

Date: February 18, 2019

To: Yes on 1631 Supporters

From:

Joan Crooks, CEO, Washington Conservation Voters/Washington Environmental Council

Rosalinda Guillen, Executive Director, Community to Community

Jill Mangaliman, Executive Director, Got Green

Aiko Schaefer, Executive Director, Front & Centered

Gregg Small, Executive Director, Climate Solutions

Mike Stevens, State Director, The Nature Conservancy, Washington

Rich Stolz, Executive Director, OneAmerica

Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai, Executive Director, Puget Sound Sage

Thank you for your support of Washington's Yes on 1631 campaign, and for helping to lead the journey toward effective, equitable climate policy. The work that resulted in the country's broadest climate coalition coming together around the I-1631 campaign is an essential part of building the movement for transformative action on climate change and clean energy. We can all take great pride in our ongoing work together to bring meaningful solutions to the urgent, defining challenge of our time. Thank you for your commitment and leadership.

As a supporter of climate action and of Yes on 1631, we would like to share with you the attached staff memo prepared by our Campaign Director Abigail Doerr for the Yes on 1631 Political Committee and governing board¹. This staff memo includes detailed information about the I-1631 campaign as well as some of Abigail's initial reflections on our campaign's strengths and challenges. We are sharing this staff memo because we are committed to an open dialogue that strengthens the movement for climate action. We welcome your comments, questions and insights.

This memo will be followed by an external campaign assessment. We plan to hire an outside consultant who will conduct both a qualitative and quantitative analysis through 1) personal interviews with a variety of campaign partners, and 2) an analysis of the recently returned voter data including overall turnout, low-propensity voter turnout, racial and economic demographics, and performance across different geographic areas of the state. We will use the results from the analysis to inform the planning for our ongoing coalition efforts for 2019 and beyond. We aim to complete this analysis by early April and we will then share it with key supporters and others.

The Yes on 1631 campaign is already making a difference in Washington: expanding who is advocating for climate policy beyond environmental organizations; integrating racial and economic justice and a just transition for workers into a comprehensive carbon pollution reduction policy; engaging businesses and rural communities; and building a state-wide distributed grassroots organizing network for climate justice.

¹ The Yes on 1631 campaign was governed by the board of directors of Clean Air Clean Energy Washington, a 501(c)(4) and political committee.

We have changed the conversation in our state from whether we should take climate action to how it should be done, driving the inevitability of major climate progress that has the support of a broad coalition and takes a holistic view of success.

The Alliance for Jobs and Clean Energy, the coalition that helped bring I-1631 to the ballot, is working to engage the broader set of the Yes on 1631 coalition partners to build on the campaign momentum and continue to grow the climate movement. We are engaging our email list of 144,000 volunteers and donors and our list of over 650 supporting entities and have reconvened our governing board and steering committee to help provide organizational support to this effort.

The 2019 session of the Washington State legislature is a crucial time to maintain engagement with our partners, supporters, and volunteers, and channel their desire for action into advocacy at the state and local level. With stronger climate action majorities and a large class of freshman legislators for whom climate progress is a priority, we have opportunities to secure meaningful action on climate this year. In fact, I-1631's visibility and momentum has fed a stronger push for climate progress in the 2019 legislature, with more bills introduced and a greater focus on equity and good jobs provisions.

Our coalition is advocating for a shared 2019 legislative agenda that includes:

- **100% Clean Electricity (SB 5116, HB 1211):** Require a transition to a 100% clean electricity grid and ensure that the transition to clean fuels does not place undue burden on people with low incomes.
- **Clean Buildings for WA Act (SB 5293, HB 1257):** Make buildings more efficient by incentivizing ultra-efficient new homes and schools, retrofitting existing buildings, adopting a performance-based energy code for commercial buildings, and investing in low-income weatherization and net zero-ready affordable housing projects.
- **The Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act (SB 5489, HB 2009):** Require state agencies to use environmental health disparity data and analysis when making decisions about enforcement, investments and policy development.

We believe that once passed, this kind of climate progress can be sustained and accelerated because of the very real benefits these bills will provide to Washingtonians: accessible, affordable clean energy for all, family-supporting jobs, and improved conditions in communities that today bear the brunt of pollution and impacts of a changing climate. This is the kind of progress that inspired our efforts to pass I-1631 and we are deeply motivated to make meaningful legislative progress this year.

We want to thank you again for your commitment to a sustainable, healthy and equitable future and for your support of Yes on 1631. Washington's climate justice story is still being written, and we are committed to writing it together. We look forward to continuing to engage with you along the way. Please do not hesitate to reach out to any of us.



