

MEMORANDUM

To: US Programs Board
From: Board/Staff Committee on the City/State Initiative¹
Date: February 5, 2012
Re: Framework for expanded city/state work and next steps

The committee on the City/State Initiative has met over the last few months to develop a framework for expanding our integrated place-based work and has focused especially on identifying cities that we should consider as possible venues for one or more additional field offices. This memo outlines the purpose of the expanded work, criteria for selecting venues for local work, the structures and other ingredients that will contribute to the success of establishing additional field offices, the relationship of the city-state initiative to national work conducted by USP, and the due diligence we would undertake as a next step. Appendices provide information about the six possible venues for field offices and are an integral part of this memo.² **The Committee seeks the full Board's reactions to the proposed framework as well as the go-ahead to conduct due diligence in some or all of the six cities it has identified as possible venues for opening a field office.**

I. A Portfolio Approach to USP Work in Cities and States

To continue to be strategic, opportunistic and nimble, we recommend that USP support local work through several different structures, each with their own specific goals. In particular, we assume that USP will support local work in response to the following circumstances:

1. **A high profile, egregious state-based attack on open society values** (e.g., Arizona/Alabama anti-immigrant legislation)
2. **A confluence of conditions that make a time-limited campaign ripe for building public and political will for reform** (e.g., the California Campaign to Reduce Mass Incarceration, taking advantage of the state budget deficit and the Supreme Court decision requiring a reduction in prison overcrowding)
3. **A compelling opportunity to model a response to a particular open society problem** (e.g., ongoing transparency and criminal justice work in New Orleans)
4. **An opportunity to create a field office to understand key social, political and economic factors affecting open society and, acting as a laboratory, develop an integrated set of strategies—grantmaking and operational--to strengthen open society in that region and offer examples for other sites** (OSI-Baltimore)

¹ The committee is co-chaired by Sherrilyn Ifill and Andy Stern and comprises Deepak Bhargava, Leon Botstein, Aryeh Neier, Acting executive director Diana Morris and members of the Senior Management Team (Erin Ibreck, Monique Dixon, Laleh Ispahani, Raquiba LaBrie, Lenny Noisette and Bill Vandenberg).

² Winnowed from a group of 16, the six cities under consideration are: Detroit, Michigan; Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota; Las Vegas, Nevada; Charlotte, North Carolina; San Antonio, Texas; and, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

We recognize that local grantmaking requires a significant amount of time from NY-based, national foundation staff if the work is done well, and we therefore should be clear about when and why we undertake it. Generally, work in response to a high profile attack is likely to be time-limited and focused on a particular issue. And, it may be complemented with national grantmaking aimed at exposing and re-framing the issue and deterring copycat initiatives in other states. A campaign, usually initiated by key actors in the field but occasionally by USP and/or other funders, takes advantage of an opening to galvanize public and political will for change on an issue. In other instances, a compelling need or opportunity in a particular state might result in one or two USP programs focusing some grantmaking there for a number of years, using a variety of approaches. In that instance, we recommend that the program(s) have clear, measureable goals before beginning the work.

The Committee believes that our **work in New Orleans** appropriately falls within this last category. It is a site where two of our programs—criminal justice and transparency—should continue to collaborate, taking advantage of the post-Katrina resolve to address some of city’s persistent open society challenges: discriminatory, over-incarceration and a corrupt, non-responsive government.³ The Committee, after discussion, opted not to include New Orleans as a possible venue for a field office and more comprehensive work, noting that the city is so distinctive that it is unlikely to serve as a laboratory for other urban centers. Nevertheless, we may opt to employ a local consultant or part-time staff person to improve the quality and efficiency of our grantmaking there.

