, Lawrence municipal primary, Malden municipal primary, Melrose municipal primary, Newburyport municipal primary, North Adams municipal primary, Northampton municipal primary, Pittsfield municipal primary, Revere municipal primary, Salem municipal primary, Somerville municipal primary, Fall River municipal primary, Watertown municipal primary, Westfield municipal primary, Weymouth municipal primary
New Hampshire	Manchester mayoral primary, Manchester mayoral general, Nashua mayoral primary, Nashua mayoral general

New Mexico	Albuquerque District 6 City Council general, Santa Fe municipal general
New York	Assembly District 27 special, New York state general
North Carolina	Charlotte municipal primary, Charlotte municipal general, 21 different municipal general elections in Wake and Guilford counties
Pennsylvania	House District 21 special, Pennsylvania state general
Texas	Austin municipal general, Houston mayoral general, Houston mayoral runoff
Virginia	Virginia state general

3. Impact Data from Randomized Controlled Trials

Although EVP likely increased turnout among our targeted voters in all of our campaigns during the second half of 2023, in this memo we only highlight the 13 elections where we can prove from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that EVP created a statistically significant increase in turnout while controlling for all other variables.

Date	State	Intervention	LPEVs Targeted	Impact on Turnout ¹	Votes added solely due to EVP's efforts ²
Aug 1	Tucson, AZ Mayoral Primary	Calls, Postcards, Canvassing	22,729	+2.7pp	614
Aug 1	Wichita, KS Mayoral Primary	Calls	4,195	+4.6pp	193

¹ "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 "+2.1pp" means: (a) turnout was ultimately 2.1 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, except for the Des Moines, IA General Election result which is statistically significant at the p = 0.1 level.

² "Votes added solely 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 +1.2pp increase in turnout among the 106,253 voters whom EVP targeted in Maine led to 1,275 additional environmental voters casting ballots in the state's general election.

Nov 7	Suffolk County, NY General Election	Direct Mail, Calls	45,084	+1.5pp	676
Nov 7	Virginia General Election	Calls, Postcards, Digital Ads	490,767	+0.4pp	1,963
Nov 7	Maine General Election	Direct Mail, Calls, Digital Ads	106,253	+1.2pp	1,275
Nov 7	Allegheny County, PA General Election	Calls, Canvassing	3,166	+5.7pp	180
Nov 7	Austin, TX General Election	Canvassing	963	+3.5pp	34
Nov 7	Savannah, GA Mayoral General Election	Direct Mail, Calls, Digital Ads	10,375	+5.0pp	519
Nov 7	Colorado General Election	Direct Mail	65,680	+0.5pp	328
Nov 7	Wyandotte County, KS General Election	Direct Mail, Calls, Digital Ads	9,264	+2.1pp	195
Nov 7	Des Moines, IA General Election	Direct Mail, Calls, Digital Ads	14,963	+1.8pp	209
Nov 7	Texas General Election	Direct Mail	166,437	+0.4pp	666
Dec 9	Houston, TX Mayoral Runoff	Calls, Digital Ads	121,197	+0.4pp	485

A. Tucson Municipal Primary.

For the August 1 Tucson, AZ municipal primary, EVP volunteers canvassed, called, and mailed postcards to 22,729 low propensity environmental voters, ultimately boosting turnout by +2.7 percentage points (pp) among our targeted voters. This campaign brought 614 environmental voters to the polls who otherwise would not have voted.

B. Wichita Mayoral Primary.

Wichita's competitive mayoral primary provided a great opportunity to grow the environmental movement's political power in Kansas's largest city. Ultimately, our calls-only campaign increased turnout by +4.6pp among the 4,195 low propensity environmental voters we were targeting.

C. Suffolk County, NY General Election.

For New York's General Election, EVP targeted 45,085 voters in Suffolk County with a campaign of direct mail and volunteer phone calls. Our mobilization efforts boosted turnout among our targets by +1.5pp, ultimately bringing 676 environmental voters to the polls who otherwise would not have voted.