YES ON 1631

To: Clean Air Clean Energy Washington Political Committee Board

Mike Stevens, *The Nature Conservancy, Campaign Board Chair*

Phil Lloyd, *Campaign Treasurer*

Aiko Schaefer, *Front and Centered*

Joan Crooks, *Washington Conservation Voters*

Jeff Johnson, *Washington State Labor Council*

Rich Stolz, *OneAmerica*

Gregg Small, *Climate Solutions*

Leonard Forsman, *Suquamish Tribe and Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians*

Tyson Johnson, *Quinault Indian Nation*

Zach Silk, *Civic Ventures*

From: Abigail Doerr, *Campaign Manager of Yes on 1631*

Re: Yes on 1631 Campaign Debrief Memo

Background

Washington state has always been a leader on environmental protection and climate action. As federal progress stalled, again and again, leaders in the state came together on how Washington could be a national leader and make meaningful, equitable climate progress.

The Alliance for Jobs and Clean Energy was formed in 2014 after acknowledgement from environmental organizations, labor unions, and community of color-led organizations that only by building a broader movement and working together for equitable climate policy, would we achieve the transformational changes needed. This coalition of Washington organizations and individuals is committed to building our state's economy, improving the health of our residents, and leading on the fight against climate change. With more than 200 coalition members including health professionals, businesses, labor unions, faith communities, environmental advocates, tribal nations, and communities of color, the Alliance was the foundational force that led to the Yes on 1631 campaign.

In 2017, the Alliance began a concerted effort to engage additional partners, shape a winnable policy and further understand voter sentiment. In recognition of an activated progressive electorate following the election of Donald Trump, the Alliance laid the groundwork to go to the ballot in 2018 expecting high and progressive turnout.

In the fall of 2017 through spring of 2018, the growing coalition conducted polls to determine feasibility and framing for the measure. A “carbon pollution fee” approach showed the campaign was winnable and that the path to victory was narrow: success would require support from both base voters and independents.

Beginning in late 2017, the Alliance joined with partners, businesses and tribes to craft comprehensive climate policy that was winnable, equitable, and effective. The Clean Air Clean Energy WA Political Committee was created and co-led by leaders from environmental groups, labor, funders, tribal nations, and communities of color.

We went into the November 2018 Election knowing we would likely be outspent by the fossil fuel industry, but by running both a traditional and non-traditional campaign we had a chance win and to overcome their money.

Our strategy was five-fold:

1. Raise enough money (\$15 million) to counter the opposition message on mass communications channels like TV and digital. We would spend our advertising budget on persuadable voters (those who leaned support and were undecided but more likely to support us).
2. Garner a broad base of support to show that this is an issue all Washingtonians care about. Leveraging the strength of the coalition to engage their communities to act.
3. Build a large grassroots and volunteer force that the opposition could never replicate.
4. Mobilize our base through Get Out The Vote efforts. Our research showed that our base would be resilient to opposition messaging and given our limited resources we focused on energizing our base through Get Out The Vote efforts. This also included investing in partner organizations’ programs to turnout low-propensity voters, young people, and voters of color.
5. Use earned media to get our message out, especially to pit the fossil fuel industry against our coalition of health professionals, workers, and families.

Yes on 1631 Message Frame

Our early message research showed that voters need to hear both the benefits of the ballot measure and that big polluters like oil companies would be held accountable for their pollution. We made a deliberate decision to lead with holding polluters accountable similar to what California did with AB 32, to own and shape how voters would see the cost of the initiative. Our main message was: “Hold oil companies accountable by putting a fee on pollution and invest in a clean energy economy to protect future generations.”

We also made a decision to lead with health, pollution, and future generations, without invoking climate change messaging directly. Climate messages proved to be very partisan and although helpful to hold on to base democrats, pushed away many independent voters we needed to win.

Campaign by the Numbers

- **\$15,281,668** - Amount raised by over **4,000** individuals and organizations.
- **6,500** - Individual volunteers that contributed to the Yes on 1631 field program
- **347,823** - Ballot signatures collected
- **720,000+** Touch points with both persuasion and GOTV universes:
 - 320,000+** Doors knocked
 - 200,000+** Phone calls made
 - 200,000+** Texts sent
- **48** - Organizations and businesses that contributed **\$1,079,000** of in-kind support.
- **632** - Total Yes on 1631 endorsements including:
 - 19** - Tribal Nations including Tulalip Tribes, Suquamish Tribe, and the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians
 - 348** - Businesses like Microsoft and REI,
 - 40** - Community of color led organizations like the Latino Community Fund and Asian Counseling and Referral Service
 - 117** - Environmental organizations like Washington Environmental Council and The Nature Conservancy
 - 20** - Health organizations like Washington Academy of Family Physicians and the American Lung Association
 - 16** - Labor organizations like UFCW 21 and SEIU 775
 - 7** - Newspapers across the state and country like the *Tacoma News Tribune*, *The Everett Herald*, *The New York Times*, and *USA Today*
- **400+** Media stories in state and national publications including *The Washington Post*, *Vox*, *The Nation*, *Teen Vogue*, and *Marie Claire*

