

**California 2020 Census Statewide Funders’ Initiative Meeting**

**March 25, 2019 | 11:00am – 2:00pm**

The California Census 2020 Statewide Funders’ Initiative was established in 2017 in order to achieve two overarching goals:

* To ensure that hard-to-count populations in California are accurately counted
* To build a stronger movement infrastructure across the state that can improve opportunities and conditions for Californians who have been politically, economically, and socially marginalized

**Meeting Agenda**

**Facilitators:**

Tara Westman, The California Endowment

Huong Nguyen-Yap, Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Time | Description |
| 10:30am | Coffee and Arrival |
| 11:00 – 11:15am | **Welcome and Introductions**  **Agenda Overview and Purpose**  ***Tara Westover, The California Endowment***   * Thanked everyone who has worked to organize the meeting possible * Acknowledged Malina Sanchez, a co-chair, is currently speaking in Sacramento as part of a PPIC panel * The Census will launch April 1st, 2020, so we are one year out * Shared a congratulations to all the groups that have been awarded contracts by the state * This table shows the value of getting organized early and being able to respond to this extraordinary offer by the state * Now that we’re one year out, we’re moving from planning and mobilizing of funders to the implementation and action stage |
|  | **Census 2020 Reflections**  ***Tara Westover, The California Endowment***   * We have about 16 RSVPs for our April meeting. Contact Karla with Philanthropy CA for an invitation. * Attended Washington, D.C. meeting. Quarterly meeting of Democracy Funders subgroup.   + Met Census Bureau director and two deputies. Sworn in earlier this year. He spoke from talking points that emphasized there is nothing amiss with the census.   + Referred questions to deputies who are more knowledgeable than him.   + Many detailed questions about confidentiality. The response was largely ‘the law is the law.’ Also said they would be introducing ‘noise’ to prevent individual identification.   + Pleasant meeting, but sense was that there was no real exchange during the meeting   + Appears that noncitizens will not be allowed to work as Census workers * Citizenship question   + Unless the Census legislation is attached to there is must pass legislation, it is unlikely we will have a resolution through Congress.   + The court cases are proceeding, with the Supreme Court taking up the case in April.   + Some states are considering setting up legal funds in order to protect people whose identities may be breached. * Budget overall is in better shape for fiscal year 2019. Census has received somewhat more than it expected. Next year is key, with the budget due to balloon by an additional $8 billion. Some uncertainties about passage, given recent struggles to pass anything.   + There are Republican champions for the Census, mainly out of concerns for rural communities as well as Native American communities within Republican districts. * There is a free book, released by Bill O’Hare, who is one of foremost researchers on the Census. Will share how to download that book.   ***Cecilia Chen, Northern California Grantmakers***   * There is an amicus brief led by Bauman Foundation, Philanthropy CA, and FCCP in the census citizenship question case   + The brief is focused on philanthropy’s use and reliance on Census data. Signed by a broad range of stakeholders.   + Effort to ensure brief is representative of the nation. Signatories invited to ensure representation across CA, blue states, red states, purple states, as well as across issue areas, homelessness, health, housing, education, etc.   + Brannan Center thinks a nonpartisan perspective is strategic, targeting conservatives on the court. It is taking a ‘vanilla’ approach to avoid painting philanthropy in a partisan manner.   + Due April 1st, so working actively to finalize.   + Brennan Center believes it would not be helpful to have a brief signed on by a lot of California foundations, so the invitation was not shared widely. * NILC is also filing an amicus brief.   + Relies mainly on three reports from San Joaquin Valley Health Fund Census research. Those reports all review the devastating impacts, via individual interviews and focus groups, both on undocumented individuals and all sorts of others. Analysis shows it will be an incomplete Census in SJV and CA.   + Several foundations have signed on, as well as many nonprofit organizations.   + The meeting day was the deadline to sign onto that brief.   Q&A   * Q: When they say they are introducing ‘noise,’ what does that mean?   + Tara: It distorts data by introducing ways in which, if you tried to pull that information out at the individual level, it would not lead you to that person. Some have expressed concerns that will disrupt the data, but the Census bureau says that’s not a concern. It’s a defensive mechanism that the Census is using because of privacy concerns. They will do additional testing this summer.   + Democracy Funders will meet around the same time as the Supreme Court decision is rendered. April 1st is both when the amicus briefs are due, but it’s also Census day, so we’re uncertain whether media attention will look at amicus briefs or other Census related news. * Q: Legal funds are being created for individuals whose identities are breached. Can you comment? That seems really scary for those arguing that protections are in place. Why does MN and other places feel compelled to offer this?   + Tara: I don’t know enough to answer your questions fully. MN has been focused on this for a long time. Council on Foundations has been using the phrase ‘we’ve got your back.’ They believe a legal fund would be helpful.   + Huong: They’re thinking of all the scenarios that could take place, including the worst-case scenarios. * Q: To the extent that Census block information is available, it wouldn’t be hard to figure out who is there, given there’s only 3-4 households per block in the Central Valley.   + Tara: The noise is intended to resolve that, but we will look at that in more detail. |