Criteria for More Intensive Work at the City-State Level

The Committee has identified the criteria listed below to help select venues for local work, including additional USP field offices. To maintain a diversified portfolio of work—choosing sites in order to understand and address particular open society challenges—sites would meet *some*, but not all, of the following criteria:

- Policy openings for affirmatively advancing our priorities or for addressing egregious threats to open society
- Shifting demographics (such as those involving youth, Muslim populations, and Latinos) that indicate a need for and/or an opening to pursue open society issues
- Some degree of existing public will on key open society issues that can be expanded and translated to political will
- Openness of the city/state governments to work well and be responsive to change
- Likelihood of the work affecting change in other cities and states through the site’s influence, comparability to other sites, or willingness to help with replication
- Potential of the work to attract the attention and interest of federal policymakers
- Presence of potential funding partners that we could leverage or, conversely, an absence of funding partners that makes our work more critical (either in places where there are no

³ The Working Group process will provide one opportunity, among others, to clarify and possibly tighten the goals of our work in New Orleans.

obvious potential partners at all or where there are some potential private and public partners that are not yet engaged)

- Some existing infrastructure to tap and/or to strengthen (i.e., at least some level of organization in the city and state to advance our priorities)
- A strong, rather than undeveloped, network of civil society players so that the place serves as a model
- Some existing U.S. Programs work that gives us an understanding of local dynamics, needs and players
- Potential local leadership—a key person or organization that could lead the effort effectively

Individual committee members have suggested additional criteria for field offices. These matters should also be considered by the board in our discussion:

- making initial commitments of 3-5 years
- raising money early is preferable and should ultimately be a requirement

We recognize that USP can and should engage in local work in a variety of ways, but as field offices will provide a learning laboratory for OSF over an extended period of time and therefore represent an important, complex institutional decision, the remainder of this memo addresses where we might engage in city or states through a field office presence.

II. Adding Field Offices to Support Integrated Place-based Work

In considering where and why we would establish one or more new field offices to ground integrated and more comprehensive place-based work, we assumed that USP would not use a “cookie-cutter” approach but would pursue different open society goals in each location and adopt structures and requirements that take into account local conditions. That said, we sought to build on some of the components of our existing field office—OSI-Baltimore, with a residential board and staff who are fully integrated into the community—that distinguish OSF’s approach to place-based work from that of other national foundations. The latter generally involves multi-city, short-term projects focused on a particular issue (e.g., to advance jobs or civic engagement), overseen by staff from their headquarters who fly in and out. And, we have sought to identify some of the factors that have contributed to OSI-Baltimore’s success.

A. Justification for expanded city/state work through additional field offices

Expanding our city/state work will enable us to advance our goals on key priority issues, address new or evolving threats to open society, and operate more efficiently and effectively. Devolution has led to many of our priority issues being dramatically shaped or determined by state and local policy (e.g., immigration). Other core priorities have always been rooted in the state (e.g., criminal justice). As a result, work in some cities/states can be critical to advancing our goals – either in terms of affirmative victory or defending against threats. With a local presence, we can react more nimbly to circumstances on the ground. And, the intelligence we gather will serve as an “early warning system” about emerging threats or obstacles to progress, allowing USP to position itself to address issues that will be most important over the next 15 years.

Demographic shifts—the development of “majority-minority” states, gentrification, and the growth in immigrant, youth and Muslim populations—are a case in point.⁴ Felt most keenly in local communities, these shifts result in or uncover barriers to equality, opportunity, and the promise of democracy as well as create openings for progress. A local presence will enable us to respond to demographic shifts with a detailed understanding of the issues particular population groups face and the stance of others in the community, and provide us with a laboratory to engage key groups in building an open society

A field office will allow us to integrate and increase the impact of our local work by sharing information and analyses across priority fields, adopting strategies that reinforce each other, and exercising a level of local leadership and coordination that is difficult to achieve through NY-based efforts. Rooted firmly in place and playing a catalytic role, a field office is well positioned to link demonstration projects—often helpful in getting community leaders, practitioners, opinion shapers, and policy makers to think and work differently—to policy reform efforts. With a sustained presence and an accurate gauge of need, opportunity and capacity, it can serve as a laboratory for USP and others, creating and testing new models at the city and state levels and initiating work on new issues.

Staff based in field offices also has myriad opportunities to lead operational work and galvanize others to take on open society issues. These activities—convening civic and community leaders and policy makers, brokering relationships, engaging in direct advocacy, developing a network of activists, and communicating persuasively about open society values, aspirations and positions—take time and benefit significantly from a sustained presence. Over time, field office staff and advisors are able to build meaningful relationships with key public officials and private funders and engage them in conceptualizing, implementing and sustaining initiatives that lead to significant reform of policy or practice. This kind of leveraging allows open society work to take hold, move beyond USP efforts, and become linked to the values and activities of others. Closely related to this dynamic, a field office also has the expertise and connections to mount a campaign quickly, providing leadership and/or support when the need and opportunity arise. It can also ensure that monitoring, advocacy and publicity continue after campaign goals are met. In the process, a field office can build capacity that is essential but missing or weak, whether data analysis and research, effective advocacy, organizing and communication, or evidence-based practice.

