

A Blunt Stakeholder Analysis on Initiative 1631 and How it Failed at the Ballot

A capstone submitted to the department of

Master of Arts in Policy Studies

University of Washington

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts

By Saiwa Conejo

The University of Washington Bothell

December 2019

Capstone Advisor:

Shauna Carlisle, Ph. D.
Tate Twinam

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Tate Twinam for the advice when beginning this paper. This paper would not have been possible without the guidance and advice of Dr. Shauna Carlisle. I would also like to thank everyone who gave their time to be interviewed and thank you to those who provided contacts for this research. This paper would not have been possible without everyone who gave me their time to be interviewed. From the bottom of my heart, all of the feedback has only challenged and taught me to be a better policy researcher.

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Chapter 1	4
Purpose of Study	4
Chapter 2	6
Literature Review	6
Previous Carbon Pricing Initiatives and initiative 1631 in Washington	7
A General Critique from the Opposing Group	8
The Loss of Initiative 1631	9
Op eds about how to move forward on climate change, if it’s not a carbon fee	10
Variables Studied	10
Steak Holder Characteristics	11
Chapter 3	15
Methodology	15
Design and Material	16
Data Collections Procedure	17
Ethical Considerations	18
Chapter 4	20
Results and Discussion	20
Results	20
Discussion	23
Chapter 5	28
Conclusion	28
Further Research and Recommendations	28
Appendices	30

Abstract

After researching and interviewing four stakeholders on initiative 1631, three main reasons continued to come up explaining why initiative 1631 failed: 1) funding from the opponents, 2) the initiative's approach to build support from minority communities by building multiple coalitions from the start, the approach it took with voters and its' approach on the policy draft and 3) the initiative's non-bipartisan approach. This study discusses the opponents' general critique and provides the proponent's answers. The research recommends a short-term and long-term approach on how to move forward with environmental initiatives to address climate change: education and environmental jobs.

Chapter 1

Purpose of Study

It is well known that the goal of initiative 1631 is to push for a carbon tax fee. This bill is necessary because the growth of carbon dioxide is a major issue. The rapid increase of carbon dioxide compared to previous years, shows a relationship between fossil fuel burning and carbon dioxide. During the ice age, carbon dioxide levels ranged from 200 ppm and 280 ppm.¹ Compared in 2013, where it hit as far as 400 ppm.² In response, certain states have been trying to pass carbon pricing bills. One of those states being Washington which has had a couple, such as initiative 732 in 2016 and initiative 1631 in 2018.³ Although science shows that climate change is happening at a rapid pace, carbon fees have not been winning at the ballot box.

It is well established that initiative 1631 did not pass as a bill in Washington in 2018. The purpose of this research is to examine the variables that contributed towards the failure of initiative 1631 from the perspectives of proponents and opponents. The push for a carbon tax and/or fee has continued to be put forth on the ballot. Initiative 1631 learned from previous initiatives such as the revenue neutral initiative 732. The policies in place for initiative 1631 created a non-revenue neutral initiative. It took a revenue allocation approach consisting of three funds, “(1) a fund for air quality and energy programs and projects, (2) a fund for water quality and forest health projects, and (3) a fund for investments related to communities.”⁴ Initiative 1631 had a coalition of different people of color organizations backing the

¹ D, Luthi. “Graphic: The Relentless Rise of Carbon Dioxide – Climate Change: Vital Signs of the Planet.” NASA. NASA, June 12, 2019. https://climate.nasa.gov/climate_resources/24/graphic-the-relentless-rise-of-carbon-dioxide/.

² D, Luthi. “Graphic: The Relentless Rise of Carbon Dioxide – Climate Change: Vital Signs of the Planet.” NASA. NASA, June 12, 2019. https://climate.nasa.gov/climate_resources/24/graphic-the-relentless-rise-of-carbon-dioxide/.

³ “2018 Carbon Tax Bill Matrix [Updated 2/2/2018].” Carbon Washington. Carbon Washington, February 14, 2018. <https://carbonwa.org/2018-carbon-tax-bill-matrix-updated-1212018/>.

⁴ “Washington Initiative 1631, Carbon Emissions Fee Measure (2018).” Ballotpedia. Ballotpedia. Accessed August 17, 2019. [https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_(2018)).

initiative, organizations and businesses. It looked like initiative 1631 was going to pass although it was critiqued for being too weak and unreliable to solve climate change and a monetary issue for the people.

The aim of this research is to examine four stakeholder perspectives of why initiative 1631 failed. Although there were a great amount of organizations supporting this initiative, we specifically wanted to examine the key factors from the perspective of the opponents and proponents that contributed to initiative 1631 failing. In theory initiative 1631 had a great coalition of organizations supporting it and although Washingtonians are known for being environmentally friendly for the most part, "...I-1631 failed to gain a majority in all but three counties in Washington even after a so-called "blue wave"". ⁵ It is possible that the initiative does not fully convince voters, even though it's an initiative that starts addressing carbon dioxide levels and ultimately environmental concerns. Therefore, the aim of this research is to investigate the following, question 1 allows us to understand the interviewee is part of an organization or company involved with initiative 1631. Therefore, we want to ask could you please explain your involvement with initiative 1631? With question 2, we want to understand the common narrative about numerous organizations supporting the initiative. This question directly asks the interviewee what variables they consider contributed to the failure of initiative 1631. Therefore, we want to ask, in theory initiative 1631 appealed to a larger group of people, in your perspective why do you think it lost? In an attempt to understand the organization's investment in the initiative, whether it was staff power, funding or other stakes it had in the initiative. We want to ask, what were the stakes of the organization in initiative 1631? To understand the future of carbon pricing in Washington and to see where people's opinions stand post initiative 1631, we want to ask; do you think a carbon pricing measure has another chance in Washington? And if so what advice would you give? If not, where do you see work being done to address climate change?

