

Memo

To: George and Jonathan Soros, Peter and Jonathan Lewis, Herb and Marion Sandler, Steve Bing, John Sperling, Michael Vachon

From: Andy Stern, Anna Burger, and John Podesta (writing as private citizens)

Date: September 27, 2007

RE: STRATEGIC OUTLOOK FOR THE 2008 ELECTIONS

This memo outlines our analysis of the political landscape and progressive strengths and weaknesses going into the 2008 elections. It is intended as background for our meeting on September 27th, 2007, and not as a concrete set of recommendations about what to do in the upcoming year. Our proposed agenda for this meeting is included in the accompanying document.

Although the prospects for continued electoral gains are solid—and the assets of the progressive movement far better than in years past—several gaps remain to be filled. Chief among these is better connection between ground activity and substantive content and messaging. In order to win next year, we must do a better job of controlling the public dialogue and overall framework of the election.

If 2008 is about President Bush, a responsible exit from Iraq, achieving universal health care, tackling our energy problem and global warming, and helping economically stressed families, we will likely score sweeping victories. If 2008 is about the weaknesses of our candidate, congressional stasis, terrorism, tax hikes, and fear of radical change, we could easily fall back and lose progress on multiple fronts.

We suggest that you keep in mind the following strategic goals as we try to develop a framework for electoral activity in 2008:

- **Create the conditions for a tidal wave against the GOP.** The stakes of the election need to fit the historical moment. The country is massively off track. Nothing will change until Bush and his supporters are out and new leaders are in—leaders who will be willing and able to do what is necessary for the country. Corruption and the war set the stage for victory in 2006. A likely downturn in the economy, the protracted war in Iraq, rising inequality and Republican resistance to change can help set the stage for widespread gains up and down the ballot in 2008. This must again be a nationalized election in terms of scope and message.
- **Keep the President's numbers down and brand all conservative candidates as "Bush Republicans."** Bush's lame duck status cannot be allowed to create space

for the Republicans to claim the mantle of change or conservative principle. The Republican presidential candidate will attempt to be the true heir of Ronald Reagan and may try to position himself as an agent for change, Sarkozy style. We must continually remind voters that the nominee and all the rest of the Republican candidates are the residual forces of the failed Bush years.

- **Exploit the particular weaknesses of the Republican presidential nominee.** Beyond tying the candidate to Bush, we must not be shy about reminding voters of the personal faults and character limitations of the Republican Party leader. The current crop of candidates is relatively unknown to Americans and will be ripe for definition through serious opposition research and media work. This will not happen organically. It will require sustained pressure and a willingness to play politics by their rules.
- **Ensure that demographics is destiny.** An “emerging progressive majority” is a realistic possibility in terms of demographic and voting patterns. But it is incomplete in terms of organizing and political work. Women, communities of color, and highly educated professionals are core parts of the progressive coalition. Nationally, and in key battleground states, their influence is growing. Latinos and young voters are quickly solidifying in this coalition as well. But many of these voters are new to the process. All of these groups—in addition to working class voters and independents picked up in 2006—will require significant long-term engagement in order to keep them reliably on our side.
- **Control the political discourse.** So much effort over the past few years has been focused on better coordinating, strengthening, and developing progressive institutions and leaders. Now that this enhanced infrastructure is in place—grassroots organizing; multi-issue advocacy groups; think tanks; youth outreach; faith communities; micro-targeting outfits; the netroots and blogosphere—we need to better utilize these networks to drive the content of politics through a strong “echo chamber” and message delivery system.
- **Set the stage for future progressive actions.** All of this electoral activity will be for naught if we do not simultaneously advance a larger vision for why progressive change is necessary and how specific progressive legislation will achieve these goals. Should progressives win in 2008, the next president and Congress will face serious challenges in both cleaning up the mess of the Bush years and moving significant reforms in health care, energy, foreign policy and Iraq, poverty and mobility.
- **Leave something behind.** We should think of investments in 2008 as building blocks for ongoing strategic campaigns and issue work in 2009 and beyond. Simply getting progressives elected will not be enough to maintain the political pressure and support necessary to pass progressive legislation and build a long-term, working majority.