As mayors and even governors regularly assert, there are generally fewer political barriers – and more potential for concrete movement and success – at the city and state levels. This provides an opening for USP to develop political will for progress on our core priorities at city and state levels and create pressure for policy reform nationally. Changing the narrative on key open society issues requires nuanced messages that will solicit broad public interest and support. City/state work will allow us to experiment with how to develop shared support for open society

⁴ Finding reliable data on growing Muslim populations in the U.S. is difficult as neither the U.S. Census Bureau nor the U.S. immigration service collects data on religious affiliation. Think tanks, university centers and community groups have stepped into this void, including the Pew Research Center, the Center on Immigration Studies, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, and the Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies. Pew now estimates that there are 2.7 million Muslims living in the U.S.

values as changing the hearts and minds of individuals often occurs at the local level.

Adding to our portfolio of local work, now undertaken by the Baltimore field office and various US programs, by adding one or more field offices would strengthen USP's unique role among other funders: we will be able to inform and advance our work drawing from deep local and broad national experience. Importantly, field staff will maintain a national perspective as they work locally, analyzing and improving the ability of national organizations to "deliver" their work locally and helping local groups to build on and contribute to the activities of national organizations. Conceived of as laboratories, the field offices will incorporate effective strategies from other cities and states even as they innovate, and they will share analyses of their own successes, missteps and failures. Integrated into their home community, the field office can model calculated risk-taking and explicitly encourage other funders—most of which work locally—to structure their own work as "risk capital" or to serve as catalysts for change. And, in a venue that is small enough and easy enough to observe, the field office can demonstrate the value of thinking, planning and acting inclusively, providing the space for those directly affected by policies and practice to be heard.

B. Unifying Values and Principles for Decentralized Field Offices

Drawing on the OSI-Baltimore experience, the Committee identified some common principles and "special ingredients" that should be part of other field office's DNA: clear values, an active presence, local leadership, a sense of urgency, and recognition that policy change requires sustained, multi-faceted effort. As indicated in the next section on selection criteria, USP would establish each office to understand and address a different set of issues, and the organization and structure of the office may differ in each venue. Nevertheless, each office would be locally rooted, guided by a diverse local advisory board that would oversee priorities, grantmaking and other activities, and be supported by at least two, residential staff. The field office should be publicly identified as OSF-affiliated, rather than appearing to be independent or separate. This provides an opportunity to be explicit about our open society values and goals. It also facilitates transparency and immediacy.

To avoid the pitfalls of other national foundations that have initiated and then prematurely abandoned programs in local communities, the Committee recommends that USP commit to each sites for at least five to eight years after the initial startup phase and make that commitment clear at the outset. The Committee believes that this commitment is necessary to provide sufficient time to: build public support and political will for change; work effectively to achieve policy change by developing realistic, multi-year plans and strategies; deepen relationships with grantees, community leaders, and policymakers so that potential reforms are fully debated, well understood and, once adopted, institutionalized and taken to scale; and interest other funders in co-investing. All of these developments will increase the likelihood that the work will be sustainable.

The Committee believes that the field office should engage local and national funding partners as well as community leaders at the outset, but USP should not impose a fundraising matching requirement in the first few years. Rather, the field office should independently establish its open society values and priorities and mode of operation without subjecting them to a negotiation with

other funders who may be risk-adverse or less committed to building an open society. At the same time, however, the field office should take responsibility for leveraging other funders' priorities and persuading community leaders and policymakers to support changes in practice and policy. If, at a later point, USP decides it is appropriate to require the field office to raise funds, that requirement should focus more on the number of donors secured rather than on the size of the contributions, indicating the breadth of public support for the site's agenda.