⁵ Kunkler, Aaron. "Why Do Washington Voters Struggle with Climate Change Policies?: Vashon-Maury Island Beachcomber." Vashon. Vashon-Maury Island Beachcomber, January 2, 2019. <http://www.vashonbeachcomber.com/news/why-do-washington-voters-struggle-with-climate-change-policies/>.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The aim of this research is to understand the variables that contributed to the failure of initiative 1631. In order to do that we first must understand Washington and its' relationship with environmental policy. Washington state is known as a progressive and environmentalist state. In most recent work in 2010, Jennifer L. Rice examines why and how climate is incorporated into local environmental policy. The author states, Seattle is specifically at the forefront of "...implementing climate regulations through formal government institutions..."⁶ In preliminary work carried out in 1997, Washington was used to test environmental philosophies. This study by Richard J. and Fred Thompson focused on four hypotheses about environmentalism and aims to explain environmental preferences. Surveys were sent to environmental leaders and members from the Sierra Club and Earth Island, and a smaller version of the environmental survey was sent to Salem and Yamhill county residents. The authors found a gap between general public and environmental activists cultural biases, "the public is far less egalitarian and far more supportive of both hierarchy and market individualism."⁷ This gap widened as one was closer to activism and leadership, where authors found, that members consistently expressed more dislike towards individualism and greater support for egalitarianism. While also expressing more distrust of hierarchical authority relations.⁸ In their analysis the authors ask, "What does the divergence in cultural bias between environmental activists and the general public mean for environmental policymaking?"⁹ Their findings of cultural dissensus suggest, that the hindrance of environmental actions are beyond institutional constraints, self-interest or lack of information. In fact, environmental actions are influenced by culture.

⁶ Rice, Jennifer L. "Climate, Carbon, and Territory: Greenhouse Gas Mitigation in Seattle, Washington." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 100, no. 4 (2010): 929-37. www.jstor.org/stable/40863612.

⁷ J. Ellis, Richard and Thompson, Fred "Culture and the Environment in the Pacific Northwest." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 4 (1997): 885-97. doi:10.2307/2952171.

⁸ J. Ellis, Richard and Thompson, Fred "Culture and the Environment in the Pacific Northwest." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 4 (1997): 885-97. doi:10.2307/2952171.

⁹ J. Ellis, Richard and Thompson, Fred "Culture and the Environment in the Pacific Northwest." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 4 (1997): 885-97. doi:10.2307/2952171.

Therefore, we can apply Rice's and Richard J. and Fred Thompson studies to understand Washington's culture on environmental policy and how it applies to initiative 1631's turn-out.

Previous Carbon Pricing Initiatives and initiative 1631 in Washington

This paper seeks to understand the variables that contributed to the failure of initiative 1631.

Many attempts have been made in order to pass a carbon pricing initiative with the purpose to reduce carbon emissions with the aim to slow down climate change. The article, "How does I-1631 Compare to Other Recent Carbon Pricing Proposals in Washington State?" provides two other important carbon policies Washington produced. It displays three carbon pricing proposals from 2018 side by side in a carbon matrix. It includes initiative 732, SB 6203 and initiative 1631. It discusses the pricing, the effect on certain coal companies, low-income households, worker transition and equity. It also discusses the oversight and accountability plan for each carbon pricing initiative. The authors conclude their study by ranking the initiatives by the amount of time they will last. Initiative 732 would work best for short-term (2018-2030), initiative 1631 would work in the medium term (2030-2040) and for a longer term (2040-2050+) it is not known for certain which initiative would be best. Although, according to the study, "I-732 reaches its own checkpoint around 2044, when its price hits the policy's ceiling of \$100. At that point, I-1631 should still be investing quite a bit of money through its clean energy program."¹⁰ The constant Carbon pricing proposals show that carbon is an important and pressing issue for progressive environmental solutions to climate change. Additionally, this article serves as a starting and important perspective to reflect on multiple carbon pricing policies and consider if carbon pricing is the future or to be entirely avoided.

¹⁰ "How Does I-1631 Compare to Other Recent Carbon Pricing Proposals in Washington State?" Carbon Washington. Carbon Washington, September 13, 2018. <https://carbonwa.org/1631-compare-recent-carbon-pricing-proposals-washington-state/>.

A General Critique from the Opposing Group

The article “Washington State to Vote on a Carbon Tax Again” by the Institute for Energy Research, provides a blunt critique on initiative 1631 information. In their critique of initiative 1631, the authors argue that initiative 1631 will not create a sufficient impact towards climate change. Instead of focusing on solving climate change, the initiative redistributes wealth.¹¹ What the author refers to is the exemptions made for certain companies like Boeing and those involved in aluminum production among others. Rather than big companies bearing the burden, smaller companies and everyday people will. Additionally, the author suggests people should not pay a tax to provide environmental projects that should be overseen and paid by a general budget that does not rely on a carbon fee. Overall, it critiques initiative 1631 as providing revenue to supportive organizations and exempting others while not addressing climate change with renewable energy.¹²

In response to this critique, the Union of Concerned Scientists, published an article answering some common concerns. It states, “Climate action should not be assumed as in conflict with economic growth.” Initiative 1631 acknowledges that in the shifting from fossil fuels to greener jobs, there will be job losses. Therefore, it has set-up support for the workforce transition which will come out of the fund for communities (5% of the Clean Up Pollution Fund).¹³ Additionally, initiative 1631 would invest in climate resilience such as preparing for sea level rise and impacted fisheries that can also affect the economy when hit hard. Another common concern is how it will affect the people versus big companies. The article addresses the critique that initiative 1631 will excuse the largest polluters, thus there will be a lack of accountability, and instead the burden will fall on small businesses and everyday people. In response to the critique, the Union of Concerned scientists says that initiative 1631 will cover large

¹¹ IER. “Washington State to Vote on a Carbon Tax Again.” IER. Institute for Energy Research, April 10, 2019. <https://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/uncategorized/washington-state-to-vote-on-a-carbon-tax-again/>.

¹² IER. “Washington State to Vote on a Carbon Tax Again.” IER. Institute for Energy Research, April 10, 2019. <https://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/uncategorized/washington-state-to-vote-on-a-carbon-tax-again/>.

¹³ Summary of Initiative 1631, Summary of Initiative 1631 §. Accessed November 13, 2019. <http://leg.wa.gov/House/Committees/OPRGeneral/Documents/2018/Initiative1631Summary.pdf>.

polluters, “...like oil refineries, industrial facilities, and utilities that have not yet transitioned to clean energy.”¹⁴ However, there are two exemptions, one, coal plants that are planned to be closed by 2025 due to a pre-existing settlement agreement, and certain Washington industries that are in competition with businesses who do not have a carbon fee like Washington will. The second exemption is for the workforce and the families, initiative 1631 would affect if the company were to move. While all of these pieces are moving, the initiative will have a committee made up of diverse specialties and representation to maintain oversight. This article is important because it gives two different perspectives. It answers questions and brings forth important skeptical questions about the initiative’s effectiveness.

