

MEMO

To: Interested Parties
From: Robby Mook
Date: March 2, 2016
Re: State of the Race: Pledged Delegate Count

Our campaign developed a strategy to secure the nomination and we've stuck to it. That strategy was to maximize delegates. We are proud to have met every goal we set so far and will continue to focus on each contest until we secure the nomination.

By virtue of Sec. Clinton's 8 wins on Super Tuesday—most of which were by significant margins—we now have a lead of more than 180 pledged delegates over Sen. Sanders. This lead is larger than any lead then-Senator Obama had at any point in the 2008 primary.

As of last night, voters in states and regions that comprise roughly 25% of the pledged delegates towards the Democratic nomination will have had their voice heard in the process. Sec. Clinton won 7 Super Tuesday states: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. Hillary also won the pledged delegates of American Samoa.

But what is most important is not just the number of states that Sec. Clinton has won but the large margin by which she is winning states. In the Democratic nomination, delegates are apportioned proportionally within a state, so larger margins of victory translate into a larger number of pledged delegates. Here are examples of why the margins of victory matter:

- Hillary Clinton's 56-point victory in Alabama is projected to net her 27 delegates.
- In Georgia, where she won by 43 points, she is projected to net 44 delegates.
- In Virginia, her 30-point margin of victory should result in 29 net delegates.
- Finally, in Texas—one of the largest delegate-rich states in the process—Hillary's 30-point victory will net nearly 80 delegates.

The table below highlights how larger margin of victories translate into larger delegate leads.

Margin of Victory in States Hillary Won	<u>Projected Net Pledged Delegates for Hillary</u>	Margin of Victory in States Bernie Won	<u>Projected Net Pledged Delegates for Bernie</u>
Iowa: 0.3%	2	New Hampshire: 22%	6
Nevada: 5%	5	Vermont: 86%	16
South Carolina: 48%	25	Oklahoma: 10%	8
Alabama: 56%	27	Colorado: 18%	12
American Samoa:	2	Minnesota: 20%	16
Arkansas: 40%	14		
Georgia: 43%	44		
Massachusetts: 2%	1		
Tennessee: 30%	19		
Texas: 30%	78		
Virginia: 30%	29		

These results point to a clear conclusion: with a pledged delegate lead of more than 180 and momentum on our side, we anticipate building on this lead even further making it increasingly difficult and eventually mathematically impossible for Sen. Sanders to catch up.

There are two major reasons Sen. Sanders will have a very difficult time catching Sec. Clinton in pledged delegates:

- 1) *Winning Coalition*: Sec. Clinton has established a sizeable lead in pledged delegates because of the strong base of support she has built with a winning coalition of voters. She has overwhelming support among voters in communities of color: African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans Pacific Islanders in particular. She also has a dramatic advantage with women, and has been winning union households by double-digit margins. On Super Tuesday, she also prevailed with white voters in a majority of states.

This broad swath of support is based on a 40-year record of working to break down the barriers that are holding people back, particularly for individuals and communities that are often left out or left behind. This record of commitment is resulting in Hillary winning each of these groups by significant margins.

Hillary won:

- African American voters in South Carolina and Super Tuesday states by *overwhelming margins*, including winning them 93-5 in Alabama.
- Latino voters in Texas by a resounding 42 points.
- Women in six Super Tuesday states by more than 30 points.
- Union households in Nevada by double-digits.
- More votes from white voters than Sen. Sanders did across all Super Tuesday states, except Vermont.

Sec. Clinton also won more votes last night than any candidate in either party, securing the support of more than 3.5 million Americans.

Despite trying, Sen. Sanders has not been able to significantly cut into Sec. Clinton's support with some of these core groups. For example, Sen. Sanders spent \$1.7 million on TV and radio, and had more than 200 organizers in South Carolina but still lost women by 58 points and African Americans by 72 points.