Adopting the de-centralized approach common to OSF, the Committee recommends that the field office advisory board and staff use an open society values screen in approaching their work and then determine the office's priorities in response to local conditions, needs and opportunities. To take full advantage of the investment in its infrastructure, the field office should pursue multiple open society priorities, employing a range of strategies and working, where practical, in an integrated manner. It should aim, however, to maintain sufficient focus and expertise to provide leadership locally and, as appropriate, nationally. The office may choose to work on some national USP priorities but not others and to initiate work for which there is not currently a national counterpart. This will ensure that the office serves, internally, as a laboratory for USP (as OSI-Baltimore has done, for example, in the school-to-prison and drug addiction treatment arenas). Conversely, after consulting with field office staff and often at their invitation, national USP staff may work to advance their goals in the field office region, bringing the expertise they have and linking the local site with other local and national work.

C. Interplay between USP's National and Local Work to Increase Impact

National organizations that USP supports are an important complement to the city-state initiatives. In addition to their nationally focused work, some of these grantees undertake research, education, advocacy and organizing in particular states. They also serve as a clearinghouse for information about state trends, emerging problems and effective strategies; build the capacity of local groups; and develop networks to strengthen local advocates' effectiveness and connect local and national efforts. While our national grantees are best positioned to determine which states are ripe for action given their own priorities, the Committee recommends that we make national grantees aware of the cities and states USP is targeting and invite them to reinforce local efforts by focusing their work there as well, if relevant.⁵ At the same time, the Committee notes that local actors can provide nuanced analyses as well as ongoing, persistent monitoring and advocacy, which can be critical to the success of national initiatives.

More generally, the Committee recognizes that USP must be deliberate about the ways in which it publicizes what it learns from local work, thinking strategically about how to convert local experience so that, collectively, it has national relevance and impact. This consideration affects the choices we make about venue and issues, how we define success as well as the investment we make in communicating our findings and linking local and national actors.

D. Six Cities Under Consideration

⁵ We have already asked that the grant classification template developed by Accenture allow us to capture the states which our national grantees propose to target. This will give us a real-time and historical overview of the state focused work that US Programs supports.

With an eye to geographic and demographic diversity, the Committee identified 16 possible sites, subsequently winnowing the group to the following six: **Detroit, Michigan; Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota; Las Vegas, Nevada; Charlotte, North Carolina; San Antonio, Texas and, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.** As indicated in the attached *City/State Matrix*, these cities have populations that hover around the 600,000 mark, ranging from 583,756 in Las Vegas to 1.3 million in San Antonio. Each, except San Antonio, is the most populous city in its state. We believe that a city this size will allow us to have impact in a relatively short period of time and produce models that will have relevance to many other cities across the country. At the same time, we note that “city” work on open society issues will often require activity at the state level. And, depending on the place, a regional focus may also make sense.

Each of the cities is a place that already reveals some of the open society challenges—and opportunities—that will be core to our work in the years ahead. Their demographic changes—in most cases, reflecting ongoing trends—underscore the importance of removing barriers to full participation in the social, economic and political life of the community, maintaining open society practices and structures that are transparent and fair, and encouraging the flow of information, debate and coalition building that will build communities that are not fractured by fear, misunderstanding or resentment. Each of the six cities also already exhibits indicators relating to poverty, unemployment, school success, incarceration, and voter engagement that demand immediate attention.

The attached appendices provide an overview of each city’s demographics, likely opportunities and threats to open society, relevance to others, and open society and philanthropic infrastructure, including current USP activity. The overviews include information provided by OSI-DC, with the caveat that political leadership will change over the years and possibly affect the influence of certain states. The overviews are uneven, reflecting the information we have from existing engagement in the region or preliminary research. We also attach a matrix showing the leading national and local foundations in each city. Further examination will reveal the extent to which these funders (public and private) plan to continue their support and direct it to open society or complementary activities.

E. Next Steps: Due Diligence

With the Board’s approval, the next step would be to conduct due diligence in some or all of the six sites. We note that, while being an armchair anthropologist can be fun, being an armchair philanthropist can be dangerous. Serious due diligence is an important next step to determine not only what opportunities and challenges are present that fit our mission, agenda and resources but whether there is sufficient local interest, commitment and organization to work with USP on open society issues to make our work successful. Based on the Board’s advice and direction, we envision collecting more information about each city in a quiet phase, in order not to raise expectations. Focused conversation with academic and policy centers, other funders, national organizations with state affiliates, labor organizations, and networks for elected leaders and city/state governments will help us to narrow our selection. Then, with the Board’s approval, we would more publicly approach a limited number of cities to gauge local interest, opportunity, need, organization and leadership.