The Loss of Initiative 1631

The piece by Ellie Anzilloti, summarized the defeated hope for initiative 1631. It is called “A groundbreaking carbon tax lost at the ballot - again”. Initiative 1631 did not lean toward a bipartisan appeal like initiative 732. Although it took a different approach on carbon fees, a carbon fee failed for the third time. According to the article, the tax was to raise \$1 billion annually for renewable energy. Initiative 1631 would tax \$15 per metric ton of carbon emissions and rise with \$2 per ton plus inflation starting in 2020.¹⁵ The opponents such as fossil fuel companies put their resources towards impeding such bills. Companies such as Chevron and BP donated \$31 million to the opposition. Some opposition points were that the initiative would exempt a coal fired plant and other big polluters. Additionally, according to this article, moving forward with renewable energy and cutting carbon emission from large companies such as amazon, will not happen fast enough. However, the author concludes that other states are committed to placing a price of Carbon and although Washington did not become the first to enact this carbon pricing initiative, it is significant because it inspired other states to place a price on carbon. It is important for this research paper that while we look at the variables for why this initiative failed, we also

¹⁴ McNamara, Julie. “Getting the Facts Right on Washingtons I-1631.” Union of Concerned Scientists, November 1, 2018. <https://blog.ucsusa.org/julie-mcnamara/facts-on-1631>.

¹⁵ “Biggest Investment Ever in Environmental and Democracy Ballot Initiatives.” *Biggest Investment Ever in Environmental and Democracy Ballot Initiatives*, October 26, 2018.

look at where it could possibly move forward. To do so, we must research the re-occurring carbon pricing losses at the ballot which this article highlights.

Op eds about how to move forward on climate change, if it's not a carbon fee

The article “Jobs and Climate Change: America’s (Rust) Belt and Road Initiative” talks about addressing climate change through states that need economic help, such as Ohio and Minnesota. By moving such states away from carbon mining jobs and creating green jobs such as building low carbon technologies. This transition is called America’s Rust Belt and Road Initiative. It encourages investment in impoverished communities, by calling for government, private and communities to work together. Interestingly, it states that a path for climate action will not come from environmentalist cities such as Seattle and San Francisco, but rather from “Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan.”¹⁶ It has now been suggested that the variables this study looks at to understand how they contributed to initiative 1631 failing, may not be the main issue, but rather the location where climate action policy was carried out.

Variables Studied

It is important for us to consider that different characteristics of the stake holders involved in initiative 1631. The four characteristics; resources, influence, power and interest are what give us a deeper understanding to which variables can affect the outcome of initiative 1631. Several studies for example have been carried out on the resources such as funds and what tools organizations use to build support. Alike, several reports and studies have shown the influence of organizations and oil companies hold, such as relationship building with clients, business partners and voters. Power is drawn from the socialization of the first two characteristics while interest is mostly drawn from mission statements or endorsement for initiative 1631. Alas these variables were all studied because they contributed to the aforementioned

¹⁶ Dolsak, Nives and Aseem Prakash. “Jobs And Climate Change: America's (Rust) Belt And Road Initiative.” Forbes. Forbes Magazine, July 15, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/07/14/jobs-and-climate-change-americas-rust-belt-and-road-initiative/4/#1fb199221db5>.

characteristics and the following articles, studies and reports exhibit their impact towards a carbon policy such as initiative 1631.

Steak Holder Characteristics

Resources

The “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989–2005” states that environmental organizations have been critiqued for doing too little and acting entitled. The study tries to gain a clearer view of the conservation and environmental sector by researching organizations’ revenue, political activity, member support and more. The report found The Nature Conservancy as one of the wealthiest among conservation and environmental organizations, “with 11 percent of the sector’s total revenue and 20 percent of its assets”¹⁷. The data used in this report was obtained from “...the IRS from 1989 to 2005...”¹⁸. The authors conclude that the environmental movement itself has grown since 1960 through members, total revenue and the amount of organizations. They also found that majority of environmental and conservation groups focus on land, water and wildlife conservation and instead of advocacy as perceived. Young organizations grew faster and had a different approach and mix of funding than general non-profits with foundation and government grants being significant to their funding. However, in 2000 foundation funding decreased. The wealthiest organizations were centered in Washington D.C. although “...the total revenue pie was decreasing.”¹⁹ While the largest organizations were stable in revenue and member numbers, the youngest organizations grew the quickest.

¹⁷ Straughan, Baird, and Tom Pollak. “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005.” *The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005*, 2008, 1–43.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32186/411797-The-Broader-Movement-Nonprofit-Environmental-and-Conservation-Organizations---.PDF>.

¹⁸ Straughan, Baird, and Tom Pollak. “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005.” *The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005*, 2008, 1–43.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32186/411797-The-Broader-Movement-Nonprofit-Environmental-and-Conservation-Organizations---.PDF>.

¹⁹ Straughan, Baird, and Tom Pollak. “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005.” *The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005*, 2008, 1–43.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32186/411797-The-Broader-Movement-Nonprofit-Environmental-and-Conservation-Organizations---.PDF>.

Like oil companies such as BP America, non-profits have been using their monetary resources for legal advice, lobbying and advocacy to generate support. The study is important because it shows how non-profit organizations use their resources and provide a picture of how vast their resources are.

Influence

The study “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989–2005”, also highlights The Nature Conservancy’s influence. According to the study, it is one of the wealthiest organizations in the conservation and environmental sector. Additionally, Washington State is home to The Nature Conservancy and the organization had about 972,000 members in 2002 – 2003.²⁰ Based on their website last updated in 2019, they have over a million members.²¹ According to Carbon Washington’s brief, “Moving Washington State Toward Zero Carbon Emissions”, Carbon Washington influence focuses on working closely with government officials and being an active participant in the state government. Much of the tasks they carry out are focused on building “political will statewide and help constituents express their support for climate issues to their legislators”²². While this is true, Carbon Washington was not the biggest stakeholders in initiative 1631. Although the brief is part of a growing body of literature about comparing and analyzing carbon pricing initiative policy details that provided policy context towards this research paper and to its’ members who are influenced by Carbon Washington. Alike, the Nature Conservancy also carries influence due to its age and number of members accumulated and retained since 1951.²³

²⁰ Straughan, Baird, and Tom Pollak. “The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005.” *The Broader Movement: Nonprofit Environmental and Conservation Organizations, 1989-2005*, 2008, 1–43.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32186/411797-The-Broader-Movement-Nonprofit-Environmental-and-Conservation-Organizations---.PDF>.

²¹ “Explore TNC's MIssion, Vision and Values.” The Nature Conservancy. Accessed November 6, 2019.
<https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/who-we-are/our-mission-vision-and-values/>.