WHAT IS VICTORY IN 2008?

Republicans argue that 2006 was an aberration in an otherwise ascendant center-right majority built on conservative dominance on national security and economic issues and strong support from white voters, the South and Heartland, and families in rapidly growing exurban counties.

This interpretation does not hold up given the results of 2006.

2006 was a watershed year for progressives and the Democratic Party. Democrats picked up 30 House seats and 6 Senate seats for slim majorities in both. Democrats won 6 governor's seats and now hold a 28 to 22 state advantage. They picked up 323 state legislative seats and now control both legislative chambers in 23 states and all three branches in 15 states. The party holds a 4-state advantage in terms of Secretary of State seats and a 19-state advantage among state attorneys general positions. In addition, all 6 states with minimum wage initiatives passed the measure, most indexing the minimum wage to inflation. And of 17 measures to limit the power of government, only one passed in AZ (although it was the only state to reject a gay marriage ban).

While these gains are not unprecedented, they are on par with the Republican turn in 1994 and constitute a significant shift in electoral ground toward progressives and Democrats. However, further realignment to progressives and the Democrats is by no means inevitable. Outside of a national crisis, continued gains are likely to be slower and more fiercely contested. In many ways, the stakes in 2008 will be greater than in previous elections. The conditions of the country have grown markedly worse over the past few years and if we do not continue to build and sustain electoral power at all levels—and replace outgoing leaders with true progressives—the prospects for fundamental change will dim.

Ideal victory in 2008 will require 5 primary accomplishments:

- A Democratic president with an expanded geographical base and 300 or more electoral votes. (Sen. John Kerry received 252 electoral votes in 2004.)
- Getting within striking distance of 60 votes in the Senate and holding the House with a strengthened majority.
- Significant strengthening of base Democratic voters and further solidification of wavering independent and moderate voters.
- Additional gains in the 11 gubernatorial races and strengthening of state legislative control in the lead up to redistricting after 2010.
- A clear mandate for progressive action on the issues we care most about: financial security and opportunity for low- and middle-income voters, universal

health care, clean energy transformation, global warming, responsible exit from Iraq and restoring American leadership in the international community.

THE THEORY OF THE CASE

Accomplishing these goals will require a series of interrelated steps focused on securing advantageous demographic and geographical trends, making the best use of existing strengths, and continuing to encourage innovation in organizing, campaigning, and media.

Step one: **Expand support among base voters.**

Women. Democrats traditionally do much better among women than men. But the true areas of strength are among single, working, and highly-educated women. This is a very positive trend given the importance of women in the electorate. Single women are now almost half—46 percent—of adult women, and if present trends continue, they will become a majority of women in the next couple of decades. Kerry carried single women 62-to-37 percent, college-educated women 54-to-45 percent (60-to-38 percent among those with a postgraduate education) and working women 51-to-48 percent.

Professionals. From the 1988 through 2000 presidential elections, professionals supported the Democratic candidate by an average of 52 percent to 40 percent. In 2004, they supported Kerry by a 63-to-37 percent margin. This sector of the electorate is also growing in influence. Professionals constitute around 17 percent of the work force and in another 10 years, this group will be 18 percent to 19 percent of the work force. Nationally, they account for about 21 percent of voters; in many Northeastern and far Western states, they form probably one-quarter of the electorate

African-Americans. The most reliable bloc in the Democratic camp, African-American voters continue to be a critical focus for electoral efforts. Kerry's margin among African-Americans (88-11 percent) was the highest since exit polling began in 1976. These voters make up about 10 to 11 percent of the electorate—a percentage that is not likely to change much in coming years.

Union households. Although union density continues to decline nationwide, the strength of labor is great and a core part of the Democratic base. Union household voters supported Kerry 59-to-40 percent. Moreover, they made up an impressive 24 percent of the voting pool—almost double the percentage of union members in the nation.