Yes on 1631 Fundraising

The Yes on I-1631 campaign had a diverse funding base with a mixture of smaller, individual online contributions, million dollar contributions, and coalition member contributions. The campaign invested in a robust online grassroots fundraising for two purposes, to fundraise and build a large base of invested supporters and voters. Moreover, the campaign fundraised from within the coalition, receiving over 36% of the total campaign funding from organizational partners including, labor unions, environmental organization, and organizations that represent communities of color. The coalition contribution model built trust and organizational investment in the campaign.

Type of Contribution	Money Raised	# of Contributors	% of total funding
Organizational Funding	\$5,506,913	22	36.03%
Million Dollar Plus	\$3,001,000	3	19.64%
\$250K to \$999K	\$2,300,000	7	15.05%
\$10K to \$249K	\$3,436,853	81	22.49%
\$1K to \$9.9K	\$287,765	140	1.88%
Online	\$345,637	3819	2.26%
Tribes	\$219,500	11	1.44%
Business	\$184,000	10	1.20%
Total	\$15,281,668	4093	

In order to qualify for the ballot, we spent \$1.4 million on signature gathering and then spent about \$13.7 million to reach voters before Election Day. To maximize our field program budget, we hired 14 organizers early, knowing that it would be more expensive to add people later in the election season, eventually growing to 20 organizers by the time ballots dropped. We also had in-kind organizing capacity from partner organizations. The rest of the funds of our General Election budget, about \$11 million, was spent on paid communications of TV and online advertising and direct mail. The remainder was spent on additional paid and volunteer field, research, fundraising, staff, and overhead.

Opposition

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) formed the official “no” campaign in April and hired Winner and Mandabach (W&M), a California based consulting firm, to run their campaign. We researched and developed a clear understanding of their strategy and expected them to spend over \$25 million. In the end, they contributed \$31,245,000. Nearly 98% of their money came from out-of-state oil industry. They spent \$20 million of their \$31 million on broadcast TV and digital and an additional \$5 million on direct mail sending over 12 million mail pieces. The remainder was spent on research and consulting fees. Their primary contributors were:

BP America	\$12,896,031
Phillips 66	\$7,201,186
Andeavor (Formerly Tesoro)	\$6,062,827
American Fuel and Petro-chemical Manufacturers	\$1,250,000
Valero Energy Corporation	\$995,000
Koch Industries	\$950,000
U.S. Oil & Refining Company	\$558,531
Chevron	\$500,000
Other Oil & Gas	\$711,000
Other	452,136
Total	\$31,576,000

W&M's basic strategy was to a) acknowledge that climate change is a real threat but layer seeds of doubt in the effectiveness of the initiative and close with a hit on the cost, b) saturate any and all markets in advertising to further layer doubt, and c) participate in all community events with paid spokespeople.

Election Results

Region	Yes	No	Total Votes	%Yes
King	552,558	403,675	956,233	57.78%
Pierce/Kitsap	172,355	274,797	447,152	38.55%
Northwest	224,671	314,383	539,054	41.68%
Southwest	208,799	333,230	542,029	38.52%
Southeast	76,179	195,330	271,509	28.06%
Northeast	106,163	224,288	330,451	32.13%
	1,340,725	1,745,703	3,086,428	43.44%

Yes on 1631 - Campaign Strengths

Broad, diverse and engaged coalition: Perhaps the most valuable resource on the campaign was the expansive and broad network of supporters. The Alliance had over 200 endorsers as the campaign began and ultimately grew to over 600 endorsing organizations. This diverse coalition developed a policy that brought together the largest coalition ever in Washington state, including an extensive grassroots field operation for a statewide ballot measure. It was also one of our best message tactics to highlight our home-grown coalition against the out-of-state oil company spending.

Strong grassroots and field program: While we knew our opposition's strength would be in money, ours would be in a field persuasion and turnout effort. The campaign had nearly 6,500 individual volunteers and 250 volunteer leaders organizing their own networks through a distributed organizing model. This grassroots energy has continued past the campaign and is being channeled in the 2019 Legislative Session.

