



Managing Disruptive & Transformative Change in the Media of Fundraising

Written by Chris Dann

In October 1977 David Ogilvy convened a three-day meeting at his French castle home, Chateau de Touffu, in Bonnes. The small group included account and creative executives from Ogilvy & Mather offices in New York, Amsterdam, and Milan and two of us from World Wildlife Fund, the International Executive Director, Charles de Haes, and me, then Managing Director of WWF-US.

In his call to the meeting, David explained that its goal was to immerse ourselves in the strategic applications and tactics of direct mail for WWF fundraising around the world, following on precedents being set in the United States. While I knew the reputation of the man known as the father of advertising, what I did not know was the strength of his convictions about what he called *direct advertising*.

In his second book, **Ogilvy on Advertising**, that would be published six years hence, David recounts his first experience with direct advertising in the early '30s, calling it his "secret weapon." A manual he wrote for door-to-door selling for the stove company for which he himself sold door-to-door helped land David a job at the advertising agency Mather and Crowther in London. As the novice he was assigned to help a man about to open a hotel but with only \$500 to spend on advertising. David spent the sum on postcards to names he took from the 'phone book, and the hotel opened filled to capacity.

David had just joined the Executive Committee of WWF's international board.



Earlier that year, during the annual meeting of affiliate CEOs and board chairs at the Secretariat in Switzerland, he had quizzed me about how we were marrying new technologies in high speed printing and donor database management to step up direct mail fundraising for WWF-US.

Changes in media technology and especially the development of new media always have impact on commerce. Thinking of fundraising as nonprofit commerce is a useful perspective by which to evaluate how it is served by media and what happens when changes come about.

Individual giving was changed profoundly some 40 years ago by events of the times and by the introduction of what for all intents and purposes was a new medium, direct mail. Now we are experiencing changes of the same or greater magnitude – we don't yet know – affected by evolution in the donor marketplace coincidental to the introduction of online.

This paper reviews the disruptive and transformative influences of direct mail in the past as prelude to understanding and managing the influences of online, including internet-based social applications.¹

¹But excluding telephone-based applications independent of the internet.

Direct Mail Disrupts and Transforms

It became clear in the '70s that these mid-boggling advances in computer-based technology were having such profound disruptive impact on fundraising as to change the entire complexion of the nonprofit sector. They were responsible for the radical growth of both new and established organizations, from Common Cause and National Organization of Women to The Nature Conservancy, Southern Poverty Law Center, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and the National Rifle Association.

No developments since – technological or otherwise – have been as disruptive until the emergence of online, again attended by equally radical developments in information technologies. And in the same way that studying social or political history can prevent repeating historical mistakes, so understanding the nature and magnitude of the disruptive influences of direct mail and telephone and their technological servants can usefully guide us through the disruptive influences of the these new media and their technologies.



While it can be said that the civil rights movement, the war in Vietnam, the women's movement, and Watergate had seminal influence on the explosive growth of the nonprofit sector in the '70s, it must be admitted that technologies bearing on how the organizations of those movements would be funded were essential to their viability and therefore their causes.

In addition to affecting expansion of the sector, the technologies and the medium of direct mail had enormous impact on the management of fundraising, on the management of organizations depending to any significant degree on the newly broadened bases of individual support, and on the people engaged in fundraising itself.

Changing Roles of Fundraisers

The roles of fundraisers were dramatically transformed. There emerged a rapidly-expanding cadre of nonprofit employees who were managers or clerks of process without either the skills or experience to engage in one-to-one donor cultivation or solicitation. And while some new titles were coined for these new positions, they were more for support staff – Database Administrator, for instance – than for those in charge. Professionals were still called Development Managers or Directors, yet they were doing much different things than those titles had theretofore denoted.

That mistakes were being made was evident in the radical surge in the rates of turnover. By the late 70s, Richard Taft of the Taft Group, a company keeping data tabs on the business, was reporting alarming turnover among fundraising managers. And to this day the problem of CEOs and COOs and human resource directors understanding what to look for on the resumes of development people persists. Most are fundraisers in effect but not in fact, and this I believe is half the reason a recent research study by the Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr Foundation and CompassPoint reported half of development directors anticipated leaving their jobs within two years and that 25% of executives reported their previous development director was fired.²

*While changing titles sounds like an insignificant matter, if you're responsible for recruiting, the consequence of misunderstanding the meaning of a title can be huge. The breadth and diversity of skills and experience associated with the titles involving the term **development** became analogous to the breadth and depth of skills and experience associated with the term **engineering**.*

Effecting Fundraising Management

The impact of direct mail and its technologies extended also to a disintegration of fundraising operations through the division of fundraising by high-speed media from fundraising through personal contact. Fundraising operations became separated into silos between or among which relations were – and continue to be – frequently frosty. This has happened at the cost of donors experiencing a constancy of relationship and engagement with organizations. It is a consequence that is the antithesis of the concept of donor value development.