Less religiously observant voters. Given the rising importance of highly observant voters to the Republican base, it is not surprising that less observant and secular voters continue to flock to the Democrats. Kerry carried those who attend religious services a few times a year 54-to-45 percent and those who never attend 62-to-36 percent. And he carried all non-Christian groups by very wide margins: Jews (77-to-22 percent); Muslims (74-to-25 percent); those who profess some other religion (72-to-25 percent); and those who

profess no religion (67-to-31 percent). According to the exit polls, non-Christians were 20 percent of voters and the less-observant were 43 percent of voters in 2004. Both figures are likely to go up in the future.

Voters in the Northeast, upper Midwest, and West. In the last four elections, the Democrats have carried 18 states, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin and the District of Columbia for a total of 248 electoral votes. Thirteen of these states can be called reliably progressive/Democratic, with strong Democratic presence in the Senate and House and state level offices as well. States like Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin are more contested and offer strong potential for pick-ups down ballot.

Step two: **Solidify groups that are trending Democratic.**

Millennials/Gen-Y. Young (18- to 29-year-olds) voters today are fairly well established as a progressive constituency but given the tenuous nature of their political participation and socialization this group will require sustained focus. Kerry won young voters 54-to-45 percent, compared to a narrow 48-to-46 percent margin for Gore in 2000. Kerry's showing in 2004 marked the fourth straight presidential election in which Democrats have won the youth vote. It was also, of those four elections, the one in which youth's Democratic support was most out-of-line with the rest of population. In 2000, youth were only two points more Democratic than all voters; in 1996, they were 11 points more Democratic than all voters; and in 1992, they were four points more Democratic than all voters. These voters also trended heavily Democratic in 2006, supporting Democratic candidates by a 60-38 percent margin.

Latinos. Considered a swing group by many analysts, Latinos appear to have become much more Democratic over the Bush years. In the 2004 election, it was initially reported that they gave Bush 44 percent of their vote. However, the exit poll is now widely acknowledged to have been flawed and the generally accepted estimate is that Kerry carried Hispanics 58 percent compared to Bush's 40 percent. Still, that represents a significant improvement of 5 percentage points in Bush's support among Hispanics over 2000. Latino support for the Democrats appeared to go up substantially in 2006, with the group as a whole favoring Democrats by a 69-to-30 percent margin

The rapid increase in demographic importance of Latinos will continue for decades. Hispanics have surpassed blacks as the nation's largest minority group, and Census projections indicate that by about mid-century Hispanics will be one-quarter of the U.S. population (at which point or shortly thereafter, the United States will become a majority-minority nation). Importantly, Latinos should not be considered monolithic in their politics. There are serious differences based on country of origin, geographical location, age and social status that need particular political focus. This is an election that could really solidify a cross-section of this community and this work should be considered a top priority.

Independents. These voters classify themselves as ideologically and politically neutral but their voting patterns are becoming increasingly Democratic in orientation. The NES estimates that independents make up more than one-third of the electorate and are concentrated in states/areas with rising numbers of professionals. Independents favored Democrats through most of the 1990s but moved to Bush in 2000 (then favoring Kerry by one point in 2004). By 2006, these voters had abandoned Bush and the Republicans, voting for the Democrats by a 57-to-39 percent margin, the largest margin for Democrats on record. Independents are unlikely to ever become true base voters but their Democratic leanings can be maintained and perhaps extended.

Step three: **Expand the battleground states.**

Hard GOP states. In the last four elections, the Republicans have carried 16 states (AL, AK, ID, IN, KS, MS, NE, NC, ND, OK, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, WY) for a total of 135 electoral votes. Adding Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana and Montana—states that have voted heavily Republican in the past two cycles—makes a total of 20 states with 170 electoral votes in the GOP base. We list these for descriptive rather than targeting purposes. States like VA, however, have become much more competitive in recent years particularly down ballot.

