Looking Ahead to the 2018 Midterm Elections
1. What happened in the 2016 election?

2. What should we expect in 2018?

3. What is the impact of demographic change?
Study Methodology

Voter Turnout Data

• Current Population Survey

Population Data

• U.S. Census, Current Population Survey, American Community Survey, California Department of Finance
2016 Voter Turnout
2016 U.S. Results

- Trump = 63 million votes (306)
- Clinton = 65 million votes + (232)
- Nearly a 100 million eligible Americans didn’t vote
- Trump – only about a quarter of eligible voters
U.S. 2016 Eligible Voter Turnout

- Total: 61.4% (61.8% in 2012)
- White NL: 65.3% (64.1% in 2012)
- Black: 59.4% (66.2% in 2012)
- Asian American: 49.9% (48.0% in 2012)
- Latino: 47.6% (48.0% in 2012)
U.S. Eligible Voter Turnout
1980-2016 General Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
U.S. Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
U.S. Youth Eligible Voter Turnout
2004-2016 General Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
California 2016 Eligible Voter Turnout

- Total: 57.9% (57.5% in 2012)
- White NL: 67.1% (64.3% in 2012)
- Black: 48.4% (61.1% in 2012)
- Asian American: 52.8% (49.5% in 2012)
- Latino: 47.2% (48.5% in 2012)
Close Margin States
1) **Michigan**: 10,704 votes (0.5%)

2) New Hampshire: 2,736 votes (0.8%)

3) **Pennsylvania**: 44,292 votes (1.5%)

4) **Wisconsin**: 22,748 votes (1.6%)

5) **Florida**: 112,911 votes (2.3%)
6) Minnesota: 44,765 votes (3.3%)

7) Nevada: 27,202 votes (5.0)

8) Maine: 22,142 votes (6.2)

9) Arizona: 91,234 votes (7.3%)

10) North Carolina: 173,315 votes (7.3%)

California: 4,269,978 votes (48.8%)
Close Margin States Voter Turnout
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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Michigan Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections
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N. Hampshire Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
Pennsylvania Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
Wisconsin Voter Turnout by Race 2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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Minnesota Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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Florida Voter Turnout by Race
2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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Latino Representation: Florida 2000-2016 Presidential Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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What happened in Florida?

- Both parties did a terrible job at connecting with Latinos
- Dems - leaving it to Latino advocacy groups and local efforts to take the lead on outreach
- Clinton didn’t launch significant Spanish-language campaign in major Latino markets, including Florida, until Sept
- The targeted advertising that Obama used was not enlisted to the same degree
- Relying on Trump’s rhetoric as a rallying cry - didn’t address key Latino concerns like healthcare, education and the economy
- But the long-term work missing
- Clinton didn’t have Latino organizing teams in battleground states, including Florida, until May
Looking Ahead to the Midterm Elections
How should we set our expectations?

1. What turnout rates are possible in midterm elections?

2. What congressional seats are up for grabs?

3. How will Trump be a factor?

4. The message fight
U.S. 2014 Eligible Voter Turnout:

Total: 41.9%

- White NL: 45.8%
- Black: 39.7%
- Asian American: 27.1%
- Latino: 27.0%
U.S. Eligible Voter Turnout
1982-2014 General Midterm Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
U.S. Voter Turnout by Race
2002-2014 Midterm Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
California Voter Turnout by Race
2002-2014 Midterm Elections

Data Source: Current Population Survey
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What does the congressional map look like?
Midterm elections are historically bad for the president's party

- In 18 of the last 20 midterm elections, the president's party has lost seats - average seat loss is 33
- But fewer swing districts than a few decades ago
- Fewer "crossover" districts - member was from a different party than the presidential candidate who carried the seat
FiveThirtyEight:

1. "Even if Democrats were to win every single 2018 House and Senate race for seats representing places that Hillary Clinton won or that Trump won by less than 3 percentage points — a pretty good midterm by historical standards — they could still fall short of the House majority and lose five Senate seats."

2. House = the 2010 redistricting process

3. Senate = based on how great the 2006 and 2012 elections were for Democrats
2018: House Advantage

1. 194 Democratic seats and 240 Republican seats

2. Democratic need 24 seats to regain a House majority

3. If Dems don’t win seats in CA then they have to win Southern/rural Midwestern seats
Cook Political Report: House

Democrats: 194 Held Seats | Republicans: 240 Held Seats
2018: Senate Advantage

1. 25 Democratic seats and 9 Republican seats

2. = 52% of all the seats Democrats control are up in 2018 while just 15% of Republicans' seats are up

3. 10 of the 25 are in states Trump won in 2016

4. 5 of those 10 (ND, MO, MT, WV, IN) are Trump states

5. Only 1 (NV) is a Clinton state

6. AZ and NV seats are most vulnerable
Cook Political Report: Senate

Democrats: 25 Held Seats | Republicans: 9 Held Seats
2018: Historic Advantage

Cook Political Report: Senate

1. Indiana – Lean Dem to Toss Up
2. Missouri – Lean Dem to Toss Up
3. Nevada – Lean Dem to Toss Up
4. North Dakota – Lean Dem to Toss Up
5. West Virginia – Lean Dem to Toss Up
But the battle will be fought.... here in California
2018: CA’s Two Key Areas of Influence