City/State Matrix: Top six cities

	City	Population	Race, age, and foreign-born population	Metropolitan Statistical Area <small>(as defined by the Office of Budget and Management)</small>	Metro 2010 rank	Percentage of Poverty	Unemployment rate	School population (graduation and dropout rates)
THE SOUTH	Charlotte, North Carolina	731,424 according to 2010 Census +35.2% increase from 2000 Census Most populous city in North Carolina	45.1% white (+16% change from 2000 Census) 34.5% black (+ 45% change from 2000 Census) 4.9% Asian (+98% change from 2000 Census) 13.1% Latino (+140% change from 2000 Census) 10.1% of population between 18 & 24 years old 13.6% foreign-born population	Metropolitan population: 1,758,038 +32.1% increase from 2000 Census 63% white (+17% change from 2000 Census) 24% black (+ 41% change from 2000 Census) 2% Asian (+ 103% change from 2000 Census) 10% Latino (+153% change from 2000 Census) 9.7% foreign-born population	33 out of 376	15.3% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$31,270	City: 10% (U.S. rate: 8.5%) State: 17.9% real unemployment (U.S. rate: 16.2%)	135,638 public school students, 2009-2010 Graduation rate: 62.1% Dropout rate: 8.7% 46.1% of students eligible for free or reduced lunch
MIDWEST	Detroit, Michigan	713,777 according to 2010 Census -25 % decrease from 2000 Census Most populous city in Michigan	7.8% white (-35% change) 82.2% black (-24% change) 1% Asian (-18.4% change) 6.8% Latino (+3.2% change) 11.5% of population between 18 & 24 years old 6.6 % foreign -born population	Metropolitan population: 4,296,250 -3.5% decrease from 2000 Census 68% white (-6.2% change) 23% black (-4% change) 3% Asian (+37% change) 4% Latino (+32% change) 8.6% foreign-born population	12 out of 376	36.4% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$14,213	City: 9.5% State: 19.2%	90,660 public school students, PK-12 (as of Nov. 2009) Graduation rate: 46.8% Dropout rate: 24.4% 77.4% of students are economically disadvantaged
WEST COAST	Las Vegas, Nevada	583,756 according to 2010 Census +22% increase from 2000 Census Most populous city in Nevada	47.9% white (+8.4% change) 10.6% black (+31% change) 5.9% Asian (+56% change) 31.5 % Latino (+63% change) 8.9% of population between 18 & 24 years old 21.7% foreign-born population	Metropolitan population: 1,951,269 +41.8% increase from 2000 Census 48% white (+13% change) 10% black (+60% change) 8% Asian (+133% change) 29% Latino (+88% change) 21.7% foreign-born population	30 out of 376	14.9% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$27,246	City: 12.5% State: 23.3%	309,335 public school students, K-12 (2009-2010) Graduation rate: 50.2% Dropout rate: 6.8% 43.7% of students eligible for free or reduced lunch
MIDWEST	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	594,833 according to 2010 Census -0.4% decrease from 2000 Census Most populous city in Wisconsin	37% white (-11% change) 39.2% black (+7% change) 3.5% Asian (+19% change) 17.3 % Latino (+44% change) 13.7% of population between 18 & 24 years old 9.5% foreign-born population	Metropolitan population: 1,555,908 +3.7% increase from 2000 Census 69% white (-4% change) 16% black (+10% change) 3% Asian (+48% change) 9% Latino (+56% change) 6.4% foreign-born population	39 out of 376	27% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$18,290	City: 7.2% States: 14.7%	82,444 public school students, K-12 (as of 2009-2010) Graduation rate: 56.8% Dropout rate: 10.5% 81% of students are eligible to receive free or reduced lunch
	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	667,646 according to 2010 Census - .3% decrease from 2000 Most populous city in Minnesota	60.3% white (-2% change) 18.3% black (+3.3% change) 1.7% American Indian and Alaska Native (-9.3%) 5.6 % Asian (-8.1% change) 10.5 % Latino (+37.4% change) 15.4% of population between 18 & 24 years old 14.7% foreign-born population	Metropolitan population: 3,279,833 +10.5% increase from 2000 Census 79% white (+2.5% change) 7% black (+54% change) 0.7% American Indian (+11% change) 6% Asian (+53% change) 5% Latino (+78% change) 9.5% foreign-born population	16 out of 376	22.6% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$28,131	City: 5.1% State: 13.1%	34,570 public school students, K-12 (2010-2011) Graduation rate: 56.5% Dropout rate: 13.55% 65.6% of students receive free or reduced lunch (2010-2011)
THE SOUTH	San Antonio, Texas	1,327,407 according to 2010 Census +16% increase from 2000 Census Second most populous city in Texas	26.6% white (+24.4% change) 6.3% black (+16.8% change) 0.2% American Indian (+23% change) 2.3% Asian (+80% change) 63.2% Latino (+25% change) 11.4% of population between 18 & 24 years old 13.4% foreign-born population	Metropolitan population: 2,142,508 +25.2% increase from 2000 Census 36% white (11.2% change) 6% black (27% change) 2% Asian (89% change) 54% Latino (34% change) 12.3% foreign-born population	25 out of 366	19.5% of population lives below poverty line per capita income: \$21,053	City: 7% State: 14.4%	404,161 public school students, K-12 (2010-2011) Graduation rate: 53.8% Dropout rate: 12.3% 64.1% of students are economically disadvantaged (2010)

