



WINNER GRANT INTERIM REPORT

PROGRAM NAME: California Citizens Redistricting Commission
JURISDICTION: State of California
AWARD YEAR: 2017
GRANT #: 2017-01
REPORTING DATE: 3/11/2019 DATES COVERED: 1/1-12/31/2018

I. Reporting Requirements

A. Briefly describe what methods you have used to disseminate information about your innovation thus far (an update on individual activities is in Section II).

Direct outreach to redistricting reform advocates has been the primary method. Our part-time Ash Grant coordinator proactively reached out to targeted states through Common Cause and League of Women Voters affiliates and Fair Districts XX organizations. Commissioner teams presented at events with national or regional audiences and leveraged the connections made to solicit subsequent invitations to targeted states. These included:

- [Unrig the System Summit](#) (New Orleans, LA)
- [Geometry of Redistricting](#) (San Francisco, CA)—one of five regional conferences organized by Tufts University to engage mathematicians (no grant funds expended as Tufts covered minimal local travel)
- Unrig the Districts (Chicago, IL)—follow-on convening from Unrig the System
- [NCSL Legislative Summit](#) (Los Angeles, CA)
- [University of Arizona \(AZ\) Redistricting Conference](#)

At each of these events, as well as subsequent events in specific states, we drove maximum exposure via news articles, media interviews, affiliated websites, social media, and word of mouth. In addition, a video produced at the Unrig the System Summit has been hosted on their website and disseminated on YouTube.

B. Identify which jurisdictions you have reached out to and which have taken steps to, or expressed an interest in adopting your program.

We contacted and sent teams hosted by local organizers to engage with advocates, volunteers, legislators, media, and the public in the following states:

- Georgia
- Michigan (2X)
- North Carolina
- Pennsylvania (2X + video participation in legislative hearing)
- Texas
- Virginia

In addition, reform advocates from Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin were reached in regional and national conferences.



WINNER GRANT INTERIM REPORT

Colorado, Michigan and Utah passed ballot initiatives borrowing key aspects of California's model. Missouri also passed redistricting reform, although not in the form of a citizens' commission. Ohio passed bipartisan legislation. Legislation has been proposed in Pennsylvania and Virginia, but not successfully passed. We continue to engage with the remaining states to adopt key reforms.

C. Describe any obstacles you have faced while disseminating your innovation, both within and outside your jurisdiction.

We have had no issues within our jurisdiction and have had many opportunities to speak to various groups about the success of the California model.

Because our innovation changes political power dynamics, entrenched politicians have resisted adopting our model. Other issues have been that some states that have expressed interest have only just begun exploration and have not yet developed a significant civic infrastructure to push for reform. The level of political entrenchment has also led to skepticism and cynicism by some members of the public about how they could ever get politicians to voluntarily surrender power—especially in states lacking the initiative process.

D. Briefly describe your dissemination plans for the coming year.

In the first two months, we have already sent teams to Maryland and again to Michigan. We are currently in the planning phase of trips to Illinois, Utah, Colorado, and North Carolina. We will also be sending six Commissioners to Tennessee to attend this year's Unrig Summit in Nashville to establish additional contacts with interested entities. We plan to follow up with other states that are still pushing for reform in time for the 2020 redistricting process, as well as those motivated to lay the foundation for future reform.

In some states we will be presenting the model. In others we will be offering advice on how to implement their new system and to both work on avoiding conflicts of interest, being transparent and engaging the public.



WINNER GRANT INTERIM REPORT

II. Update on Activities

Please describe the status of each activity as described in your grant proposal. Include whether the activity has been completed, and if so, what results were achieved. Please describe any modifications that have been made during this grant period and any obstacles faced

A. Activities

1. General Administration

We allocated \$10,000 to fund a part-time Ash Grant Coordinator as the CRC is not allowed to use state employees' time for activities outside the scope of its California redistricting responsibilities. (In addition, Commissioners are volunteering their time for Ash Grant activities.) The contract only covers the period through June, 2019 as we had anticipated spending most grant funds by then. Due to the inconclusive Supreme Court rulings, some anticipated conferences did not materialize, and we expect to need to extend the contract through 2019 to support the new flurry of events and requests for teams.

2. Commissioner Speakers Corps

We continue to send multi-partisan teams—usually one Republican, one Democrat, and one No Party Preference—to target states where local organizers can leverage our experience and expertise fully over 1-5 days. We expect to continue this activity until grant funds are expended and as long as Commissioner volunteers are available. Our only obstacles are the lack of full-time staff to support the CRC, the logistics for each trip, and continuing challenges with administering the grant through the State of California. If grant funds are still available after 12/31/2019, it is likely we will ask for an extension of the grant period as long as we still have requests from target states and willing Commissioners through the end of our term in August, 2020.

3. Documentary Video(s)

We have largely abandoned this activity due to lack of resources. A subcommittee of Commissioners investigated this and concluded that we could not adequately fund such a video without substantial third-party support (as well as significant engagement by some Commissioners). The plan is to reallocate these funds to administrative support and travel expenses for the Commissioner Speakers Corps.



WINNER GRANT INTERIM REPORT

Budget Update

	Proposed	Actual (to date)
<i>Insert: deliverable 1</i>	\$10,000	\$6,667
<i>Insert: deliverable 2</i>	\$80,000	\$23,000
<i>Insert: deliverable 3</i>	\$10,000	\$0
<i>Insert: deliverable 4</i>		
<i>Insert: deliverable 5</i>		
Total	\$100,000	\$29,667

Budget Narrative (*please describe any discrepancies in the above table*): We have decided not to pursue deliverable #3 given limited resources. Due to advance travel planning, we have conserved budget to cover more trips for the Commissioner Speaker Corps. A decision was also made not to hire an external PR resource and instead to leverage the PR connections of local organizers. We would like to reallocate the funds for Activity #3 instead to the first two deliverables.

Name of person responsible for grant administration:

(Please note that this should be the person with whom we can contact about the program and can expect a prompt response)

Cynthia Dai and Stan Forbes

Address of person responsible for grant administration:

Citizens Redistricting Commission,
1017 L Street, PMB 563, Sacramento,
CA 95814

Signature of person responsible for grant administration:

Date:

3/11/2019