²² “Moving Washington State Toward Zero Carbon Emissions.” *Carbon Washington*, 1–8. Accessed November 9, 2019. <https://carbonwa.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Carbon-Washington-Brief.pdf>.

²³ “Explore TNC's MIssion, Vision and Values.” The Nature Conservancy. Accessed November 6, 2019.
<https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/who-we-are/our-mission-vision-and-values/>.

On the other hand, there are stakeholders such as BP America whose influence also comes from how long it's been around and the quality of service to its members. However, their members are partnerships and investments instead of the public like for non-profit organizations. According to "BP Statistical Review of World Energy", it has reserves worldwide, a few in almost each continent.²⁴ It is also a member of the Western States Petroleum Associates and has a strong relationship with the American Petroleum Institute among other relationships.²⁵ Therefore, although the amount of studies on oil company influence seems to be thin, the limited literature shows that oil companies such as BP carry influence on the political economy like in initiative 1631.

Power

In order to understand the variables that contribute to the loss of initiative 1631, we take a look at power. In this research power is in the form of resources and influence characteristics combined. The article, "Nonprofit Environmental Organizations and the Restructuring of Institutions for Ecosystem Management" examines environmental non-profit roles and their institutional implications. Although it recognizes the powerful role non-profit organizations carry, the author concludes that non-profits also raise important concerns about accountability and institutional design.²⁶ The author states, "As nonprofit organizations gain increasing influence in the management and allocation of natural resources, taking on functions that are both more governmental and more entrepreneurial, questions of accountability and

²⁴ "BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2019." *BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2019*. BP, 2019.
<https://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/business-sites/en/global/corporate/pdfs/energy-economics/statistical-review/bp-stats-review-2019-full-report.pdf>.

²⁵ "The Climate Accountability Scorecard: BP." *The Climate Accountability Scorecard: BP*. Union of Concerned Scientists, October 2016.
https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2017/05/BP_scorecard_Revised.pdf.

²⁶ Breckenridge, Lee P. "Nonprofit Environmental Organizations and the Restructuring of Institutions for Ecosystem Management." *Ecology Law Quarterly*, 1999, 692–706.
<https://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1592&context=elq>.

fairness are bound to arise.”²⁷ This study shows, that while environmental non-profit organizations’ influence and resources are growing, in combination they are becoming a sort of power house. Like so, companies have also become power houses. In order to get a sense of how initiative 1631 we need to look at the intersection of influence and resources so that we can observe whether a stakeholder’s power has any prediction about initiative 1631’s outcome. As observed in previous literature, the amount of power environmental non-profit organizations has great implications.

Interest

To understand the stakeholder’s relationship to initiative 1631 and better understand the stakeholders, we dove into its’ interest. This characteristic was based on mission statements, letters of endorsement and other literature that highlighted the organization’s or companies reason for why they were interested in working on initiative 1631. According to author Smith, Larry W. in “Stakeholder analysis: a pivotal practice of successful projects”, “Understanding the attributes, interrelationships, interfaces among and between project advocates and opponents, assists us in strategically planning our project.”²⁸ Therefore, learning the interest of a stake holder is vital to a stake holder analysis.

²⁷ Breckenridge, Lee P. “Nonprofit Environmental Organizations and the Restructuring of Institutions for Ecosystem Management.” *Ecology Law Quarterly*, 1999, 692–706.

<https://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1592&context=elq>.

²⁸ Smith, L. W. (2000). Stakeholder analysis: a pivotal practice of successful projects. Paper presented at Project Management Institute Annual Seminars & Symposium, Houston, TX. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.

Chapter 3

Methodology

To conduct this study a group of stakeholders that met the above criteria were approached for participation in this study. Throughout this paper we use the term “stakes” as either power, influence, resources and interest. Resources are money and any other tools the stakeholders have access to use on initiative 1631. Influence is their following, such as how many members they have, the relationships they have acquired and how long they have been around. Power is the combination of resources and influence. Interest is based on their mission and why they support initiative 1631. The initial target audience was five proponents and five opponents for initiative 1631. But only 4 replied, 3 proponents of the initiative and 1 opponent.

The first step of analyses investigated were resources such as the amount of money each stakeholder donated to initiative 1631. From there, the top ten stake holders were chosen due to the amount of influence preliminary research highlighted. The largest donors from each side of the initiative and op-eds and articles that quoted staff from those organizations and companies were found. This would allow for a more targeted reach out with the participant instead of contacting the general organization/company email. The stakeholder’s website was also searched to find possible contacts. Although ten stakeholders were supposed to be contacted for interviews, twelve were contacted due to referrals. The proponents were Clean Air Energy Washington, Fuse Voters, The Nature Conservancy, League of Conservation Voters, Bill Gates, Carbon Washington and Yes on 1631. The opponents were, Western States Petroleum Associates, the Association of Washington Business, BP America, Phillips 66 and Andeavor. Out of the twelve stakeholders contacted, four were interviewed. The customization of the number of interviews carried out was done due to time constraints since getting a hold of some stake holders took longer than expected.

The Nature Conservancy was the largest donor by \$3.4 million. Followed by League of Conservation Voters, Bill Gates and Michael Bloomberg as the top four donors. The total amount raised was \$16,398,381.52 in support of the initiative. Western States Petroleum Association and the

Association of Washington Business led the opposition on initiative 1631 with a fund of \$31,591,364.54. The largest donor was BP America with \$13.5 billion.²⁹ Out of the four stakeholders interviewed, The Nature Conservancy and BP America were the largest stakeholders for initiative 1631 due to their resources and their influence. The Nature Conservancy was founded in 1951 and BP was found in 1901.

Design and Material

To determine which stakeholder was going to be interviewed, there were a set of variables researched before contacting the organizations and companies. These variables were different types of stakes the organization and company had in the initiative, such as monetary funds towards the campaign, influence in terms of connections and following, power and interest. The top 5 donors on both the proponents side and opponents side were selected to contact. However, some organizations, companies and people were taking too long. An alternative solution was to decrease our sample size to 3 stakeholders from each side of the initiative. For each one I did not dive into the organization's individual projects, rather their work on initiative 1631. The initial plan was to either have these interviews in person or through video chat. Video chat worked best and one phone interview due to technical difficulties. The snowball method was used in the research. It was originally planned to be used at the end of each research but sometimes came up at the beginning.