All of these consequences paled, however, by comparison to the consequence of organizations deferring broad-base fundraising strategies and tactics to commercial direct mail services. While support services exploitation is a natural liability of the program /support services structure of nonprofit organizations, direct mail fundraising brought to the sector

²UNDERDEVELOPED A National Study of Challenges Facing Nonprofit Fundraising is available via CompassPoint at www.compasspoint.org

an enterprise that simply had to be outsourced to those with significant advantage of knowing how it worked and how it could work to their maximum financial benefit.³

Dies were cast. Analogously parallel technologies soon came to the telephone. Telephone fundraising – with the unfortunate term *telemarketing* – came on the scene with organizations just as ill-prepared to manage it and vendors just as well prepared to sell it on their own terms.

As with direct mail, vendors of telephone fundraising presumed to tell their organization clients what the standards of practice should be and how to measure performance. And in the cases of both mail and telephone, those measures served better the business interests of the vendors than the strategic and long-term donor base asset management interests of the organizations.

In recent years, vendors of canvassing services, albeit with no new technologies but taking exploitive advantage of the ubiquity of credit cards, seemed to have been inspired by conventionally poor standards of performance accountability to re-emerge in force in the high-traffic shopping areas and on the thresholds of homes in major markets across the country.

Tactics Rule and Sector Becomes Vulnerable

What's been overlooked are the essential strategies of donor retention, value development, and donor base growth, all set on a plane ramped so as to serve both the financial stability and increasing program financial capacities of organizations. In their place have been substituted tactical measures of immediate or near-term performance. For the most part they are measures of work with no regard to productivity.⁴



“Overlooked” is probably too gentle a term. The evidence abounds that media-tactical orientation has become institutionalized on a massive scale across the nonprofit sector. One can see it in the sector’s

conferences and conventions, in the trade media, in the curricula of trade schooling, in organizations’ IRS 990 filings, and in the organizations themselves through their staffing configurations, employment ads, and, especially, requests-for-proposals.

This is the context into which online and social media have entered the nonprofit sector. On the one hand, people and organizations unschooled and unaccustomed to planning and managing the business of fundraising anchored by essential strategies of donor base value development cannot deal with media and technologies

³True, the sector had always been vulnerable to outside fundraising service vendors. It’s amazing today to remember that prominent fundraising agencies well into the ‘70s actually owned the donor lists of their client organizations, the brokering of those lists being a lucrative sideline for those companies.

⁴In the cases of telemarketers and canvassers they aren’t even relevant measures of work.

poised to transform and disrupt their business models. On the other hand, a sector that predominantly takes its lead in employing media in fundraising from sellers of media and media services is ill-prepared to evaluate the highest and best uses of those media and to invest wisely.

Mentioned earlier was the “siloeing” of fundraising responsibilities. That has extended to media-specific silos. It is not uncommon to see fundraising media described as *programs*, i.e. *direct mail program* and *online program*, nor to find those programs and their staffs virtually cordoned off from one another as if the respondents to either media were sub-species or at least distinctive market segments.

Media Hits the Technology J-Curve

A J-Curve is what results if one plots the timing of new technological developments on one axis of a graph and on the other axis the consequence in productivity of whatever that technology deals with. Take, for example, the timing of technologies aimed at increasing travel speed, and imagine the increasing frequency of developments from the first automobile to the steam-powered engine to the diesel engine to the propeller-driven airplane to the jet aircraft and then to the rocket-powered spacecraft.

The J-Curve of combined technologies of the microchip and fiber optics has a shorter tail and a much steeper ascent, a pace that has almost defied our ability to

keep track, let alone pace. And because they are information technologies, they are media technologies. Their disruptive and transformative influences on media organizations themselves have been profound.

We have to understand a little bit about the physics of the microchip. It has enabled the reversal of what has been called *combinational explosion*, where increasing the number of interactions in a system slows the system down. The silicon mazes of microchips, however, have enabled technology to transcend the downside effects of exponentially growing complexity to produce increasing efficiency. No imagined complexity of interactions, interconnections, or switches defies this ever-advancing technology.