Voters in contested states. States not clearly identified at this point fall into three categories. First, there is a small category of three pure swing states that have split their support between the two parties in the last two elections: Iowa, New Hampshire and New Mexico fall into this category. These states have a total of 16 electoral votes. Next, there is a very significant group of states—Florida, Missouri, Nevada and Ohio—where the average GOP margin in the last two elections has been 5 points or less. This purple leaning red category has a total of 63 electoral votes. Finally, there is a mixed group of five states—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Tennessee and West Virginia—that might be characterized as “red vulnerable”. In these states, the average GOP margin in the last two elections has been less than 10 points (though more than 5). And, they are also states that have been carried by the Democrats as least once in the last four elections. They have a total of 41 electoral votes.

The general trend in the states is that the Rocky Mountain region is moving more progressive; the South remains solidly conservative; and in the Plains/Heartland states, Republicans are strong at the federal level with Democrats making gains at the state level.

Step four: **Build on progressive assets and increase campaign innovation and experimentation.**

Democratic Party voter contact and the 50-state strategy. Despite internal wrangling between the campaign committees and the DNC in 2006, it is clear to us that the DNC’s 50-state approach is working and needs to be sustained over time. Preliminary examination of the DNC’s plans for 2008 suggest that they have put together a sound method for integrating volunteer recruiting and voter contact with efficient online

targeting through the VoteBuilder database. The 2008 plan calls for 112,500 functioning precinct leaders nationally, and more than 40,000 in targeted Senate states and nearly 30,000 in 76 targeted House districts. While this is a critical effort, it is important to keep in mind that many voters do not identify themselves in partisan terms, making any outside effort that much more necessary.

Independent voter registration and contact. There are scores of excellent voter registration and mobilization efforts that progressives have developed to find and bring to the polls voters across diverse subgroups. These non-partisan groups, generally organized as 501 (c)(3)'s, spent a combined \$90 million in 2004. America Votes provides a clear mechanism for harnessing all of these independent efforts into a coordinated and strategic approach that avoids overlap, centralizes data collection and targeting, concentrates resources on both mobilizing existing voters and finding new voters in previously hard-to-reach or overlooked areas, and encourages local activism and leadership development to run future campaigns. The key with these efforts, particularly among unaffiliated or independent-leaning voters, is to tie registration and contact to specific issue agendas and substantive content.

Micro-targeting. Progressives have put significant effort into developing and refining our ability to identify, track, target with tailored messaging, and mobilize multiple subgroups of voters. Catalyst is the current iteration of this micro-targeting effort and works intimately with the America Votes network to help find new progressive voters and mobilize core supporters to the polls. Although not as developed at this point, similar micro-targeting methods can and should be applied to online organizing and activism.

Strategic issue advocacy and community organizing. Single issue advocacy has rapidly been augmented by multi-issue, multi-group coalition advocacy focused on achieving concrete progressive goals such as poverty reduction, support for low-income families, universal health care, energy independence, and an end to the Iraq war. These efforts differ from traditional single issue work in that they also focus on building long term political power and developing a base of support for future progressive battles. Increasingly organized around state tables, these issue campaigns are critical in terms of finding new activists and voters, encouraging more strategic cooperation and better use of resources among groups, and driving the political debate and media coverage. These efforts are generally underfunded but mechanisms such as America Votes can help to bridge funding needs.

Online organizing and netroots activism. The growing strength of the progressive netroots—broadly defined as progressive and Democratic activists, bloggers, and other social networking/online users conducting politics through interconnected, less centralized means—is an important and positive trend for our side. The advantage of large numbers of people quickly and efficiently moving ideas, money, content, and messages adds tremendously to the traditional forms of voter contact and mobilization. It also acts as a powerful check on the mainstream media and offers multiple venues for more direct and creative messaging. The progressive netroots is heads above its

conservative counterpart at this point but this advantage will potentially narrow as conservatives get up-to-speed.

MOVING FORWARD

Our meeting in New York brings together the most generous funders of progressive causes and progressive infrastructure in the country. We sit in September 2007, in a much different position than August 2003, when the same group literally jump-started an independent effort to change course in this country. Many lessons were learned, some painful, from that effort and the effort in 2006. Much has been built in the ensuing four years, particularly with respect to direct voter contact, registration and mobilization but much remains to be done. And it is clear that each of you as individuals will play an important role in funding the remaining work.