City/State Matrix: Top six cities

Percentage of English language learners	Homeownership rate	Voter registration and turnout rates by state	City criminal justice statistics (average daily jail populations and crime rates)	Political landscape (names, party affiliations, terms of mayors and governors; makeup and basic operation of state legislatures)
9.5% (14,204 students from 2009-2010)	57%	Voting eligible population: 6,596,556 Total ballots cast: 2,622,532 Turnout: 39.8% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 38 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election: 44	Crime rate: 49.63 (National avg.:33.455 per 1,000 inhabitants) Number of inmates at local/county jail: 2,274 daily Maximum capacity of jailhouse: 2,988 Capacity of occupied: 75.6% by mid-year 2010 1 in 110 adults in North Carolina is in prison or jail (ranked 29th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 58 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 30th nationally)	Mayor: Anthony Foxx, Democrat, next election, 2013 Governor: Beverly Perdue, Democrat, next election 2012 Legislative session: January 26-June 18. Special redistricting session July 13-July 29. Senate: 19D/31R House: 52D/67R/11 Legislator compensation: \$13,951/year; \$104/day (U) set by statute. \$559.00/month expense allowance.
10% (8,754 students from 2008-2009)	51%	Voting eligible population:7,288,055 Total ballots cast: 3,268,217 Turnout: 44.8% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 22 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election:8	Crime rate: 72 Number of inmates in local/county jail: 2,600 (average monthly) Maximum capacity of jailhouse: between 2,800 and 2,900 1 in 105 adults in Michigan is in prison or jail (ranked 26th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 37 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 10th nationally)	Mayor: Dave Bing, Democrat, next election 2013 Governor: Rick Snyder, Republican, next election 2014 Legislative session: Convenes on January 12th and throughout the year Senate: 12D/26R House: 47D/63R Legislator compensation: 71,685/year/ \$10,800 yearly expense allowance for session and interim (V) set by compensation commission.
18.2% (56,232 students from 2009-2010)	57%	Voting eligible population:1,692,499 Total ballots cast: 723,515 Turnout: 42.7% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 29 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election: 41	Crime rate: 39.44 Number of inmates in local/county jail: 173 daily Maximum capacity of jailhouse: 500 1 in 89 adults in Nevada is in prison or jail (ranked 14th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 106 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 47th nationally)	Mayor: Carolyn Goodman, Independent, next election 2014 Governor: Brian Sandoval, Republican, next election 2015 Legislative session: February 7-June 6 Senate: 11D/10R Assembly: 26D/16R Legislator compensation: \$137.90/day maximum of 60 days of session for holdover Senators, \$146.29/day for all other legislators.
9.5% (8,657 students from 2009-2010)	44%	Voting eligible population: 4,203,366 Total ballots cast: 2,210,145 Turnout: 52.6% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 6 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election: 6	Crime rate: 62.8 Number of inmates in local/county jail: 2,525 daily Maximum capacity of jailhouse: 2,835 Capacity occupied: 89.1% by mid-2010 1 in 105 adults in Wisconsin is in prison or jail (ranked 26th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 37 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 10th nationally)	Mayor: Tom Barrett, Democrat, next election 2012 Governor: Scott Walker, Republican, next election 2014 Legislative session: January 11-June 30. The January special session is ongoing. An extraordinary session can be convened if necessary. Senate: 14D/17R/2V Assembly: 39D/59R/11 Legislator compensation: \$49,943/year; \$88/day maximum.
23.2% (8,020 students from 2010-2011)	49%	Voting eligible population: 3,799,328 Total ballots cast: 2,123,269 Turnout: 55.9% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 2 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election:1	Crime rate: 58 Number of inmates in local/county: 694 daily Maximum capacity of jailhouse: 703 1 in 211 adults in Minnesota is in prison or jail (ranked 50th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 30 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 4th nationally)	Mayor: R. T. Rybak, Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, next election 2013 Governor: Mark Dayton, Democrat, next election 2014 Legislative session: January 4-May 23 Senate: 30D/37R House: 62D/72R Legislator compensation: \$31,140.90/year; Senators receive \$86/day and Representatives receive \$77/legislative day.
11% (43,431 students from 2010)	57%	Voting eligible population: 15,407,666 Total ballots cast: 5,069,508 Turnout: 32.9% Turnout rank for 2010 midterm election: 50 Turnout rank for 2006 midterm election: 49	Crime rate: 69.52 Number of inmates at county jail: 4,169 daily Capacity occupied: 92.3% by mid-year 2010 1 in 71 adults in Texas is in prison or jail (ranked 5th nationally in share of adults in prison) 1 in 86 adults is on probation or parole (ranked 7th nationally)	Mayor: Julian Castro, Democrat, next election 2012 Governor: Rick Perry, Republican, next election 2014 Legislative session: January 11-May 30. Special session May 31-June 29 Senate: 12D/19R House: 49D/100R/1V Legislator compensation: \$7,200/year; \$150/day (U) set by Ethics Commission.