This *microcosmic* phenomenon of the microchip is what has been primarily responsible for the user engagement and control that characterizes the internet. Microcosm in information technology is a term given coinage in 1989 by George Gilder in his book under that title. The following year he was one of the authors published in the new media experiment, Whittle Direct Books. There's a passage in that book⁵ worth consideration here:

The force of microelectronics will blow apart all the monopolies, hierarchies, pyramids, and power grids of established industrial society... All hierarchies will tend to become “heteroarchies” – systems in which each individual rules his own domain...a society of equals.

⁵Life After Television - The Coming Transformation of Media in American Life, Whittle Direct Books, Knoxville, 1990

Quod Erat Demonstrandum

Think of it this way: if the internet, especially with its social applications can topple dictators, surely it has the capacity to disrupt and transform fundraising and nonprofit organizations' business plans. In situations like fundraising and starting revolutions, where the initiatives of the crowds are completely voluntary, the promulgator – bad dictator or good cause – does not control all the action. A nonprofit organization that wants to be around at the end of this decade is compelled to bring carefully into its mix of donor engagement media intelligent deployment of online and its social applications. And doing that involves a great deal more effort than calling on the services of a vendor of those services.

A Different Environment

To gauge just how disruptive or transformative the influences of these new media are on the nonprofit sector, it's also useful to look back at the differences between the environment into which direct mail emerged and the environment into which online has emerged.

Mentioned earlier was the fact that multiple strong social and political movements prepared both the nonprofit sector and the donor marketplace to embrace a new medium that had new capability for rapid deployment (in '70s terms) and capacity for huge volumes of broadly- cast solicitations.

Online and social media have emerged in an entirely different environment. There are no strong social or political movements urging organizations and donors to come together. Instead, the principal environmental factor of the times is one of substantial change in the demographic character of the marketplace.

Probably no one in business today understands changes in the marketplace better than IDEO. In his book, **Change By Design**, IDEO CEO Tim Brown wrote:

As consumers we are making new and different sorts of demands; we relate differently to brands; we expect to participate in determining what will be offered to us; and we expect our relationships with manufacturers and sellers to continue beyond the point of purchase.

To meet these heightened expectations, companies need to yield some of their sovereign territory over to the market and enter into two-way conversations with their customers.

There couldn't have been a better time for revolutionary developments in media of commerce for-profit or nonprofit, especially for developments that offer control to donors and support more intimate engagement with the organizations they support.

Donors are not only a subset of the consumer marketplace, they are a subset of very distinctive characteristics. Changes in the donor marketplace, while under the same influences that have brought about the characteristics Tim Brown describes, are manifest in particular changes in donor disposition and behavior.

Because all giving is voluntary, the practice of giving matures at the time in people's lives when their discretionary income is highest, and giving data consistently proves this. So the prime age range of giving is between the ages of 55 and 64, when discretionary income peaks. This is an age range now dominated by Baby Boomers.



Boomers have caused a proliferation of tomes and papers. Suffice to say here that they have proved themselves generally indisposed toward large organizations of any kind – business, government, or nonprofits – and disposed toward taking firm control not so much of how much they spend but how they spend. These dispositions extend to expectations of accountability of those who benefit from their spending.

Among Boomers is a generation of women playing a greater and different role in philanthropy than their mothers or grandmothers ever played. If not yet equitably compensated, they are nonetheless better educated, better employed, better heeled, and more financially independent than preceding generations of women.

Disruptive Influences

For ease of analysis, I am making a distinction here between influences that disrupt and those that transform. In only one respect do I foresee online and its social applications effecting both disruption and transformation. In all other respects, I see a few, albeit profound, disruptive influences and more transformational influences.

I foresee four principal disruptive influences of online and its social applications:

- Geographic or territorial transparency
- Illusory leveling of the fields of competition
- Displacement of domestic human welfare giving
- Charity facilitators

The internet is the medium of the flat Earth. In the same way as it makes markets for both the Japanese Lexus and the Italian olive, it allows any nonprofit organization to fundraise anywhere, whether actually entitled or not. The new medium is allowing organizations to stake claims where they do great damage to other organizations that are bound by choice to serving specific areas. Similarly, the new medium is encouraging national organizations to preempt as never before the role of regional or local affiliates.

Geographic transparency is one way the new medium enables illusory leveling of the fields of competition. There are others, most prominently including the fact that the costs of online and social media applications to fundraising are at levels that no longer require such financial resources as building donor bases by mail demanded. So an organization with a substantial investment in its field, not just in fundraising but also in program, can be undermined easily by one with a snappy brand and little skin in the game.