The question on the table is whether the group has the shared strategic vision, will and desire to once again lead a joint effort to get the country back on a sane and progressive track. If you can come to some collective agreement, then there really is no question that the power, resources and judgment of the people assembled will shape the structure and impact of the “outside campaign”—the efforts of the groups and entities operating outside the candidates’ and party structures.

The question of a shared vision and strategy needs to be answered against a backdrop in which a number of building blocks have already been put in place, but are not fully funded.

To organize the discussion, it makes sense for us to think about the outside effort as consisting of two big blocks of work—direct voter contact and driving the message and dialogue of the campaign. If that division sounds a little like the structure of ACT and the Media Fund from the 2004 campaign it isn’t, as will be explained below.

Direct voter contact/registration/mobilization

The structure of this big bucket of work is most mature. It includes detailed planning in targeted states to register, contact, persuade and motivate voters in sufficient numbers to elect progressive officeholders; a list of actual and potential voters with detailed knowledge down to the household level of their potential to perform as progressive voters (micro-targeting); coordination and division of responsibility amongst the groups working on voter mobilization to ensure the most cost-effective and persuasive way to reach those voters; accountability for results; and leaving behind permanent structures to continue a dialogue with voters for future elections and to influence the outcome of future legislative battles.

The Republican campaign in 2004, under the direction of Karl Rove, had a substantial advantage over the outside campaign waged in support of the Democratic candidate, largely through the vehicle of ACT. Although it in fact accomplished a great deal, ACT

suffered from late entry, lack of good voter file information—particularly micro-targeting in weak Democratic performing districts—and a voter contact model of using paid canvassers to carry out the work leaving behind no permanent structure to build upon.

Most of those weaknesses, if not all, have been remedied in the 2008 model.

- The Atlas Project has collected and is analyzing data in 15 states for the purpose of developing detailed state voter contact plans for both the party and outside organizations, work that will be completed by the end of this year. That work is largely funded by subscription from party organizations and 501(c)(4)'s that are mounting voter contact programs. The work for those states is largely funded. Depending on how the nominating processes play out, or whether a strong third party independent enters the race, Atlas is considering expanding the number of states (which would require additional resources).
- A robust voter file with strong micro-targeting potential has been developed by Catalyst. A number of you have been generous investors in Catalyst, which proved its worth in the 2006 election. It is currently expanding and strengthening its platform and needs an additional \$3 million to be fully operational in 2008.
- America Votes, now being led by former Congressman Martin Frost, is playing a coordinating role amongst groups doing the actual voter contact work. Most of those groups are building community based or membership based structures to avoid the ACT pitfalls. America Votes includes 37 national groups and more than 260 state-based organizations. It is currently active in 9 states but would like to be active in 15 states (AZ, CO, FL, IA, MI, MN, NH, NM, NV, OH, PA, VA, WI, WV, with one more to be determined). America Votes estimates that this 15-state effort will require \$15 million.

The most substantial funding need is for the groups operating on the ground to carry out their individual state voter contact plans. The groups, largely operating as 501(c)(4)'s with a proven track record of success in the 2006 cycle, such as ACORN/Project Vote, Women's Voices, Women Vote, MoveOn, Sierra Club, Emily's List, Working America, and US Action should be top candidates for investment.

One place where the existing infrastructure remains weak and heavily underfunded is voter contact with Latino voters. While a number of these groups do some work in Hispanic communities, (particularly ACORN/Project Vote and LULAC, which is a member of America Votes) there is no national group that has a proven track record of success. PFAW's Democracia USA operates in a few states and some groups such as NCLR and NALEO do non-partisan voter registration amongst Latinos. NDN is considering expanding its work in the Latino community from media to direct voter contact and MoveOn is considering seeding a new Latino organizing effort, but those are in formation.