Community of Color engagement: With a policy strongly rooted in equity that communities of color were part of writing and a campaign they were leading, they were able to do targeted, cross-cultural outreach in support of 1631 in traditionally untapped markets. This included a variety of authentic engagement with black churches, Spanish language doorbelling by latinx farmworkers, in-language videos created in Korean and Punjabi, and more. In addition, this wide and diverse network was able to respond to misinformation and attacks from the opposition campaign in real time.

Governor Inslee support: Governor Inslee's enthusiasm and support for Yes on 1631 was invaluable. He kicked off our fundraising efforts with in-state and national climate funders and was a critical campaign spokesperson. To voters, his passion to fighting climate change and his positive vision was an effective and trusting voice to respond to our opposition's attacks.

Changed the movement & opposition narrative: The campaign's diversity and intentional focus on non-traditional spokespeople like tribal leaders, health care professionals, moms, workers, community of color leaders, and business owners and the over 400 national and state press stories helped reshape the national climate narrative in three ways:

- I-1631 showed that the climate movement is much broader than white upper-middle class, urban America and by highlighting our diverse coalition we demonstrated that this movement is built to last.
- The national press around I-1631 pulled the mask off the oil industry's claims that they are willing to work towards climate solutions and showed them as main opposition.
- The Nation was the first publication to call I-1631 "the new green deal," which helped shine a light on climate policy nationally.

Yes on 1631 Challenges

Big Oil spent \$31 million to defeat I-1631: I-1631 was the most expensive campaign in Washington State history. The state was saturated by opposition messaging by the time our fundraising efforts picked up.

Half of the campaign's money came in final 6 weeks: Six weeks before the election we had raised about \$6.2 million (\$1.5 million of that we needed to qualify for the ballot). The remaining \$9 million we raised came in the door these final weeks and only about \$1.5 million of it we had been anticipating. Six weeks before the election our opposition had contributed about \$20 million. We likely would have made some different decisions had we known we would end with a substantially larger budget.

Big Oil played dirty: Because our policy was a direct threat to their corporate interests, the fossil fuel companies fought dirty from their long-standing playbook. They paid for a fake economic study, put out a false endorsement letter of Latino business owners, and confused voters on what was actually in the ballot measure.

Our Message was complex: While our messages and our opponents' messages both tested favorably, neither message was extremely compelling to voters. The opposition only had to poke holes in our policy, the key to our message was to layer a two-part narrative (both calling out the big oil opposition while delivering a hopeful path forward). It was difficult to highlight both parts of our narrative in a 30 second TV or digital spot.

The policy was comprehensive, but complex: One of our biggest assets was also a vulnerability for the campaign. In order to build trust and include the interests of a large coalition necessary to win, the majority of the carbon pricing policy needed to be spelled out in the initiative. The opposition campaign then had plenty of fodder to extract potential vulnerabilities within the proposal. Ultimately, the estimated cost to consumers was the primary opposition driver, but they also used the coal plant exemption, oversight board, and spending plan to raise questions about how effective the policy could be.

Lack of early investment in base voters: Our research indicated that our base was strong and with limited resources, we didn't spend as much money on base communication in the beginning of the campaign. By week 4, we started to lose ground with the base and responded by shifting gears to bring back our base. If we had resources, we would have invested more intentionally in sharing our vision and inoculating our base early in September so that we could then spend those final weeks trying to win swing voters rather shore up our base. In addition, early in the campaign it was advised by our research firm to not directly talk about climate change because it was polarizing. Instead our message was centered around clean air and water. That worked better for us in persuading independents, but we also lost some base Democrats who were most motivated by climate change.

Seattle Times Editorial Board: The Seattle Times has written about the need for climate action regularly for years, but has yet to agree to any policy solution. This mentality that climate change action is urgent, but other solutions are better, fit right into the oil industry's messages and validated it. Their "no" endorsement gave swing voters an excuse to vote "no" in the final days of the election.

Post 1631 Exit Polling

We conducted polling immediately after the November Election and the results showed that while Washingtonians rejected I-1631, 80% of Washingtonians continue to overwhelmingly believe that climate change is real and 64% feel further action is needed. In many ways, the campaign was not about if we should act it was how we act, and the oil companies were unsuccessful in dissuading Washingtonians from wanting climate solutions. Our polling showed that Washingtonians are still in favor of carbon pricing and other policies like 100% clean energy and a clean fuel standard.