This strength of support is critical to preventing Sen. Sanders from being able to catch Sec. Clinton in pledged delegates; these groups will continue to represent a significant portion of the electorate in remaining primaries, and Sec. Clinton's strength with these constituencies ensures that she will keep racking up large numbers of pledged delegates, even in states she might lose.

It is also important to note that these constituencies are not only critical to winning the Democratic nomination but will also be central to how a Democrat wins in November, and a candidate that starts with a deep base of support will have an advantage in the general election.

- 2) *Proportionality*: The same dynamic—proportional allotment of delegates—that helped Sec. Clinton build up a strong lead, makes it very difficult for Sen. Sanders to catch up.

As she has to date, Sec. Clinton will continue to win diverse states by large margins—enabling her to add to her pledged delegate lead—and she will compete in every state with a strategy uniquely tailored to each state so that Sen. Sanders cannot net too many delegates anywhere.

In fact, one example from Super Tuesday perfectly captures the challenges Sen. Sanders faces. Our targeting may allow us to net more delegates out of just one congressional district in Alabama (7th district) as Sen. Sanders netted from his victory in the state of Oklahoma.

All of this simply underscores that in order to catch up, Sen. Sanders doesn't just have to start winning a few states, but he needs to start winning everywhere and by large margins. This is why it is very difficult for him to close the large gap in delegates.

Here is Tad Devine, Sen. Sanders' chief strategist, making this same point in October:

“[proportional representation] is a great advantage to anybody who gets ahead. Ask Obama, ask Jimmy Carter in 1980, the same thing happened there—**you get ahead, you can't lose.**” [emphasis added]

It is worth noting that none of this analysis takes into account superdelegates. Sec. Clinton's sizeable lead is among *pledged delegates*. Among superdelegates, Sec. Clinton has a lead of more than 400.

Strategic Approach

From the start of this campaign, we have maintained a clear and consistent strategy to methodically amass pledged delegates in every contest to ensure that Sec. Clinton will secure our party's nomination. We have stuck to that plan—fighting for votes in every state, even when polls showed us down. This approach has paid dividends as Sec. Clinton is now on a clear path to the nomination.

By comparison, Sen. Sanders failed to compete in delegate-rich states such as Georgia, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, enabling us to build large margins of victory and, as a result, net larger numbers of pledged delegates.

Sen. Sanders' campaign continues to pursue a strategy focused on states rather than delegates. For example, Sen. Sanders is competing very aggressively in Michigan, where he has already spent \$3 million on TV. We are also competing to win in Michigan and feel good about where that race stands, but even if Sen. Sanders were able to eke out a victory there, we would still net more delegates in Mississippi, which holds its election on the same night. The end result is that Sen. Sanders will spend millions of dollars in Michigan but not make any net gain in pledged delegates because he isn't competing in states like Mississippi.

The disparity in strategies is reflected in the amount both campaigns spent on TV and radio in Super Tuesday states as compared to the number of pledged delegates won. Our campaign spent \$10.5 million to secure more than 500 delegates. Sen. Sanders' campaign spent a

comparable amount at \$9 million but only secured 350 delegates, which is ultimately the margin of difference in the race. The difference is that we deployed our resources strategically and efficiently in states and media markets that would allow us to maximize the number of delegates we netted on Super Tuesday. That strategy paid off.

Looking Ahead

We have no doubt that as long as Sen. Sanders remains in the primary, he will continue to win elections along the way, but it will make little difference to Hillary's pledged delegate lead. This upcoming Saturday will reinforce this point: although we continue to fight for every vote, Sen. Sanders has clear advantages and is investing heavily in two upcoming caucuses (Nebraska and Kansas). But even if Sen. Sanders does win in these states, we anticipate being able to win Louisiana by a larger margin and emerge from the day with more net delegates.

In other words, over the upcoming weeks, we intend to steadily add to Hillary Clinton's already sizeable lead in delegates, and as we do, it will become harder and harder mathematically for Sen. Sanders to ever catch up.