Given the growing power of Latino voters, and in light of the organizing around the immigration fight, this is a particularly good time to invest here. The We Are America coalition, which was built out of existing grassroots organizing around immigration, has the potential to be a vehicle for this work. It has created both (c)(3) and (c)(4) arms and it will certainly be involved in voter registration as well as GOTV.

Rob McKay, who chairs the Democracy Alliance Board and will be joining us at 4:00PM, and Anna Burger are in the process of forming a 527 organization to collectively raise money for voter contact/voter mobilization work which would be distributed through the America Votes table based on need and effectiveness. To fully fund these groups in 15 targeted states, they estimate that approximately \$135 million needs to be raised in addition to the money that the groups themselves are expected to bring in on their own.

A key item in our proposed agenda is a discussion of the status and strength of these efforts, commitments already made by the donors, the relative merits and further funding of the coordinating infrastructure and affiliated groups.

A note on 501(c)(3) voter registration. Non-partisan voter registration can be highly effective in delivering progressive voters to the polls. The Sandler family and OSI are already deeply involved in funding organizations to do this work in communities of color and with respect to unmarried women. The Lewis family is the lead funder for doing this work amongst young voters. The expertise in this area resides in the recipients of this memo, rather than the drafters, but we have left some time on the agenda to discuss what more needs to be done in this area, as well.

Controlling the Dialogue, Messaging and Media

If the structure of voter contact/voter mobilization is relatively mature, the structure of using outside forces to control the messaging and the debate in the campaign is almost nonexistent.

Ever since the 1996 Clinton campaign discovered the soft money loophole in the campaign finance law to run “issue ads” that pummeled Bob Dole before he even got the nomination, national and local television campaigns have been waged using non-federal dollars. The McCain-Feingold law closed down the loophole Clinton used to run that advertising through the DNC, but a new avenue for soft dollars to be spent on advertising quickly was found through spending by so-called 527 organizations. The FEC was in the process of narrowing this new loophole when the Supreme Court, this June, blew a hole in the McCain-Feingold laws to permit 527’s, unions, corporations, trade associations and others to run “issue ads” right up until Election Day.

The Media Fund in 2004 was built on this theory of soft money advertising and the notion that the candidate would be without resources from the spring through the convention.

Two things have changes since then. First, it seems certain that the candidate and party committees will be able to raise *very* substantial amounts of money and will not go dark during any period in the campaign. Second, and in our view more important, it is dubious, at best, to believe that spending gobs of money on traditional, uncreative, 30 second political spots in a sea of media clutter, will have any impact, let alone be cost-effective for an outside campaign.

But there is an important role, as noted at the beginning of this memo, for a strong coordinated messaging campaign, or series of campaigns to do the following: (1) keep Bush's job approval low and keep him relevant to the decision about who should lead the country; don't just let him fade off into the sunset with a good riddance; (2) brand all conservative candidates "Bush Republicans"; (3) define the Republican Presidential candidate's flaws just as he is emerging from the primaries; and (4) set the issue framework for the upcoming election on our terms—Iraq, affordable health care for all, energy and global warming, and inequality and mobility, rather than theirs—taxes and terrorism.

To accomplish these goals, we would need the kind of sophisticated and strategic coordination that is the equivalent of the top management of the presidential campaign itself. That is a daunting task, but it has to be done. Ideally, media would not be independent of the voter mobilization effort, but would be coordinated so that each would support and echo the other.

Ideas are popping up all over about how to organize this effort.

- Wes Boyd has discussed with some of you the idea of creating a multi-purpose outside war room (perhaps modeled on Americans Against Escalation in Iraq) to drive strategic campaigns and paid media in both traditional and new media through an organization that would drive research, media, and online activities through the cycle. Wes envisions a budget for this work of approximately \$128 million.
- Rob McKay and Anna Burger envision using the new 527 described above in the voter contact section to raise additional funds, approximately \$65 million, to support media and messaging work.
- First Tuesday—a group of Hollywood talent led by Chris Moore, Katie McGrath and Bruce Cohen that has done some really innovative advertising for VoteVets, CAPAF, and Majority Action—has proposed creating a virtual studio to do creative media campaigns that avoid the pitfalls of relying on the monopoly of political media consultants, whose work can be mind-numbing.