| 11:30 – 12:30pm | **Subgroups Discussions**  **Power and Movement Building**: *Tessa Callejo and Vy Nguyen*   * Two goals as statewide funders table:   + 1) Ensure hard to count communities are counted;   + 2) build statewide infrastructure and capacity * Subgroup goals:   + 1) provide funders with suggestions on including movement building opportunities in their grantmaking;   + 2) inform the evaluation approach * The Census is seen as a good power and movement building opportunity because it helps organizations meet, work together, and ‘date before marriage’   + Power and Movement Building consists of Long-term vision beyond any campaign for equity and justice; unites groups across issues, race, and place; authentically engages communities; builds civic engagement * Process: Interviews and work with USC PERE and existing research * Recommendations:   + Our recommendations are intended for use by individual and pooled funds; for organizing groups and direct service; designed to signal, encourage and support nonprofit orgs   + Overarching principles: Explicitly communicate your interest; co-design goals and metrics with grantees; minimize burdens to nonprofits; look to pooled funds to prioritize power and movement building   + Grantmaking: Provide general operating support to orgs with power-building lens; fund grassroots outreach and organizing groups; fund infrastructure that will outlasts census; ask grant applicants to ID at leas one movement-building goal; fund groups supporting leadership of communities of color, particularly Black community; don’t restrict outreach messaging to Census only; fund intermediaries that can convene and train.   + Beyond the Grant: Webinar/in-person training series on phone-banking, canvassing, etc. with movement-building lens; statewide and/or regional nonprofit convenings; statewide post-census debriefs. Interest if there are funders who want to take these on. If so, we could move forward with estimating implementation options and costs.   *Discussion*   * San Diego: Do we have a sense now of how many funders with interest in the Census have expressed interest in power building?   + Vy: Early discussions it had a good amount of interest. Would love a temperature check. Now is a good time, given we’re at a phase of making grants. * Wes Sands: One focus of our work is doing outreach to hard-to-count communities, which are often rural, while the other is movement-building, which often done in more concentrated population areas. Wondering how movement building strategy fits into that? It sounds like a situation that is city-based versus rural. Do the subgroup members reflect those areas?   + Tessa: If you look at the back of the documents that were sent out, you’ll see the subgroup members. It was a mixture of different foundations looking at it from a variety of organizational perspectives. We were hoping to come up with concrete recommendations and test this further. What we’re talking about is not movement building in a generic sense, but the future of the state.   + Ellen: Shared an experience on movement building from a rural perspective: The Region 6 and Region 4 ACBOs both applied with an approach that was very much a movement building approach. The organizations involved have found, through their integrated voter engagement work, that rural immigrants are super excited about this work. Access to drinking water is connected to voting. Those partners have already started outreach around these issues. We have demonstrated experience that integrated voter engagement strategies are likely to be successful. It’s not the sole strategy, but it is the driving strategy.   + Jonathan: One of the things that the IVE groups have been able to do is expand their database. A lot of groups are beginning to combine voter data and consumer data. It helps organizations branch out to do additional work. It’s a very privileged group, even if you’re just a registered voter, compared to unregistered or those without legal status. * Vy: Slides will be shared. Folks who were interviewed are included in the documents. Interviews and feedback on metrics can also be shared. This is meant to be a draft. Best thinking both from funders and on the ground. * Q: Referring to continuing evaluation, Is the recommendation to pursuing something similar to what USC PERE did in 2010? Interested in connecting groups who do direct service to organizing groups and others.   + Vy: I didn’t go into our evaluation recommendations. We’ve tried to have linkages between the subcommittees. The two-year recommendation was based on advice that you need to consider to what extent groups are still working together one or two years after conclusion of the Census work.   **Young Children**: *Richard Thomason, Blue Shield of California Foundation*   * Our mission is to surface strategies to reduce the young child undercount * This was the largest group missed in the 2010 census, over the last several census’ this group has fallen the most * Many factors contribute to this, but largely they are in larger households or multi-family households. Four out of five households in which return the form. It’s not that they’re not responding, it’s that they’re not counting the children. * Partnership for America’s Children is leading this effort. Created a CountAllKids.org website with information. * By June, message testing will be complete on what messages and messengers would help. Bill O’Hare is working on an outreach tool. Also sign up at CountAllKids.org for updates. * We’re trying to wrestle with how best to reach out to service providers, which is very important.   + One key group will be your friendly local First 5’s. They are developing some convenings. Encouraged everyone to connect with local First 5s.   *First 5 Representatives*   * We’re working on bringing together every count in the region in teams of 5. Working in sync with counties, state, ACBOs, and generally seeking to avoid duplication. Partnering with NALEO.   + First meeting is April 3rd in the Bay Area. Each county will lead the convening with their draft plan that will run through June 2020.   + Looking at funded and unfunded partners. Rolling those plans up to identify regional crossover and coordinate those efforts to create a statewide strategy. * Tapping into existing First 5 model. Using broader footprint across the state to do this work. The current materials don’t represent the 0-5 community well.   + This is our first Census, which is shocking and surprising to us. Across this community, there just isn’t a lot of 0-5 representation in these efforts, partly because First 5 wasn’t involved. * We fund over 1,000 CBOs across California, large and small. We’re hoping that is movement building, where they are even closer to the ground than we are.   + Been able to help various groups understand the urgency of this work and these deadlines. * Other key point: For funders are interested in a pooled fund, the LA Partnership has a fund in LA area, but could expand to statewide.   *Kaci, LA Partnership*   * One of tools in our arsenal is a pooled fund. Don’t have a lot of apparatus, so can deploy fund sin a rapid way. Staff vets recommendations and brings to investor’s committee and decides yes-or-no. Funds can move quickly as that is the decision-making process and can be done by phone or email.   + We will establish a Census Fund investors committee, i.e., those funders who participate will be the investors committee. Meeting with larger committee on Weds to lay out this plan. Will develop an RFP.   + We have dollars that can go out right now for translation of a toolkit. However, do not have RFP yet. Considering whether to sending dollars out door or wait for RFP.   + Huong: This is a working draft, so send any recommendations to HY. * Curious to know more about 4 of 5 children in households who did return questionnaire.   + Richard: Research Bill O’Hare is doing is into reasons for 4 out of 5 missed being in households who return forms. Some of it has been into how enumerators work and how questions are asked. Over next couple months, as research around the outreach tool come out, we’ll have more information. It will be interesting to see where the outreach tool suggests we target our resources. I would guess there will be overlap with HTC communities, but we will see. More to come in next couple months. Connect with Partnership for America’s Children to learn more, they will be doing webinar to get this information out. * Vy: In recommendations, we note utility of using webinars to collaborate, and the connection to power-and-movement building suggestion around webinars.   + Tara: Already webinars on some of these projects. Bill O’Hare and that effort will be important in understanding the resources that already exist. * For the LA Partnership pooled fund, when you think about opening up statewide, is there a sense of where geographic targeting will be useful? Is it distributed across the state?   + Kaci: We haven’t thought that far in advance for geographic dispersal. Want to make available because it can be used for rapid response. Interested in discussing geographic and strategic focus once we have buy-in.   **Evaluation:** *Tara Westman*   * Since last quarterly meeting, we have taken feedback we’ve received on our approach to evaluation, what reflects our table’s priorities, what reflects the workgroups, and what can be reasonably expected, given we have a budget for this. * We hoped input from last meeting would help us to narrow, but it didn’t. It tells us we want to do it all. The workgroup thus took on the role of narrowing and defining. You’ll see they are aligned with the larger group roles. * Raised a potential $320,000 for this evaluation. Many thanks to all who have put funding toward this. * Preethi: This is meant to be something that will ground the current thinking around evaluation. The details are something the evaluator can help us work through. Will walk through the big buckets. Tried to pull together youth * The project description seeks to articulate the purpose of the evaluation:   + 1) Outcomes or effectiveness of grantee partners;   + 2) information on the process itself and how the group worked together. * Evaluation approach: One area we’d love input on is how formative vs summative this should be. Do we want this to inform ongoing processes and/or sum up the efforts that have been made? * Key to have a community or equity focused evaluation, so it’s key to have a community voice in the evaluation. * Questions will be massaged by evaluator to ensure they are effective and appropriate. Take the individual questions with a grain of salt but consider them more in terms of themes.   *Discussion*   * Can the evaluation collect baseline data for power and movement building and how would it do so? What relationships already exist and what groups are already working together?   + Preethi: Great question. I don’t know what data exists and in what form. Key question for evaluator: how do we take stock of what data exists? It also depends on whether we do a more formative or summative report how that would be performed. * How much time there is do the formative piece? And maybe the summative piece would be focused on certain issues? Could it be tied to redistricting?   + Tara: We’re asking ourselves: To what degree it will be useful? What will be valuable to them in real time? We’re going to have to sort out how much formative can be done during Census implementation. Our initial thought is more weighted to the summative section. Re redistricting, that is not something that came up within the groups we discussed. If we start an additional topic.   + Tessa: When we did the interviews with the nine organizations redistricting did come up repeatedly as a concern and an interest and one of the groups that was just funded statewide. Maybe it didn’t make it distinctly into the recommendations, but it was mentioned.   + Preethi: Question about timing is a really good question. We want to be clear what we would do with the data we collect. If we can’t do anything with the information in the time that we have, we may not want to proceed in that manner. * Curious about focus on youth and movement building and whether that lands well with everyone.   + Tara: When you think about children, they live within families that are cross-cutting. But within power-and-movement building, we know there are a multiple efforts across populations. We will know about a lot more than just children. Preethi: It’s hard to articulate all the connections between these different areas. * It would be good to add a sentence. For us, immigrants are an area of focus we would like to include.   + Preethi: We can absolutely add that. * Tara: Next steps include beginning to make grants to GCIR; continue the search for and evaluator; and ask for table’s agreement.   **Communications:** *Jonathan Tran and Stephania Ramirez*   * Has only held one call as a subgroup * Recognized GCIR team for supporting their survey * Analysis and findings from 20-person survey is still being finalized, but we were excited to see the level of participation * Next steps:   + 1) use survey to identify gaps that exist, in coordination with state’s activities;   + 2) developing a comprehensive timeline to visualize different communications efforts;   + 3) developing strategies to share design resources and other collateral that people are developing * Stephania: Will be following up over next few weeks to share the summary of the findings. * Tessa: If you have concerns, please raise them after this meeting. This is a collective effort. Give us feedback.   *Discussion*   * Vanessa: Our focus is making the Census lovable and relatable. Maggie from United Philanthropy Forum has confirmed that The Count from Sesame Street is available for the Census. In Ventura County, looking to use this widely. Great way to intersect the work on the youth side and power and movement building.   + What I witnessed on the last complete count committee was not something I’d ever had in a professional experience. Very inclusive and remarkable. We need to think about how we can solidify these relationships from a meaningful long-term perspective. We have all these complete count committees and they all look so different. We need to start to have merchandize and things that solidify that collegiality. * Kaci: we’ve been in contact with PBS as well. Will be in touch with Jonathan. * Ellen: In San Joaquin Valley, have two ACBO regions, six and four. We see the fact of SJV being cut into two regions as an artificial barrier. We’ve been talking about the logo for the whole SJV be Count with Me / Cuenta Con Migo. |
| 12:30pm – 12:45pm | **Break and Grab Lunch** |
| 12:45 – 1:45pm | **California Complete Count: State Strategies + Q&A**  *Justyn Howard, Deputy Secretary for Census*   * Started with $100M budget; governor included additional $54M in most recent budget * Budget needs to be enacted by June 15th * Strategy: Utilizing trusted messengers to reach HTC communities. Not targeting all Californians but tailoring to 13.5 M HTC households. * Strategy: Goal is to maximize resources on the ground: build strong base of trusted community voices; allow for in-person impressions that are key; facilitate culturally appropriate engagement; break down language access barriers; combat disinvestment campaigns; allow for and responses and deployment of resources. * Funding allocations: more than half to outreach, more than a quarter to media campaigns, other smaller slices * Ground game is focused on:   + 1) hard to count based on where they live;   + 2) hard to count based on who they are;   + 3) how to reach them, such as utility companies, counties, entertainment, faith-based organizations, etc., also known as geographic, demographic, and sector-based methods. * County Outreach: $26.7 million allocated directly to counties   + Counties will serve as fiscal agents to target hard to count populations within their boundaries   + Based funding amounts on the CA HTC index   + Some counties received population-based minimums   + 45 of 58 counties have opted in. Counties have recently received their first tranche of funding. First step was to finalize county. Have until end of May to develop their strategic plan.   + What will be done with funding for counties that chose not to participate?     - San Diego county will participate, but not as fiscal agent. Stockton will serve as fiscal agent for their city, which represents 2/3 of San Joaquin county. Will augment contracts with additional details. * Native American and Tribal Government Outreach   + Historically hard to count and undercounted. Diverse population that presents unique challenges.   + Direct funding to tribal governments to do outreach, in many cases very small micro grants to do community event. Funding based on number of households in service area.   + Looking to ensure Tribal governments are included in everyone else’s plan, particularly ACBOs. Providing funding to certain statewide CBOs that touch Native American communities.   + Provided the opportunity for 68 tribal governments to participate with the state: 12 have opted in; 14 have committed to opting in; another 19 are in active communications.   + Once we get a hold of the tribal organizations, they tend to opt in, but 22 organizations have not had contact with yet. One has indicated they do not want to participate in outreach or potentially the census count at all. * Of $54 million, setting aside $10 million for ACBO contracts. The amounts will depend on non-response follow-up plans and where we need forces on the ground to implement. [All ACBO awards have been set.](https://census.ca.gov/2019/03/12/acbo-winners/) Finalizing contracts before the funds are released. * For statewide ACBO Outreach: RFP has closed.   + Awards were announced last Friday. Awardees are [listed online](https://census.ca.gov/2019/03/22/news-release-state-census-office-announces-more-community-partners/).   + We’ve awarded $4 million. Have another $6 million to award to statewide demographic groups. Such as Middle Eastern Northern African, seniors and older adults, homeless, children 0-5, disabled, others. Some of additional funds will go to existing groups, either through awardees or to other groups. * Education Sector Outreach: Provide $1.75 million to 40 county offices of education. This helps them capture 98% of targeted Title I and Title III children. Schools without those populations may not receive any awards. * Sector Outreach: working on a plan to determine the key methods that we intend to fund in those areas.   + Put out outreach and public relations RFP. $16 m available immediately, with additional $30 M as part of Governor’s budget. RFP due March 15 and contracts will start in June.   + Focus of campaign is hardest to count communities   + Required to work with local, ethnic media   + Collaboration with community-based organizations and local governments is required   + Message testing and vetting required   + Priority audience demographics include Asian Pacific Islander; African American; Latino   + Bidders conference on March 29th; evaluation team will rank bidders; oral interviews and presentation by top three bidders with State Census office; state will potentially negotiate with top one or two bidders. * Language Access: Critical and permeates throughout all of Census office work. Census Office is developing standards that all partner organizations will be required to follow; only state with such standards; the standards being developed will not be one-size-fits-all and will adjust based on geographic regions. * Other Funded Efforts:   + Contingencies and Emergencies: Set aside $1 million for enumeration process   + LUCA is over and awaiting federal government response   + California Housing Population Sample Enumeration: proposing $4 million, program run by Department of Finance’s demographic research unit     - will help target our outreach by doing a 20,000-person target sample enumeration process; improve their own demographic estimates and determine whether models they use are valid and make sense, will happen after the Census   + Outreach Team: 5 offices throughout state, diverse 16 person staff   + SWORD: Any foundation receiving statewide funding can receive access to SWORD.     - Setting up process to request user login to the online SWORD tool. It’s the statewide repository for all outreach being done by the state. * Between June and September, kicking off second round of convenings.   + Bringing in everyone who state is funding to review strategic plans and determine how best to implement them.   + 27 convenings located strategically across California.   Questions   * Q: What evaluative activities will the state be undergoing? Who would be the best person(s) to talk to about access to data and to understand how the state will evaluate itself in this process?   + It seems like a lot of the strategic plans are coming in at a similar time. Over the summer communities and regions will be looking through those. Will there be a time for us to look at what areas are covered and what are the pockets or gaps that we should direct funding? * Q: In terms of timing, when would ACBOs be expected to subgrant to groups on the ground? * Q: Re the infrastructure of ACBOs, we’re building an interactive web platform to manage the inflow of correspondents from our region. How can we better learn about the technology and resources available?   + Timing of ACBO subgrants: Once we ‘let’ the contracts, i.e. signed by both parties, it will be up to when they have an approved strategic plan. We are not going to dictate when and organization is going to dictate the sub-granting process. Likely waiting until late May or sometime. Once we have an approved strategic plan, we will post those on our website. Regional program managers are currently evaluating draft strategic plans. We will post those on our website once those are finalized. We will find pockets or gaps. We already have gaps or concerns based on our statewide funding plan. Only putting $1.7 million to title I and III schools, but we are thinking more could be put there. Language access: concerns about whether we have translation services necessary for all the different areas of California.   + Evaluation: Hoping the California housing populations sample will give us some good insight on whether message is adopted or not, as well as mapping where funding went. Will have response rate data on a daily basis at a block level. Developing a template that talks about outreach activity performed, number of impressions, languages used, etc. When we do evaluation, we’ll know at least what was conducted, what happened in various communities. We hope that by being able to demonstrate the number of impressions we had, and uptake will inform us whether what we did was a success or not.   + Working on systems to determine how to handle. We’re looking at tools within our own office. We’re open to ideas. * Q: More clarity on the convenings? * Q: Watched last week’s hearing in Sacramento with the elected officials. Getting the impression some of them are only just coming to this topic. How could we work with the state to engage our elected officials? * Q: Is there any interface between the ACBO contracts and the communications contract? Will there be opportunities to interface and ensure there’s communication and alignment? * Q: When is state planning the SWORD training? Will that be opened up as well now that SWORD is available to others? A lot of us are also serving as ACBOs. The data management piece has been difficult to budget. Has the state considered using additional funding to make SWORD available to all the ACBOs without them having to incur additional costs?   + Communications contract: To engage and influence the public relations bidding, come to the bidder’s conference.   + Census Day: Aiming to have events Monday through Friday of next week to kick off the one-year-out stage.   + ACBOs interfacing with communications: Will facilitate through implementation workshop, and RRPMs will be having standard calls with those issued contracts, will look at duplication of efforts, trying to ensure they are on same page. Key goal is to ensure everyone is collaborating.   + SWORD Training: There will be training for those they have contracted with. ACBO dates he does not have on hand. No charge for SWORD, but each organization must have staffing to upload spreadsheets as necessary.   + Engage elected officials: Many still need Census 101. A lot of questions on the state board were more appropriate for the Census bureau than the state. Elected officials are often concerned if they do not know what is going on, but if they’re informed they’re typically on board.   + Justyn will get back to group on best person to engage on evaluation work. Need to designate a lead. * Q: Is there anything you want us to keep in mind or do?   + Justyn: Continuing to partner with us. The more information sharing we have back and forth the better. The more we know about what you’re doing will help us. Being a strong supporter. Information because this is all about coordination for us to identify where there are gaps. Information is key so we know where you’re investing. |
| 1:45pm – 1:55pm | **Next Steps, Announcements and Closing**     * We will continue to gather funding information from all of you. All of you should have received information. * Continue to work with the state to get questions answered and see where we can increase our partnerships. |
| 2:00pm | **Adjourn** |

**Meeting Locations and Video Conference Information**

Please note that the Los Angeles space is at capacity. If you haven’t registered but would like to join, we encourage you to join by video conference. Please contact Stephanie Ramirez, [stephanie@gcir.org](mailto:stephanie@gcir.org), if you have any questions about your meeting registration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Location | Address |
| Video Conference | Blue Jeans weblink: <https://bluejeans.com/u/359CR>  Audio dial in number: (408) 740-7256  Meeting ID: 213 928 1359 |
| Sacramento | *Progress Room - 1414 K. Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814* |
| Oakland | *Inclusion Room - 2000 Franklin St., Oakland, CA 94612* |
| Fresno | *Tulare Room, 2440 Tulare Street, Suite 420 Fresno, CA 93721* |
| Los Angeles | *Room 359, 1000 N. Alameda Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012* |