Encouraged by charity facilitators – described below – and by the persuasive advocacy of intellectuals such as Toby Ord at Oxford (see his essay, “The Moral Imperative Towards Cost Effectiveness” and www.givingwhatyoucan.org) and Peter Singer at Princeton (**The Life You Can Save**), there’s evidence that Americans’ support of international human welfare may be on the rise.⁶ Longstanding trend data tell us, however, that American donors at least don’t vary much their distribution of giving among types of institutions

and causes. So it is very likely that increased international giving in human welfare will come at the expense of domestic human welfare giving.

Toby Ord’s **GivingWhatYouCan** exemplifies the new phenomenon that we call charity facilitators. New ones seem to emerge daily. At this writing, some of the prominent include www.globalgiving.org, www.justgive.org, www.greatnonprofits.org. GuideStar (www.guidestar.org), while founded and well established as a source of information on nonprofit organizations, has lately taken on the role of facilitator in encouraging a sort of crowd-sourced review of nonprofits. (Great Nonprofits, more forthrightly, confesses to be the “Zagat” of nonprofit organizations.)

Charity facilitators come in two forms. One encourages and facilitates engagement of donors with specific projects, particularly in the developing world. The other plays a Zagat or Yelp function, offering donors reviews and ratings of organizations (sometimes with default settings for organizations the site itself seems to favor or has been led, perhaps even compensated, to favor (see www.justgive.org)).

I am not including in this category sites like www.gofundme.org that facilitate individual giving to individuals, nor the watchdogs – most prominently Charity Navigator – given life by the internet. It’s hard to imagine these having much disruptive influence. The former deals in nickels and dimes, and the latter is blind to the role of charitable motivation in giving. Neither will move the needle perceptibly.

⁶The latest data from the IRS is for 2010, and increased international giving that year could well represent an outpouring of support in response to the earthquake in Haiti.

Transformative Influences

Provided organizations can tether online and its social applications to strategies framed in their best financial and program interests, these new media have many more positive transformative opportunities than threatening disruptive challenges. Of course transformation means change, and it's fair to make the general observation that change comes harder to nonprofit organizations than it does to profit-intent organizations. That's not a criticism; it's an observation of the character of nonprofit endeavor and my experience as both a nonprofit executive and consultant.

Here are five categories of the transformative influence of online and social media:

- Charity facilitation
- Donor control
- Convenience and immediacy
- Crowd forming
- Universal reach

Charity Facilitation

As mentioned above, the phenomenon of charity facilitation is one of those items one would list as both a threat and an opportunity in a SWOT⁷ assessment. Many organizations, especially those whose missions are human services and disaster response – and among those, especially organizations working internationally – struggle with donor perception of them as middlemen. The internet and social media enable organizations readily to transform from middlemen to facilitators between donors and program initiatives wherever they are.

Charity:Water (www.charitywater.org) in an earlier age would have presented as a middleman organization. But it sprang into existence as a facilitator because it framed its fundraising business strategy taking full account of the capabilities of the internet. While it can be argued they've short-changed themselves by failing to make use of other media to build relations with donors, what they have done with the internet is truly break-through.



⁷Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats

Donor Control

Perhaps many would regard the internet's enabling of donor control to pose a threat. But they'd have to admit it's a threat to the old order and an opportunity the old order never presumed to envisage.

So imagine the financial opportunities awaiting organizations that use the internet through social applications to enable collaborative control as the chief characteristic of engagement with tens of thousands of donors. One could argue, in fact, that using online in this way should become a characteristic of *middle donor* fundraising programs.

What the new technologies enable is bringing fundraising full circle, back to what was common practice of the old order: engaging donors to provide them a role in collaborative control over their philanthropy⁸. The most common experience of fundraisers engaged in that sort of relationship with donors was – still is – donors increasing their financial commitments, often to surprising degrees.

Convenience and Immediacy

The convenience and immediacy of online have become especially evident in three sorts of situations: major, high-profile disaster response; public radio and television on-air campaigns; and advocacy campaigns. Each shows a tactical facility that can be valuably applied to strategies of donor acquisition or reinstatement and to donor value development.

The web has been a boon to maximizing individual funding in response to disasters. Prior to its emergence as a medium of ready access and utter convenience, prospective donors had to take greater initiative, and many fewer did.

Public radio and television, albeit curiously late at employing their use of the medium, discovered that online fulfillment of giving in response to on-air solicitations had multiple advantages over conventional mail or telephoned fulfillment, most attributable to convenience and immediacy: lowering fulfillment costs, countering “pledgers’ remorse,” increasing the incidence of sustainer conversion, and getting higher average gifts (through higher incidence of credit card giving) were some of them.

One company in particular – Care2 – has built a donor acquisition business on the advantages the internet offers for convenient, immediate response to advocacy. The latter day charity facilitators are likely to pose stiff competition for Care2, and we can predict with their presence a demonstration of the value of competition in the marketplace.

