Commercially Sexually Exploited Children
Identification and Awareness Training
2014-2015 Report

Background
For the 2014-2015 year, California Department of Social Services contracted the Northern California Research and Training Academy to provide this training for the 28 counties served in the Northern region. Utilizing collaboratively developed learning objectives, a training curriculum and resource materials were developed and a comprehensive training plan was developed to offer trainings throughout the Northern California region to child welfare, FFA and community partners between January and June 2015.

Executive Summary
The Northern California Research and Training Academy (NCRTA) provided a total of fifty-six (56) 6-hour training sessions. They were delivered throughout the Northern California region to a total of 1,845 participants from January to June, 2015. The course, “Commercially and Sexually Exploited Children and Youth 101: Identification and Awareness” was designed to provide a basic understanding to all child welfare staff, foster family agency staff, tribal partners and other community partners. The NCRTA developed a plan to offer these trainings throughout the 28 county Northern region to all of these partners within the timeframe as well as develop its own curriculum based on the statewide learning objectives and its own knowledge evaluation to look at the increase in knowledge of its participants. This report outlines the services provided and outcome data.

About the Northern California Research and Training Academy
As part of the Center for Human Services at UC Davis Extension, the Northern California Research and Training Academy provides training, research, evaluation and consultation to 28 Northern California counties. The counties include rural and urban counties with various training challenges for child welfare staff. The Academy recognizes the priority need for
integrated training across disciplines in the region, and we are committed to delivering high-level training and other professional services to meet counties’ needs.

Scope of Work
The Regents of the University of California, Davis, Northern California Research and Training Academy was contracted to develop a curriculum and provide a training mandated by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for child welfare staff, foster family agency staff, tribal partners and other community partners and local service providers, serving this population on the identification and awareness of commercially and sexually exploited children. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) required 6-hour training sessions be provided to the Northern training region by the end of June 2015 to address the basic identification and awareness training needs of child welfare staff and partners. In addition, trainings were required to be provided by qualified trainers with experience in CSEC, and curriculum was required to be approved by CDSS and implemented into training. Further, work was to be completed in conjunction with the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP), CalSWEC, and the statewide training system to develop a training plan, build trainer capacity (via training for trainers) and deliver trainings per the agreed upon training plan.

Using the scope of work outlined and approved by CDSS, a curriculum was developed on the commercial sexual exploitation of children and youth through a survivor-led and trauma-informed lens. Drawing upon best practices and empirically validated data, training attendees were provided with information on recognizing, responding to and investigating cases involving human trafficking. Tools for increasing awareness and addressing the particular vulnerabilities of special populations of children and youth were provided, with the goal of preventing the increase in new CSEC cases throughout Northern California.

Fifty-six (56) 6-hour training sessions were delivered in the 2014-2015 fiscal year throughout the Northern California region to 1,845 participants. The trainings were offered in a one day format to child welfare staff, community partners, foster family agency staff, and other local partners who provide child welfare services. The training offered included the statewide learning objectives and was delivered in the following format:

Welcome and Introductions
- Knowledge Pre-test
- Human Trafficking Terminology
Trainings Offered
In order to assess the training needs for the 28 counties served by the Northern California Research and Training Academy (NCRTA), a survey was developed and sent out to counties in November. After results were compiled, a comprehensive training plan was developed to serve the region. There were a total of 56 CSEC trainings offered in 23 locations throughout Northern California between January 14 and June 30, 2015. The 23 locations for the training included:

Bishop  Chico  Crescent City  Davis
Eureka  Loyalton  Marysville  Nevada City
Orland  Oroville  Red Bluff  Redding
Rocklin  Sacramento  Shingle Springs  Sonora
Stockton  Susanville  Sutter Creek  Ukiah
Weaverville  Yreka  Yuba City
Training Participant Characteristics
Each section of the training had an evaluation component, both for satisfaction and for knowledge. The results are compiled and summarized in the evaluation section of this report. The following table outlines the roles of the attendees of the CSEC classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSEC Attendees by Role/Professional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were 75 participants that we did not have data on for role/profession that were not included in the chart above.

In addition to the trainings offered to child welfare and all partner agencies throughout the Northern region, NCRTA also offered a training for CDSS staff on June 3, 2015. The training was provided to 26 staff using the same CSEC 101: Awareness and Identification curriculum. The evaluation for training provided to CDSS is outlined in the evaluation section of this report.