Steve Bing will describe his thoughts and conversations about how to carry out this work.

The hard part in bringing these threads together is how to structure and who would be responsible for driving this effort. We have proposed a serious block of time on the agenda to discuss the substance and possible governance of this effort.

We believe that if we get the strategic goals, operating structure, governance and leadership of this effort right, it will attract substantial outside funds.

We look forward to seeing you on Thursday and appreciate more than you can imagine all that you have done and all that you are doing.

APPENDIX
Current Status of Major 2008 Initiatives

America Votes

America Votes currently consists of roughly 40 national organizations and 260 state/local organizations. In 2006, *America Votes* was active in 9 states. The organization is looking to be active in 15 states in 2008, with perhaps one or two pilot states as well (e.g. working on an Indiana congressional district). They are also doing some special project work in Kentucky in 2007.

As of now, 14 states have been determined—with capacity to add one more state that will be determined at the December Board meeting. The 14 states are: AZ, CO, OH, PA, MI, MN, NH, NM, IA, MO, NV, VA, and FL.

America Votes estimates that a 15-state plan will cost \$15 million, although they do not have concrete state budgets at this point.

The Atlas Project

The Atlas Project, LLC intends to complete comprehensive baseline polling and focus groups in 15 states over the next several months. The research will inform the vote goal scenarios produced for the recommendations we make in the group's strategic reports. Additionally, as part of Atlas' core mission, the organization hopes to provide clients with a thorough post-election analysis of the 2007/2008 effort

The Atlas Project is fully funded at this point since they have subscribers and are able to meet institutional needs. Subscribers include: AFL-CIO, AFSCME, *America Votes*, the American Association for Justice, AFT, Emily's List, LIUNA, SEIU, NEA and Sheet Metal Workers. The DNC has also signed a letter of intent and following delivery of the final product will enter into a contract. Negotiations for other committees—DSCC, DCCC, DGA—are also underway as are determinations about where they can contract on a state-by-state basis.

Reports to independent groups will be distributed on November 15, 2007, and to party committees on March 15, 2008. Atlas is currently focused on 15 states but might expand depending upon the primary outcomes or if a strong third party candidate enters the race.

Catalist

Catalist is also funded based on a subscription model but needs another \$3 million to be fully operational.

Current clients include: AFL-CIO, NEA, SEIU, NARAL, *America Votes*, MoveOn.org, NAACP, US Action, Women's Voices, Women's Vote, Emily's List, ATLAS, Sierra Club,

The Center for Civic Participation, League of Conservation Voters, Wake Up Walmart, Citizen Action of WI, Center for Community Change, ACORN, Clean Water Action, Education Voters Institute, DSCC, Democracia USA, Defenders of Wildlife, DCCC, California Labor Federation, The Strategy Group, Maine Public Action, Mission Control, Rock the Vote, and Blueprint.

DNC

In 2008, the DNC will have 150 funded field staff charged with building a network of precinct and county leaders in targeted areas. State party field staff and campaign field staff will be encouraged to plug in to this effort. Paid staff will be responsible for recruiting precinct leaders, providing training, voter contact, and canvassing. The DNC will also have in place a master list of activists, accessible online, and some access to the VoteBuilder voter file to help facilitate contact, outreach, and mobilization.

ACORN/Project Vote

In 2006, Project Vote registered 547,539 voters; targeted 686,796 voters for mobilization; attempted 1.5 million contacts to those voters; and was the largest registrant of young voters in the United States.