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

“**Total funding on USP priorities**” is the citywide total of all foundations’ grantmaking on USP priorities, which are not all captured in the detailed breakdown. The breakdown shows the top five foundations working on USP priorities in the city. “**Grantmaking on USP priorities**” is listed for each of the top five foundations and includes all of the foundation’s grants in the city that correspond with USP priorities. For each foundation’s grants, only the top categories that correspond with USP priorities are listed.

The South			Total funding on USP priorities:
Charlotte, NC			\$5,774,784
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	Grantmaking on USP priorities: \$1,431,534	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount
		Minorities	\$1,431,534
Foundation for the Carolinas	\$769,400		
		Minorities	\$709,400
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$40,000
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$12,000
The Wachovia Wells Fargo Foundation	\$601,000		
		Minorities	\$584,000
		Civil Rights, Voter Educations	\$5,000
		Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$1,500
Leon Levine Foundation	\$578,000		
		Minorities	\$125,000
		Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$225,000
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$28,000
		Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$10,000
Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation	\$415,000		
		Minorities	\$130,000
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$85,000
		Civil Rights, Voter Education	\$60,000
		Civil/Human Rights, Immigrants	\$50,000
		Civil/Human Rights, Advocacy	\$40,000

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

The Midwest			Total funding on USP priorities:
Detroit, MI			\$148,998,007
Skillman Foundation	Grantmaking on USP priorities: \$17,713,750	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount
		Minorities	\$7,752,750
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$6,636,000
		Offenders/Ex-Offenders	\$1,380,000
		Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$1,315,000
W. K. Kellogg Foundation	\$11,045,270		
		Civil/Human Rights	\$750,000
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$240,000
		Civil Rights/Advocacy	\$500,000
		Minorities	\$9,519,020
Kresge Foundation	\$11,602,606		
		Minorities	\$4,122,360
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$4,787,378
		Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$375,000
		Media Journalism (includes radio and film)	\$357,958
		Civil/Human Rights	\$1,449,450
		Arts, Public Policy, Cultural/Ethnic Awareness	\$37,960
The Ford Foundation	\$17,102,705		
		Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$12,316,855
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$5,410,850
Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan	\$12,749,023		
		Minorities	\$5,853,000
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$5,476,864
		Offenders/Ex-Offenders	\$350,000
		Media Journalism (includes radio and film)	\$52,831
		Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$191,106
		Arts, Cultural/Ethnic Awareness	\$30,000