D. Virginia General Election.

The Virginia state legislative general elections were one of the year's highest profile elections, attracting quite a bit of spending from campaigns and outside groups. EVP targeted 490,767 low propensity environmental voters with a campaign of digital ads, volunteer phone calls, and volunteer postcards, ultimately boosting turnout by +0.4pp among our targeted voters. This impact rate means that 1,963 environment-first voters cast ballots who would not have voted without EVP's voter-mobilization campaigns.

E. Maine General Election.

For the November 7 general election in Maine, EVP targeted 106,253 low propensity environmental voters with a combination of direct mail, digital ads, and volunteer phone calls. This was a high-profile election – with significant campaign spending by utilities – due to a ballot question concerning the creation of a new, consumer-owned non-profit utility. EVP's campaigns increased turnout +1.2pp among our targeted voters, yielding 1,275 ballots cast by environment-first voters who otherwise would not have voted.

F. Allegheny County, PA General Election.

For Pennsylvania's General Election, EVP canvassed and called 3,166 voters in Allegheny County – home to Pittsburgh – ultimately boosting turnout among our targets in the county by +5.7pp over our control group. These combined volunteer-based interventions represent one of the highest randomized controlled trial results EVP has documented.

G. Austin, TX General Election.

During Texas's General Election, EVP ran a door-to-door canvassing-only campaign targeting low propensity environmental voters in the city of Austin. This small-scale campaign proved the impact of our canvassing messages and techniques by boosting turnout among our targets by +3.5pp.

H. Savannah Mayoral General Election.

For Savannah, GA's mayoral election, EVP targeted 10,375 low propensity environmental voters with a combination of direct mail, volunteer phone calls, and digital ad campaigns. The voter mobilization campaigns boosted turnout by +5.0pp among our targeted voters, bringing 519 environment-first voters to the polls who otherwise would have stayed home.

I. Colorado General Election.

For Colorado's General Election, EVP targeted 65,680 voters for a [direct mail experiment](#) testing the efficacy of "heads-up mail," which primes voters to expect their soon-to-arrive mail ballots. Our experiment successfully boosted turnout among our targets by +0.5pp, with a particularly large impact (+1.0pp) among voters aged 35 and older.

J. Wyandotte County, KS General Election.

Wyandotte County, KS – home to Kansas City, KS – has a municipally-owned utility run by an elected Board of Public Utilities. EVP mailed, called, and sent digital ads to 9,264 low propensity environmental voters for the Board of Public Utilities general election, and we were ultimately responsible for boosting turnout by +2.1pp among our targeted voters in the election.

K. Des Moines, IA General Election.

For Des Moines, IA's municipal general election, EVP targeted 14,963 low propensity environmental voters with a combination of direct mail, volunteer phone calls, and digital ad campaigns. The voter mobilization campaigns boosted turnout by +1.8pp among our targeted voters, bringing 209 environment-first voters to the polls who otherwise would have stayed home.

L. Texas General Election.

For Texas's General Election, EVP targeted 166,437 voters for a [direct mail experiment](#) testing the efficacy of "trending norms messaging," which taps into voters' "fear of missing out" to nudge them to the polls. Our experiment successfully boosted turnout among our targets by +0.4pp, with a particularly large impact (+1.3pp) among voters aged 35 and older.

M. Houston Mayoral Runoff Election.

For Houston’s mayoral runoff election, EVP targeted 121,197 low propensity environmental voters in the country’s fourth-largest city. Our campaign, which consisted of digital ads and volunteer phone calls, boosted turnout by +0.4pp and brought 485 voters to the polls who otherwise would not have voted.

4. Conclusion

Each of our voter mobilization campaigns in the second half of 2023 contributed to EVP’s multi-year, cumulative impact on the electorate. We are proud of these election-specific results proven by randomized controlled trials – which included some of EVP’s best results since the beginning of our organization – but we also remain focused on our ultimate goal of creating unstoppable populations of environmental “super voters” who never skip an election. For more information on the growing number of consistent environmental voters we’ve helped create, please visit the [results page](#) of our website. We look forward to building upon these efforts throughout 2024.