As for the interview, it was made up of four questions as previously mentioned. During the interview a smart phone was used to record interviews, another smart phone or laptop was used to video chat or phone an interview and a writing utensil and paper for extra notes and thoughts that appeared during the interview. For consistency, the questions were on a laptop and read verbatim at every interview. In terms of how the questions were asked and how to respond or comment on unforeseen interesting facts that came up the interview took a casual process to acknowledge confounding variables.

²⁹ "Washington Initiative 1631, Carbon Emissions Fee Measure (2018)." Ballotpedia. Ballotpedia. Accessed August 17, 2019. [https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_(2018)).

Additionally, long answers were in some form confounding variables because some interviewees at times would go on in a tangent. But if they were too far away from the goal of the interview, one would nod or say “uhuh” and move on to the other question to focus the interview. For the first two surveys, the wording was slightly different for some questions, but the same questions were being asked to each interviewee. The four same questions were asked to each interviewee, with the exception of the first two interviews due to adding the third question mid research.

Data Collections Procedure

In order to understand the variables that were involved in the failure of initiative 1631, an interview from each stakeholder was conducted. In an attempt to ask purposeful questions during the interview, secondary literature was used which sparked the questions. Much of the analysis will be drawn from pairing op-eds, research papers and interviews. The sources range from op-eds for Forbes by professors, research papers from organizations and more. All preliminary research and interviews were done by one researcher. From preliminary research, the top five stakeholders were contacted through email or through a website contact page, in order to interview them and understand the variables that were involved in the failure of initiative 1631. However, only four stakeholders agreed to be interviewed. If they were interested in participating I would send them the consent form to sign, but also let them know the consent form will be gone over before starting the interview. A time and place were chosen and on the interview day the tools used were an iPhone to record the interview, the consent form either on the computer or a physical one, a writing utensil, paper and if the interview was a video call interview, another iPhone or laptop was used for the call. For security, the interviews were saved in my iPhone with a passcode I only had access to.

The first interview was from the Yes on 1631 campaign. To control for interview methodology, we faceted from our homes because meeting in person was not possible due to conflicting schedules. Meeting at home also allowed for a quiet place that made it easy to record. At the beginning of each

interview, the consent form was gone over, additionally it was sent via email before each interview. Then the consent form was signed if not signed before the interview begun. The interview lasted 11 minutes and 39 seconds including the consent form and was saved on an iPhone that recorded the interview. The second organization was Carbon Washington. The interview lasted 17 minutes and 34 seconds including the consent form. The same tools were used for this interview except due to technical difficulties, we could only do a phone call instead of a video call. The interview was conducted from my home and it was not disclosed from where the interview was interviewing at. The third interview was with the Nature Conservancy. The interview lasted 10 minutes and 32 seconds. Regardless an in-person interview was proceeded with. The same tools were used, a writing utensil for notes, paper, laptop with the interview questions, an iPhone to voice record the interview and the consent form was signed there. The fourth interview was with BP America. This was a video chat interview and a writing utensil, paper, iPhone and laptop were used to carry the interview. This interview lasted, minutes and seconds.

Ethical Considerations

IRB approval was sought for this research because it consists of interviews and collecting permission for interviews. One of the ethical issues I faced in this study the possibility of only having proponent interviews because an assumption was made that larger companies that were mainly the opponents, were not going to be available for interviews. Therefore, the research was being considered of just including the proponents and further research could be about the opponents. However, this would make the research bias when the research is fundamentally about the variables that partake in its failure. In order to answer the research question, the opponent's opinion had to be shared as well. It would add a totally different perspective from the winner's side. Another ethical issue was whether or not to keep the interviewees anonymous. Just in case an interviewee would have liked to keep anonymous it was decided that all interviews were going to be anonymous. However, it was not foreseen that some would not mind to not be anonymous. For this, it was expressed how they would remain anonymous but not the organization so that all the interviews were consistent with the initial research procedure. Another ethical

issue along those lines was that the interviewer came from a small organization, so it could potentially be easy to figure out who did the interview. However, this only came up once and the interviewee was fine with not being kept anonymous. Regardless, normal procedures continued to keep all interviewees anonymous.

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

Results

To understand which variables contributed to the failure of initiative 1631, we analyzed the variables for each characteristic of the stakeholder through interviews. Literature on resources, influence, power and interest were the characteristics that allowed to choose which stakeholder to interview. While preliminary research allows us to focus on choosing stakeholders. Information on how variables were used, how they were perceived in relation to initiative 1631 and what kind of implications they propose was highlighted through interviews.

The interviews revealed that the amount of money the oil industry was pouring into the campaign against initiative 1631 was a variable for the initiative's failure. Initiative 1631's campaign approach was also brought up as a possible variable. When interviewee from the Yes on 1631 campaign was asked about why they thought 1631 lost, although in theory it seemed to appeal to a larger group of people, they answered, "I think the real problem was the oil industry spending big bill, spending about 15million dollars to defeat this initiative because they knew that it would ultimately, lead to their demise in a state like Washington and lead to them losing a lot of power". When the interviewee from Carbon Washington was asked this question, they mentioned that it was due to multiple variables. But the approach of Initiative 1631 could also be a significant variable towards the failure of initiative 1631. They mentioned that initiative 1631 involved a lot of communities of color drafting the initiative but if you compare it to 732 who did not have the same narrative about appealing to a larger audience, 732 had support in minority areas regardless. They mention, "it was never clear that that [communities of color drafting the initiative] was going to lead to an increase vote share over 732, because 732 had a good vote share as well". The article, "How does I-1631 Compare to Other Recent Carbon Pricing Proposals in Washington State?" includes side by side comparisons of initiative 732, SB 6203 and initiative 1631. When conducting research for initiative 1631, initiative 732 came up often. It was found that one of initiative 1631's strategies was to include more organizations in the formation of the bill to build more coalitions,

especially with people of color organizations. The initiative involved nonprofit organizations and acquiring stakeholders to endorse the initiative such as certain utilities.³⁰ It was also found that initiative 1631 did not appeal to moderate or conservative voters, “The kind of big progressive things Washington did, managed to appeal to some moderate voters in the suburbs and 1631 didn’t do that...at least in the drafting process. There’s a lot of focus on communities of color non-profits and labor union engagement. And then they focused really hard on getting utilities to endorse it...it under represented moderate voters or suburban voters or rural voters, and that kind of shows up in the voting tally.” Interviewee from The Nature Conservancy also acknowledges multiple variables that contributed to its’ failure. Similar to the interviewee from YES on 1631, the amount of money the oil companies poured into their campaign was also considered as a variable towards the failure of initiative 1631. But also, the idea of more taxes, “I think another reason that it failed, is that, it was a, it was essentially around asking the voters to pay more. And, that’s a really, really tough thing to do. Especially in Washington State where we tend to be fairly tax averse”. The interviewee also mentioned the reluctance of the organizations during the campaign. Interviewee from BP America 1631 stated, initiative 1631 did not have local pre-emption which was a concern to BP America that initiative 1631 was not going to be inclusive. “...we felt that 1631 just didn't meet the principles that really meet good carbon policy...it was a carbon tax that was basically focused on just the refineries and just our customers. And we think good carbon policy includes everybody, manufacturers, customers, users, carbon is carbon. The other thing that was missing was local pre-emption... ”.