Northern California Research and Training Academy also partnered with hosting a training for its region with the Los Angeles County Probation Department and its trainers from Nola Brantley Speaks. A two-day train-the-trainer course was offered to 20 participants, targeting county staff and community partners who will provide future CSEC training. The training materials provided were developed by Los Angeles County Probation and entitled “Word on the Street.” It is anticipated another session will be offered in 2015-16. Because the NCRTA only hosted this training rather than provide content, the training evaluations were conducted by the trainers and will be included in their report on the scope of work. No separate evaluation was conducted by NCRTA, therefore it is not included in this report.

Evaluation of Training
A total of 1,513 evaluations were completed by participants throughout 54 of the 56 trainings (the final two evaluation results were not available in time for inclusion in this report due to the end of year deadlines). Within these daily evaluations, participants reported the following satisfaction rating for the following items (with a rating scale of 1-5, one being "Disagree" and 5
being "Agree"). The following were the items being evaluated and are summarized in the following section. For a full review of the data from these trainings, see Figure 7, the Participant Satisfaction Survey Results, at the end of this report. A digital spreadsheet can be made available upon request.

**Course Workshop**

1. Course objectives were clearly stated
2. Course Objectives were clearly met
3. Course provided a balance between theory and application
4. Course handouts were valuable

**Instructor**

1. Displayed a clear understanding of subject matter
2. Was effective in presentation style and delivery
3. Stimulated discussion and we responsive to participants

**Overall**

1. Overall educational value of the course
2. Overall teaching effectiveness of the course

**Course Length**

1. Just Right
2. Too Short
3. Too Long

**Course Level**

1. Just right
2. Tool Basic
3. Too Advanced
Participant Feedback and Ratings

Course Workshop

Participants were asked to rate the course for 1) how well the objectives were stated and met, 2) how well it balanced theory and application, and 3) the value of the materials provided. Overall for this section, participants rated the course at 4.73 out of 5. See Figure 1.

Figure 1. Participants Ratings of the Training Course Materials

Overall, the comments received by participants shared that they found the training to be powerful and had gained awareness around working with youth and possibly even parents who have been impacted by commercial sexual exploitation. Students were asked to provide feedback on strengths, areas for improvement and how the information would be applied. Here is a sample of comments from the evaluations:

Strengths:

• “It was definitely educational, especially since the trainers experienced it personally. It’s this definitely more powerful to hear.”
• “I valued the passion and drive each of the instructors had to understand the bigger picture of this problem. It helped provide perspective.”
• “I value the concept of not blaming the victim by requiring they testify or be prosecuted.”

Suggestions for Improvement:
• “I would break this into a 2-day class - there is so much info to grasp that the efficacy of what to do with it all is hindered.”
• “More discussion amongst participants.”
• “If we had more time, I'd love a more in depth discussion/practice of how to talk with youth in these situations interview techniques for youth.” ~ Participant
• “Find out about and share local resources.”

Application:
• “I feel more equipped to handle this situation more effectively now. I also feel more knowledgeable on how to navigate through the system (welfare, judicial, etc.).”
• “It is nice to gain a deeper understanding of issues in order to identify signs and symptoms as well as maintain empathy and understanding for victims.”
• “Open discussion with our agency, seek out agencies that specialize in treatment of the sexually exploited youth.”
• “This information will contribute to our analysis and development of agency policy & education curricula.”

Instructor
Participants were asked to rate the course for how well the instructor displayed understanding of the subject matter, effectiveness of their presentation style and delivery, how discussion was opened up, and whether they were responsive to students. Overall for this section, participants rated the course at 4.84 out of 5. See Figure 2 for the ratings of the individual items.
Overall, the comments received by participants shared that they found the instructors to be engaging and that the instructor/survivor model was effective for participants. Students were asked to provide feedback on strengths, areas for improvement and how the information would be applied. The following is a sample of comments from the evaluations:

**Strengths:**
- “Great balance w/survivor experience & theoretical. Held everyone's interest throughout.”
- “Amazing training! Best and most informative training I've been to all year. Catie and Emily really complement one another in the manner of how they put out the information. No repetitiveness.”