In 2007-08, Project Vote will be pursuing a program focused on five priorities:

1. **Traditional Voter Participation:** Project Vote's traditional voter registration, voter education, and voter mobilization program with a goal of helping 1.1 million people register to vote and reach a minimum of 1.9 million voters for education and mobilization;
2. **Young Voter Registration:** Building on the 2006 success in reaching young voters by targeting high schools, community colleges, and GED programs;
3. **New American Voter Participation:** Pilot a program in the Southwest that will help between 400,000 and 600,000 recent immigrants, especially Latinos, register to vote;
4. **Precinct Voter Action Network:** The continued implementation of Project Vote's precinct captain program called the Precinct Voter Action Network (PVAN);
5. **Election Administration:** New work to defend the franchise from attacks and expand access to the voting rolls through our increasingly effective Elections Administration program; and

The projected budget for voter registration in 2007-2008 is \$15.5 million. Project Vote has challenge grants totaling \$7.5 million (from the Sandlers and Wellspring Advisors) and needs to raise an additional \$7.5 million to draw down these grants.

Women's Voices. Women Vote

Women's Voices. Women Vote has an ambitious plan to register more than one million

single women and other under-represented groups between 2007 and 2008. WVWV will utilize their traditional register by mail programs, as well as testing pilot internet strategies for registration. New computer models enable WVWV to target single women more accurately than ever before, both by likelihood of response and issue interest. The organization also plans an aggressive GOTV program in 2008, targeting 2.75 million unmarried women who are irregular or low propensity voters. All WVWV programs are research tested first, and include control groups so that the organization can measure cost efficiencies and impact. Recent census data shows that nearly one quarter of the eligible electorate is made up of unmarried women and that a majority of women now live without a spouse. These trends underscore the importance of WVWV's motivation and mobilization efforts.

WVWV aims to be active in 25 states with a total budget of \$15 million. They have raised \$5 million and are currently working on a \$2.5 million matching grant through the end of the year.

USAction

USAction is designed to create a bridge between groups (outside of labor) specializing in low-income community organizing and those specializing in middle-income community organizing. In 2006, USAction focused primarily on issue-based work, and in 2007, it worked with MoveOn and SEIU to help lead the creation of Americans Against Escalation in Iraq. Now, the group is focused on building a new anti-war movement, and readying its 2008 program to take this organizing well outside the usual progressive community—groups like military families and Reagan Democrats, key constituencies needed for majorities in 2008 and beyond.

USAction's state affiliates are key leaders of state progressive coalitions, bringing together powerful groups of labor, environmental, social justice, and human service organizations.

USAction's estimated total (c)(4) civic engagement budget through 2008 is \$9 million. USAction Education Fund's comparable budget is \$10 million. Priority states are AZ, CO, CT, FL, IA, IL, NH, NJ, NY, ME, OH, MI, MN, MO, PA, WA, WI and WV.

Labor

SEIU

In the 2004 Presidential election cycle, SEIU spent \$65 million. In the 2006 mid term elections, SEIU built on that investment by spending \$35 million. SEIU's strategy focused on three key areas: the "ground game," creating momentum in tier two and three districts around issues and ballot initiative campaigns, and strategic paid media.

In 2008, SEIU will continue working with these goals in mind and will contribute more in the 2008 cycle than ever in its history. The union is committed to electing a President, congress and state elected officials who support working men and women and their issues.

Change to Win

In 2006, Change to Win's efforts focused mainly on electing pro-worker gubernatorial and U.S. Senate candidates in Michigan, Pennsylvania and Ohio. In all of the races to which Change to Win devoted significant resources, their candidates won. In addition to Change to Win's efforts, its affiliates spent close to \$45 million on the 2006 elections.

In 2008, Change to Win's expanded political program will focus on 15-20 states.

AFL-CIO

A.F.L.-C.I.O. states that it mobilized millions of voters in several states during the 2006 elections, helping shift the balance of power in Congress.

In 2008, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. plans to help elect "a pro-worker president" and help gain three to six "pro-worker seats" in the Senate and add five in the House by focusing on Congressional districts with many union members.

The federation said that it would seek to reach out to voters, through a new affiliate, Working America that would enlist workers not in regular unions. The \$53 million political budget for this cycle is up from \$50 million in the presidential cycle of 2003-04.