When asked, what were the stakes of the organization in the initiative, the interviewee from The Nature Conservancy mentioned their influence. “We’re a global organization and we’re in all 50 states, and so we saw this as an opportunity, to really be able to lead. And if we can get something passed in Washington and we have carbon pricing already in California, and the conversation is definitely

³⁰ “Washington Initiative 1631, Carbon Emissions Fee Measure (2018).” Ballotpedia. Ballotpedia. Accessed August 17, 2019. [https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_(2018)).

happening in Oregon. We're kind of hoping for a critical mass so it can really be, show leadership for the rest of the country." Records show that BP America gave a total of \$13,148,516.20 including in kind contributions.³¹ Additionally, the interviewee for BP America mentioned the company sent in a co-director to help out with the campaign and represent the campaign. Despite including this question after interviewing Yes on 1631 and Carbon Washington, it was found that both organizations contributed influence and resources such as endorsement, advocacy support and more.³²

To understand the next steps after initiative 1631's failure, interviewees were asked do you think a carbon pricing measure has another chance in Washington? And if so what advice would you give? If not, where do you see work being done to address climate change? Interviewee from Yes on 1631 did not think there is an opportunity for a carbon tax in the near future due to the past two carbon fee turnouts and the legislature, "...the larger concept of carbon pricing has been tried two times, at the ballot box here in Washington and has lost, so that might not be the right manuscript." As for the legislature, the interview points out the importance of racial justice and equity and says it might not be possible for these challenges to be addressed in a future carbon tax, "...carbon pricing is complicated and it is important that it is rooted in equity and justice and racial justice, and so because of that...we have a pretty strong legislature but still, the dynamics of the state legislature would not allow for something like 1631...". As for where they see work being addressed, the interviewee mentioned a campaign for a clean fuel standard and the need to implement the HEAL act on the state level. The advice given was, "...do it anyway even if it's the hard way you might lose, if it's rooted in equity good things will come of it." When asked this question, Interviewee from Carbon Washington mentioned that we will not be able to reach carbon target without a price on carbon. For future carbon taxes, they suggested to approach voters differently, "...we need to make more progress in rural and suburban communities...we need to first invest in trying to learn

³¹ "Washington Initiative 1631, Carbon Emissions Fee Measure (2018)." Ballotpedia. Ballotpedia. Accessed August 17, 2019. [https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Washington_Initiative_1631,_Carbon_Emissions_Fee_Measure_(2018)).

³² "2018 Carbon Tax Bill Matrix [Updated 2/2/2018]." Carbon Washington. Carbon Washington, February 14, 2018. <https://carbonwa.org/2018-carbon-tax-bill-matrix-updated-1212018/>.

and engage those people in the climate change discussion such that they can get excited about...”. Like Yes on 1631 interviewee, interviewee from The Nature Conservancy also does not see a carbon tax initiative in the near future. Instead, an effort similar to a carbon tax would be easier through the legislature, “A lot of the coalition members and stakeholders that were very closely engaged in 1631 are now pivoting to work towards the legislature to get that done.” Interviewee from BP America stated, “...to us as a company, it’s not a matter of if there’s going to be a carbon price, it’s a matter of when, it’s a matter of what it’s going to be. We think there should be a price on carbon, we think there will be a price on carbon. It’s not a matter of if it’s going to happen, it’s a matter of when and it’s a matter of what it’s going to be.” Afterwards, interviewee from BP America mentioned a cap and trade policy, senate bill 5981.

Discussion

Findings suggest climate change is complicated and multiple variables contributed to the failure of 1631. The approach initiative 1631 took drafting and during the campaign along with large monetary investment from the opponents could have contributed towards initiative 1631 loss. The research shows three variables of the approach which falls under influence and power. The first is the opponent’s approach to advocating for initiative 1631. The second including people of color in the initiative in order to form a greater coalition and support and address climate justice. The third is the non-bipartisan approach the initiative took on.

According to The Nature Conservancy, this campaign was one of the most expensive campaign in Washington’s history. Opponents were primarily made up of large oil companies and invested double the amount the proponents spent. Furthermore, after talking to interviewees from Yes on 1631 and the Nature Conservancy both thought initiative 1631 did not pass due to the large monetary investment from the opposition. After looking at literature and records that show how much each stakeholder invested, the results point to the likelihood that money contributed greatly to the resources of the campaign. In this research it was found that non-profits work to gather funds in order to go against large corporations is by canvassing, advocacy, marketing and overall a lot of face to face interaction and networking with

different organizations. Their influence and power count on the resources they produce and gather such as monetary funds. Likewise, their resources count on their influence and power, such as members and their history of work that allow members and organizations to gravitate towards the organization. Therefore, it is very important that an organization and a company build their reputation. As for non-profits, it is very important to invest in advocacy such as canvassers because those are who gather membership support.

Interestingly, the opponents were smart in the way they marketed no on initiative 1631, instead of focusing on climate change not being real, they focused on the effectiveness of initiative 1631 on climate change and how it was not an inclusive policy for all industries. This type of approach was actually smart given the results from a Yale study. According to the “Who is changing their mind about global warming and why?” study, 84% of people said they have become more concerned with climate change (Figure 7).³³ Out of the people who are less concerned about climate change 1% are taking it less seriously, 3% thought it was a hoax and 11% think it’s natural.³⁴ Therefore, most people in the U.S. are not climate change deniers but are in the middle as disengaged. Therefore, the effective way to win votes over, is to invest in doubt. The conversation has shifted to doubt initiative 1631’s effectiveness and how it will affect voters. Furthermore, the change in discussion may be a common approach to other environmental policies. It seems likely opponent stakeholders know that they cannot win if the old conversation of climate change denial is used in the Washington. In order to combat this, environmental stake holders could focus on education and advocacy.