> “Amazing training! Best and most informative training I've been to all year. Catie and Emily really complement one another in the manner of how they put out the information.” ~ Participant

- “The fact that the instructors have personal experience and investment in the topic and were willing to share their story made the training more effective.”
Suggestions for Improvement:
- “Need aim specific to child welfare & how CSEC youth can be assisted under WIC 300.”
- “Since this is based on educating child welfare there needs to be more understanding & focus by presenters on child welfare system & dependency process.”
- “It felt faith based organizations were not valued and referenced as problematic.”

Application:
- “Working collaboratively with other agencies to develop a local protocol for CSEC.”
- “Yes! I will work with providers to ensure that they know how to identify and help the CSEC population.
- I am inspired to learn more to help the community.”

Overall
Participants were asked to provide an overall rating for the course for overall effectiveness of teaching and educational value. Overall for this section, participants rated the course at 4.77 out of 5. See Figure 3.

Figure 3.

Overall, the comments received by participants shared that they found the instructors to be engaging and that the instructor/survivor model was effective for participants.
Course Length

87.22% of the participants reported the course length was just right, 9.33% reported that the course was too short and 3.5% indicated it was too long. See Figure 4.

Overall, the comments received by participants shared that they found the course to be just right in length, but the comments made by participants also included many suggestions to make this a two day course to allow for more discussion, group work and skills based trainings. Below is a sample of these comments.

• “I would like a longer version - 2 to 3 days in length. We need tools on how to immediately apply to the youth in our direct care.”

“Longer to allow time to explore more cases and use application.” “…more technique building, skill based”. ~ Participant

• “Longer to allow time to explore more cases and use application.” “...more technique building, skill based.”
Course Level
96.07% of the participants indicated the course level was just right, while 3.93% that reported it was too basic for the audience 0.40% indicated the level was too advanced. See Figure 5.

Figure 5.

![Pie chart showing participants' overall satisfaction with the level of the training content (N=1513).]

- Just Right: 96%
- Too Basic: 4%

Overwhelmingly, the comments received by participants shared that they found the course level to be just right.

For additional information or copies of the individual course evaluation results, please contact the Northern California Research and Training Academy.

Knowledge Evaluation
Pre/Post CSEC/Y Knowledge Tests
In consultation with the CSEC/Y trainers, the NCRTA developed a 15 item knowledge test administered at pre and post training. While the same knowledge test questions were offered on the posttest, the items of the questions were in a different order. Knowledge tests that had incomplete pre and posttest information were not included in the analyses. The CSEC/Y knowledge tests were administered by paper and consisted of multiple choice questions and true/false style questions.

Average Test Scores
In examining participant performance on the overall knowledge tests, there was a significant increase in participants answering questions correctly from before the training ($M=.54$, $SD=.15$).
to after the training ($M=.75$, $SD=.14$); $t(1112)=43.84$, $p<.00$ (see Figure 6). Additionally, the average pretest knowledge score was positively and significantly correlated with the posttest knowledge score, ($r=.42$, $p<.01$).

Figure 6. Mean knowledge test scores across trainings from pre to post training.

![CSEC/Y KNOWLEDGE TESTS PRE TO POST TRAINING (N=1113)](image)

Comments from the knowledge test were compiled and organized to help instructors revise and update presentation styles and materials to improve knowledge gain during courses. The following are some examples of comments shared by participants:

**Strengths**

- "Very informative training. Topics were appropriate for educating. More local resources available would be beneficial."

Would like to learn more about skills/techniques to engage CSEY victims in making changes (after they have chosen to leave "the life") ~ Participant

---
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• "I think [the instructors] presented on this subject thoroughly. I would like to know how to get involved and would like to thank [the instructors] for showing [their] story and using it as a way to empower others and educate the community. Thank you."

• "Maybe just longer to explore more cases. Overall amazing training!"

Challenges

• "Working with victims in Tribal committees where services are often limited and confidentiality can be a significant issue as people in positions who have access to information are often related to people reports are made for."

• "I would like to hear details on a variety of successful cases that had interventions which resulted in desired outcomes, a variety of them demonstrating specifically what took place in the service process (what was done by whom, when and including perp and survivor.)"

• "I would only suggest that religion is not talked down upon without also showing positive sides."

Suggestions

• "I would like a little more info on trauma-informed practice, i.e., how to avoid unintentionally triggering a victim."

• "I think that criminalizing CSEY victims is still a problem and I would love to see discussion around providing services for victims in precontemplation without criminalizing/pushing - e.g., placing victims in locked facilities."

• "Screening tool for CSEY evidence-based practices for healing."