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

The West Coast			Total funding on USP priorities:
Las Vegas, NV			\$2,399,384
Grantmaking on USP priorities:	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount	
Engelstad Family Foundation	\$1,500,000	Minorities	\$1,500,000
Bank of America Charitable Foundation	\$185,000	Minorities	\$140,000
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$25,000
Citi Foundation	\$165,000	Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$115,000
		Minorities	\$15,000
Nevada Community Foundation	\$161,370	Minorities	\$161,370
Wells Fargo Foundation	\$138,912	Minorities	\$88,500
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$15,000
		LGBTQ	\$5,000
		Urban/Community Development	\$1,213

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

The Midwest		Total funding on USP priorities:	
Milwaukee, WI		\$13,290,113	
	Grantmaking on USP priorities:	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount
Ford Foundation	\$2,750,000	Community Development, Citizen Coalitions Civil/Human Rights, Women	\$2,000,000 \$750,000
Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$1,882,040	Minorities Community Development, Neighborhood Development Immigrants/Refugees Offenders/Ex-offenders Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations	\$1,185,000 \$277,040 \$190,000 \$30,000 \$40,000
Greater Milwaukee Foundation	\$1,408,898	Minorities Community Development, Neighborhood Development Offenders/Ex-offenders LGBTQ Immigrants/Refugees	\$359,900 \$280,750 \$117,000 \$113,050 \$50,000
Helen Bader Foundation	\$1,379,975	Minorities Community Development, Neighborhood Development Civil/Human Rights, LGBTQ Civil Rights, Race/Intergroup Relations Civil/Human Rights, Advocacy	\$803,275 \$100,600 \$42,000 \$41,800 \$33,800
Annie E. Casey Foundation	\$928,000	Offenders/Ex-offenders Civil/Human Rights, Women Immigrants/Refugees	\$595,000 \$158,000 \$30,000

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

The Midwest		Total funding on USP priorities:	
Minneapolis, MN		\$74,944,253	
	Grantmaking on USP priorities:	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount
Ford Foundation	\$14,824,000	Arts, Cultural/Ethnic Awareness	\$3,500,000
		Minorities	\$3,124,000
		Urban/Community Development	\$1,025,000
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$850,000
		Women	\$650,000
McKnight Foundation	\$12,812,000	Minorities	\$4,572,000
		Urban/Community Development	\$2,762,000
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$1,475,000
		Immigrants/Refugees	\$1,379,000
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$460,000
The Minneapolis Foundation	\$9,901,611	Immigrants/Refugees	\$1,224,790
		Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$477,150
		LGBTQ	\$234,100
		Civil/Human Rights, Equal Rights	\$198,300
		Performing Arts/Performing Arts Education	\$118,433
Otto Bremer Foundation	\$4,093,681	Minorities	\$1,438,091
		Immigrants/Refugees	\$859,950
		Women	\$620,104
		Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$325,570
		Community Development, Citizen Coalitions	\$262,500
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	\$3,773,362	Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$3,500,000
		Community Development, Neighborhood Development	\$223,362
		Minorities	\$199,000
		Immigrants/Refugees	\$50,000

Leading funders in the top six cities of interest, 2009-2011

The South			Total funding on USP priorities:
San Antonio, TX			\$16,408,168
Funder	Grantmaking on USP priorities:	Top funding USP priority areas	Amount
W.K. Kellogg	\$12,628,682	Child development/Education /Latinos	\$12,628,682
Ford Foundation	\$700,000	Arts/Cultural, Ethnic Awareness	\$500,000
		Civil/Human Rights, Advocacy	\$200,000
Energy Foundation	\$550,000	Civil Rights/Voter education	\$550,000
Albert & Bessie Mae Kronkosky Charitable Foundation	\$442,327	Arts/Cultural, Ethnic Awareness	\$270,000
		Civil/Human Rights, Minorities	\$162,128
Kresge Foundation	\$1,050,000	Offenders/Ex-offenders	\$400,000
		Minorities/Immigrants	\$400,000
		Arts/Cultural, Ethnic Awareness	\$250,000