Another reason why initiative 1631 had difficulties winning was in its approach of minority communities. As expected, organizing and building coalitions with more minority communities was a

³³ Deeg, Kathryn S, Erik Lyon, Anthony Leiserowitz, Edward Maibach, John Kotcher, and Jennifer Marlon. “Who Is Changing Their Mind about Global Warming and Why?” Yale Program on Climate Change Communication. Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, January 9, 2019. <https://climatecommunication.yale.edu/publications/who-is-changing-their-mind-about-global-warming-and-why/>.

³⁴ Deeg, Kathryn S, Erik Lyon, Anthony Leiserowitz, Edward Maibach, John Kotcher, and Jennifer Marlon. “Who Is Changing Their Mind about Global Warming and Why?” Yale Program on Climate Change Communication. Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, January 9, 2019. <https://climatecommunication.yale.edu/publications/who-is-changing-their-mind-about-global-warming-and-why/>.

signature move of this initiative. After much research and thought, an environmental justice approach is necessary if long lasting change towards addressing climate change can happen. However, for this initiative, whether it is through involving numerous organizations from the start or approaching voters on the ground, it was not clear that initiative 1631 was going to end as strong as it started. Interestingly initiative 1631 did not end as strong as it started according to interviewee from The Nature Conservancy. The approach initiative 1631 had towards building support and coalitions with minority groups could have had a great impact on votes but when needed to campaign there was not as much support. Regardless, the need of having minorities involved in the process of initiative 1631 is important because in order to address climate issues, we need to take an interdisciplinary approach of climate justice. That means involving people of color and addressing their concerns. Furthermore, it goes down to the core that environmentalism is primarily white led. A white person cannot relate to a black person and a Latinx person can't relate to a black person. Therefore, the involvement of communities of color when drafting the initiative was viewed as a strong variable of initiative 1631. However, according to interviewee from Carbon Washington, initiative 1631's bipartisan approach may have left certain groups of people out of focus, such as rural and suburban voters.

One of the reasons initiative 1631 did not pass could have been due to the non-bipartisan appeal it took. In the "Who is changing their mind about global warming and why?" research, more Americans are concerned with climate change. Initiative 1631's poll numbers show an increase of votes in general, yet it did not surpass the votes for the opposition. Interviewee from Carbon Washington based on a Yale research said, "...actual climate change deniers are a pretty small group, but there are bigger groups of people that they described as the disengaged group, like those people who maybe heard about it but they don't think about it..." Part of the answer to why initiative 1631's non-bipartisan approach may not have been the best, can potentially be found in the numbers of people who are actually disengaged in climate change discussion rather than climate change deniers. With results from the Yale study, for why people are more and less concerned about climate change, a very small amount of people in the U.S., like person

2 and the Yale research mentioned, do not believe in climate change. Then out of the 84% that have become more concerned with climate change, it is because they experienced it (21%), are taking it more seriously (20%) or are more informed (20%). Given these data results, we see that people are becoming more concerned when they learn more about it, aside from experiencing it. Not learning about climate change could feed into why of those less concerned about climate change think it is natural. Therefore, 1731's non-bipartisan appeal could be considered ineffective by not engaging in conversation with voters who were conservative or moderate but disengaged. But the approach can be considered effective or the best use of time by advocating in suburban and rural areas ahead of campaigns. When environmental campaigns occur then the voter will be able to make an educated vote that they believe will bring the best outcome.

Furthermore, the American people don't act on their environmental values due to culture. So, what does that mean for carbon policies in the future? Although only one interviewee mentioned Washington being tax averse, it could be that it is not about a sole carbon pricing policy, but rather how people's environmentalism does not align with creating changes when needed. If what Kempton et al. in *Environmental Values in American Culture* suggests is true, then it is fair to ask, how do we take environmental action when (1) based on, Richard J. Ellis and Fred Thompson study "Americans do not behave more like environmental activists because culturally they are quite unlike them". And (2) Kempton et al. explains that "barriers to action" prevent Americans who share the same environmental values with environmentalists from behaving like environmentalists.³⁵ Such barriers to action is how people conceptualize climate change. Therefore, how do we address growing carbon dioxide levels and furthermore solve a climate crisis? We can also apply this to the local pre-emption that was missing in

³⁵ Kempton, Willett, James S. Boster, and Jennifer A. Hartley. *Environmental Values in American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

initiative 1631. Initiative 1631 did not have a local pre-emption; thus, the state would not have been able to control the cost of carbon pricing according to the BP America interviewee. Having a local pre-emption allows the state to control cost that affects consumers instead of having other governments in the state doing their own thing. Therefore, if humans are culturally not like environmentalists, in order to insure oneself, shouldn't there be a pre-emption? Furthermore, the focus of this research began trying to understand the variables that contributed to the loss of initiative 1631, but was found that the big question is when do we draw the line between acting authoritarian or as a democracy when addressing environmental policy on our way to solve climate change given that we have not voted for neither carbon policy that has been put on the ballot?

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This paper investigated which variables contributed towards the failure of initiative 1631 and they appeared through research in the characteristics of resources, influence, power and interest. The research led to an overall finding that climate change is complicated and there are multiple variables that contribute to the failure of initiative 1631. With that being said, of the four characteristics that were looked into, influence and power were mentioned the most. The variables within those characteristics were the approach initiative 1631 took, such as how the policy was written and how the voters were reached out to. The second most common characteristic was resources; the amount of money the oil industry put into the initiative. A consequence of this research is that non-profits should consider their approaches before a campaign, specifically in education and advocacy towards rural and suburban communities. Additionally, non-profits should keep listening and involving communities of color in order for climate policy to be sustainable. For policy makers it is important to keep researching into the details of previous policies in order to create a sustainable and prosperous policy. The drafting of a policy and the ground work, because both go hand in hand. Furthermore, we can consider a carbon pricing to be economy wide and whether that will make it more sustainable. Given that our findings are based on a limited number of stakeholders, the results from such analyses should consequently be treated with considerable caution. Additionally, our current study may be limited due to adding the stakes question toward the end of the research where it was not asked to Yes on Initiative 1631 and Carbon Washington. However, with the help of articles some of those details have been added. Despite the number of stakeholders attained is less than initially proposed, there is value in the following interviews.

Further Research and Recommendations

Given this research being small, more interviews are needed for further research, where more people involved with the initiative are interviewed from the opponents and proponents side. In terms of the initiative's bipartisan appeal, it should take the bipartisan appeal approach if the future initiatives have the time and resources. Then it would be a more focused movement forward. Thus, early on education is

needed. People who are disengaged, not educated about climate change are the biggest numbers, not the climate change deniers. Therefore, it is worth investing time and money towards education and advocacy about climate change. People should feel engaged and like they have a voice on matters that affect us and our surroundings. Based on interviews, laying a foundation of education and awareness of climate change will be necessary for long and lasting effects.