• "Additional resources for Northern California, additional skill building as to how to talk to youth to determine if they are a victim of CSEY."

• "Interviewing workshop for social workers in CPS who may come across referrals that involve human trafficking."

• "Present a panel of survivors to talk w/ group, so they get perspective of where coming from, especially former foster youth."

• "Having county counsel and judges also have the training. Educate, educate, educate."

• "Maybe role play conversations or do activities to offer more hands-on advice on how to apply what we learned. Explain specifically how to apply all the great info we’ve learned to each person’s field job. Or ask us to think that out during training and share w/ group, make a poster, etc."

• "I think it would be great to educate youth (who may be at risk) about the possibility of CSEY to prevent getting caught in the cycle before it starts."
• "Would like to learn more about skills/techniques to engage CSEY victims in making changes (after they have chosen to leave "the life")."
• "Perhaps have more of a Q&A portion and maybe demonstrating/roleplaying as a social service provider ways of addressing survivors at their different phases."
• "Highlight what "rules" can help when CSEC is placed w/a foster caregiver. What should the caregiver do?"
Trainer Bios

Emily Sims, B.A., M.A., Born in San Francisco and raised in Marin County, Emily Sims is the Founder and Director of West Marin Advocacy, a nonprofit organization providing services to survivors of family and community violence in rural and isolated areas throughout Marin. As a survivor of childhood sexual abuse, and commercial sexual exploitation as a young adult, Emily emphasizes trauma-informed interventions, strength-based practices and motivational interviewing when working with individuals and families.

Emily received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Golden Gate University in 2001. In 2011, she completed her Master of Arts degree in Interdisciplinary Studies at Sonoma State University, focusing on Public Administration and Women's and Gender Studies.

Emily advocates for the creation and implementation of equitable and inclusive services, particularly addressing the needs of LGBTQ youth and undocumented survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Through training community members, social service and law enforcement agencies, she strives to increase the availability of long-term housing, access to education and employment opportunities for survivors of abuse and exploitation.

Catherine Hart, B.A., was born & raised in Boulder Colorado, and moved to the Bay Area in 1998. She is the survivor of seven years of sexual exploitation. Since escaping her perpetrator in 2006, she has completed almost 300 hours of trauma therapy, and earned a degree in Sociology from UC Berkeley. For the past two years she has worked to fight human trafficking, both with the San Francisco Police Department’s Special Victim’s Unit, as well as various non-profits in the Bay Area.

Charles Cacciatore, JD, is a Deputy District Attorney with the Marin County District Attorney's Office, where he has been employed for 30 years. Since the beginning of 2014, Chuck has been specially assigned to prosecute human trafficking cases and is the District Attorney's representative on the Human Trafficking Task Force, which his office co-chairs. For the past 6 years, Chuck has been the supervisor of the Family Violence Unit, responsible for case review and filing, plea negotiations, jury trials, training, and supervising the Domestic Violence Unit trial team. The Family Violence Unit includes the prosecution of child abuse and physical elder abuse cases.

Chuck is responsible for drafting and updating the Marin County Law Enforcement Domestic Violence Protocol and the Marin County Human Trafficking Protocol. Chuck is the assigned
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supervisor for the Marin County Family Violence Court and the Marin County Adult Drug Court. Chuck is the District Attorney's Office California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, Violence Against Women Vertical Prosecution (VV) Program Deputy District Attorney and Program Coordinator. Chuck is a Police Officers Standards and Training Certified Instructor and has presented for the California District Attorneys Association and for AEquitas: The Prosecutors' Resource on Violence Against Women.
## Figure 7. Participant Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Course or Workshop</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/14/2015</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2015</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2015</td>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/2015</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/2015</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2015</td>
<td>Nevada City</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/2015</td>
<td>Sutter Creek</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/2015</td>
<td>Oroville</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/2015</td>
<td>Weaverville</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2015</td>
<td>Crecent City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2015</td>
<td>Rocklin</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Value1</th>
<th>Value2</th>
<th>Value3</th>
<th>Value4</th>
<th>Value5</th>
<th>Value6</th>
<th>Value7</th>
<th>Value8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/16/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/2015</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2015</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2015</td>
<td>Ukiah</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2015</td>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2015</td>
<td>Eurekaville</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/2015</td>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2015</td>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>Loyalton</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2015</td>
<td>Susanville</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2015</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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