1. Battle for Congressional Control

2. Political Contributions and Advocacy Capacity
California: Democratic Strategy

Of the 61 Republicans seats Democrats are hoping for nationwide, seven are in Californian:

1. **CA-10**: Jeff Denham (R-Turlock)
2. **CA-21**: David Valadao (R-Hanford)
3. **CA-25**: Steve Knight (R-Palmdale)
4. **CA-39**: Ed Royce (R-Fullerton)
5. **CA-45**: Mimi Walters (R-Irvine)
6. **CA-48**: Dana Rohrabacher (R-Costa Mesa)
7. **CA-49**: Darrell Issa (R-Vista)

- All Clinton districts
- Many out-performed Trump
California: Republican Strategy

The NRCC has identified four Democratic California seats as targets:

CA-7 Ami Bera (Sacramento)
CA-24 Salud Carbajal (Santa Barbara)
CA-36 Raul Ruiz (Palm Desert)
CA-52 Scott Peters (La Jolla)

All GOP difficult pickups – all in Clinton districts
Blue California?

Clinton – 62%
Trump - 32%
Beyond 2018
Demographic Change
"Autopsy' on 2012 Loss

Calls for Inclusion Not Policy Change

“message was weak; our ground game was insufficient; we weren't inclusive; we were behind in both data and digital; our primary and debate process needed improvement," Priebus said of Mitt Romney and the GOP's 2012 loss. "There's no one solution. There's a long list of them."

Extensive outreach to women, African-American, Asian, Hispanic and gay voters

Back ing "comprehensive immigration reform"

Softening language to become a more inclusive and tolerant party

"I think it's about being decent," Priebus said. "I think it's about dignity and respect that nobody deserves to have their dignity diminished or people don't deserve to be disrespected."

RNC’s "Growth and Opportunity Project”
Demography is still political destiny

- Even if turnout rates of voters of color don’t increase

- By 2040 - Latinos projected to be 28.6% of the total U.S. population, up from the current 17%

- In many states, - Latino pop will grow at even higher rate, including swing states such as NV, CO and FL

- But Latinos aren’t a monolith and their loyalty can’t be taken for granted by Dems (i.e. Florida)

- The GOP’s national brand is now linked to racialized discourse

- May impact CA’s shrinking Republican Party for another generation (similar to prop. 187’s impact)

- Pre-prop 187, a greater share of CA Latinos were registered Rep vs. now (although still more Dem than Rep)
U.S. Population, by Race and Ethnicity 2014

- White NL: 61.9%
- Black: 17.3%
- Latino: 12.7%
- Asian: 5.2%

Data Source: American Community Survey, 1 Year Estimates, 2014
Demographic Impact on the U.S. Vote
Declining White Share of the U.S. Vote

1980-2016:

- White NH: 90.1% - 73.3%
- Black: 9% - 12.4%
- Asian: 1.7% - 4.0% (since 1998)
- Latino: 2.6% to 9.2%
Declining White Share of the U.S. Vote

Figure 1.8

U.S. Share of the Vote
1980-2014 General Elections

Dramatic Growth of the California Latino Vote
What is the breakdown of CA’s population by race/ethnicity?
California Population, by Race and Ethnicity
2014

- White NL: 38.3%
- Latino: 38.6%
- Black: 5.8%
- Asian: 13.9%

Data Source: American Community Survey, 1 Year Estimates, 2014
California Population by Race and Ethnicity 1980

Data Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates, 2014
California Population, by Race and Ethnicity
2014

Figure 2.2

Data Source: American Community Survey, 1 Year Estimates, 2014
Demographic Impact on the CA Vote
Declining White Share of the U.S. Vote

1980-2016:

- White NL: 89.4% - 55.6%
- Black: 7.6% - 5.9%
- Asian: 6.1% - 13.9% (since 1998)
- Latino: 6.6% to 23.2%
Declining White Share of the CA Vote

Figure 2.7

California Share of the Vote
1980-2014 General Elections

*data for year 1984 not available
2018 Take-a-Way

• The 2018 map is not friendly to Dems
• Battle for congress will be a battle over narrative
• Demography is still political destiny - but groups can’t be taken for granted
• Engagement now must be translated to engagement at the ballot box
Thank you
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U.S. Projected Population Change
Figure 5.8

U.S. Projected Total Population
2015-2060

Percentage of Population

2015 2020 2030 2040 2050 2060

White NL 59.6% 55.5% 51.3% 47.3% 43.7%

Latino 17.7% 19.0% 21.6% 24.1% 26.5% 28.6%

Asian 13.2% 13.3% 13.6% 13.8% 14.1% 14.3%

Black 5.5% 5.9% 6.9% 7.8% 8.6% 9.4%

Other 2.80% 3.12% 3.83% 4.63% 5.54% 6.53%

2020-2060 Projected Total Population
California

Data Source:
California Department of Finance Population Projections
Figure 5.10

2012-2040 Projected Eligible Voter Population
California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White NL</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source:
California Department of Finance Population Projections
UC Davis California Civic Engagement Project - CCEP