Additionally, cultural constraints on education limits us to educate others about the environment unless they seek it. Thus, climate change will have to be addressed in other ways that do not stray from cultural constraints. Like the article, “Jobs and Climate Change: America’s (Rust) Belt and Road Initiative” mentioned, change may not come from the cities such as Seattle. But rather from the mid-west where jobs are needed and in the form of green jobs that will also tackle climate change. Therefore, killing two birds with one stone. Education was mentioned for long lasting change previously, but for further immediate steps, providing green jobs can be the first step followed by educating and engaging people in climate change discussion in order to tackle climate change. Learning about climate change is almost considered as an extracurricular unless you are majoring in the subject. In a capitalist culture, it is not accessible to everyone, especially to minority communities. Therefore, after looking at all these initiatives, it’s a process that needs action rather than further development whether it is environmental education or environmental jobs.

Appendices

Table 1. Stakeholder Resources, Influence, Power and Interest					
Stakeholders	Resources		Influence	Power	Interest
	Cash contributions	In-kind donations			
Clean Air Energy WA	\$15,316,688.31	\$1,079,088.21	Advocacy	53 orgs	Fighting climate change for the health of WA residents and other reasons based on the organization
Fuse Voters	\$2,605	0	Grass Roots, advocacy at federal level, focus state and local level, founded 2007	Driven by donations, \$2,605, founded 2007	One of its' focuses is state policy reform that reduces carbon emissions. Works with the Alliance for Jobs and Clean Energy to build grassroots support. Thus, the initiative 1631 involvement.
Nature Conservancy	\$3,250,000	\$325,771.27	"most effective and efficient environmental organizations in the world", nonpartisan approach, 9 locations, 36 companies in collaboration	9 locations, 36 companies in collaboration, biggest donor	Focuses on tackling climate change by conserving land and waters, in hopes for a prosperous and sustainable future. Thus, considered initiative 1631 to be the best "state-level opportunity" the state had that election year for carbon emissions reduction

League of Conservation Voters	\$1,400,000	0	Advocacy, founded 1969, 30 state organizations, one federal organization	30 state organizations, one federal organization and \$1,400,000	Advocates for environmental laws and policies thus is one of the top donors of initiative 1631
Bill Gates	\$100,000	0	Globally known, 1995-2017 richest person in the world according to Forbes, philanthropy, humanitarian speaker	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Terra Power, Microsoft	Was skeptical at first but very concerned about Climate change. Three reasons for which Bill Gates supports initiative 1631, Washington will be an innovative environmental hub, it will allow renewables to catch up to oil prices and nuclear and hydro power remain competitive.
Western States Petroleum Associates	\$31,245,664.73	\$331,199.81	Climate Policy standing: Market-based approach	One of the largest lobbying groups in Cali. Represent multiple companies that work with petroleum. Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon and Washington, Member of Washington Consumers for Sound Fuel Policy	Advocates for market-based approach on climate policy
Association of Washington Business	\$14,000	\$500	Mission: economic prosperity in WA, Oldest & largest business association	111 businesses (WEC), \$14,500	Economic prosperity

BP America	\$12,896,031.4	\$252,484.76	WSPA member, lobbying, 9/10 relationship strength w/American Petroleum Institute (API)	Biggest donor, close relationships with other oil industry stakeholders	1631 did not have local pre-emption, carbon pricing was not economy wide, advocates for a market-based price on carbon
Philips 66	\$7,201,186.54	0	WSPA member (7/9 strong relationship) No clear disclosure of position on climate change, founded 2012	Strong relationships with oil industry stakeholders, founded 2012, \$7,201,186.54	Not found
Andeavor	6062827.17	0	WSPA member	One of the largest oil refiners in US. Ties to Senate Majority Leader Mitch Mconell, owned by Marathon Petroleum, \$6,062,827.17	Not found

Question 2: In theory initiative 1631 appealed to a larger group of people, in your perspective why do you think it lost?

Table 2 – Question 2 responses		
Variables	Organization	Quotes
Money	Yes on 1631	“I think the real problem was the oil industry spending big bill, spending about 15million dollars to defeat this initiative because they knew that it would ultimately, lead to their demise in a state like Washington and lead to them losing a lot of power”.
	The Nature Conservancy	"...the biggest one is that the oil companies poured so much money into it, and made it the most expensive initiative campaign in the state's history..."
Ground approach	Yes on 1631	"And they're smart, you know, in this state they're savvy and they don't say things like climate change isn't happening or it's not man made. They say things like climate change is really complicated, you need to get right."
	Carbon Washington	“I think 1631 compared to 732 or compared to some of the legislative bills, involved more non-profit organizations in the policy creation process. But if you actually look at the voting data for 732, 732 did really well in demographic areas that are majority minority..."
		"...it was never clear that that [communities of color drafting the initiative] was going to lead to an increase vote share over 732, because 732 had a good vote share as well”
The Nature Conservancy	"...throughout the policy development process, we worked really closely with a lot of businesses. But then their leadership didn't really show up once the campaign kicked off and they were very reluctant to weigh in and I think that really could have helped a lot."	

	BP America	" I think what resonated the most with people, were the ads that talked about that it wasn't economy wide, that other businesses would have been exempted."
Policy approach	The Nature Conservancy	"I think another reason that it failed, is that, it was a, it was essentially around asking the voters to pay more. And, that's a really, really tough thing to do. Especially in Washington State where we tend to be fairly tax averse".
	BP America	So globally BP has been working with governments around the globe and with state governments here in the US and in Washington D.C. advocating for a market-based price on carbon. When the Washington initiative came up... we felt that 1631 just didn't meet the principles that really meet good carbon policy...it was a carbon tax that was basically focused on just the refineries and just our customers. And we think good carbon policy includes everybody, manufacturers, customers, users, carbon is carbon. The other thing that was missing was local pre-emption... "
		"I think the message from the ads that really resonated the most was that it wasn't going to be inclusive of everybody who was causing the challenge, and that because of that it wasn't going to work...from a BP's perspective ultimately, we get the sense that people understand how difficult this is, that they're looking for something that's fair, that everyone is in on together, and this wasn't that proposal..."
Multiple Variables	Carbon Washington	"Well, there's a whole bunch of factors, there's not just one thing."
	The Nature Conservancy	"Yeah, well I think there's a number of different reasons..."