⁸This is the best, most functional definition of major donor fundraising and only comes about through collaborative engagement, necessarily in person.

In addition to serving organizations whose missions are advocacy, the web has proved just as useful for other organizations mounting advocacy campaigns under special circumstances. We've been privileged to work with the New York Public Library in support of online campaigns to urge New York's City Council to sustain or restore the City's funding of the library.

Crowd Sourcing

Advocacy campaigning is one sort – a virtual sort – of crowd forming. The other was the very reason another pioneering company came into the nonprofit sector along with the internet.

energy and to raise money themselves in support of organizations makes a far more positive contribution to donor base development than gathering smaller numbers of people to dress up, eat, drink and be made merry.

Universal Reach

The (almost) universal reach of the internet has two-dimensional transformative influence on fundraising. It is expanding the opportunity of broader geographic reach at virtually no added cost and, in combination with social applications, is expanding the donor market by reaching demographics inefficient or impossible to reach by most other media.



Kintera, an online services company since acquired by Backbaud, was founded principally to sell to the expanding market of participatory fundraising events, rides, walks, and runs, raising money mainly for a variety of disease-fighting charities.

No doubt Kintera's founders and developers were intent on doing good while doing well. But the good they did went beyond increasing financial and moral support of the charities they served. Gathering crowds to actually expend significant

While the internet carries with it the threatening disruptive influence of geographic transparency mentioned earlier, it also portends the opportunity of ethical deployment in fundraising. Before eBay, or at least while eBay was in development, another internet-based Bay Area start-up, NetConex, with funding from solid sources, had codified in its business plan the transformative influence of the internet for nonprofit organizations raising money through online auctions.

Two examples of typical nonprofit auction items – a weekend at a resort and a collector-condition vintage automobile – illustrate the brilliance of the NetConex concept. While a weekend in Sonoma Valley could fetch a decent bid from the San Francisco Bay Area, it could do much better in Raleigh or New York. And while the vintage automobile would most likely be sacrificed for a song at the typical local auction – there being too few bidders to appreciate it and bid it up – a nation-wide bidding war would be the likely result of its being auctioned online. Many more (and probably better!) examples are readily imagined.

Sadly, NetConex failed. I tried to help prevent that by hosting a meeting of public television auction managers from those few major market stations still doing auctions. While they generally scoffed at the notion of the internet being a useful medium for auctioning, I suspect their resistance was grounded in the prospect of losing the opportunity to mount their annual television production cum social events.

The dimension of expanded demography as a transformative influence of online is as a gift horse to the nonprofit sector. But the appropriate warning is not that the horse might be long in the tooth, it's that its legs might not be sound. For while this new medium and its social applications have brought masses of younger people into the ranks of social and political causes and into the constituencies of major, high-profile disaster funding, they have proved themselves means of transitory contact, not developing engagement.

This shouldn't come as a surprise. Both capacity to give and disposition to engage with organizations beyond signing on to their causes come with the confluence of discretionary income and maturity of life experience. While nonprofit organizations that are the beneficiaries of the younger demographic availed through the internet and its social applications should be grateful both for the money and nascent charitable habit it represents, they must be cautioned not to invest in those donors more than modest money and expectations. This is an example of the fact that knowing one's funding and fundraising business model is essential to proper employment of media.

Managing the New Media

Online was introduced to the nonprofit sector largely under false pretences. Its earliest purveyors acted like time travelling U.S. marshal rookies arriving in 1875 Dodge City with taser guns, presumptuous that everything that needed to be done to keep the peace and harmony in the West could be handled by the new technology strapped to their hips.

It wasn't only the developers and purveyors who believed and claimed the medium could and would become the exclusive medium of fundraising. Nonprofit managers and board members believed it as well. And this wave of enthusiastic conviction delayed the inevitable need to develop measures of performance independent of online service vendor claims and to integrate the use of online with mail and other media.

The first challenge to managing new media in fundraising is the challenge that eluded so many when modern direct mail emerged. That is simply to understand that the internet and all its associated social applications are *media*. They are tactical means toward achieving strategic ends. They are not strategic and their deployments are not strategies. It is axiomatic: if planning and management of fundraising (or any enterprise) proceeds from tactics, then strategies never get properly addressed. Conversely, if planning and management proceeds from strategic goals and objectives, tactics are far more efficiently employed.

So the next challenge is getting a firm grip on the management of online and its social applications by figuring out their highest and best uses and the associated costs. These new tools are definitely good for many things in fundraising and donor cultivation – even terrific – but not for everything. And put to their highest and best uses, they can be expensive to use:

- Facilitating instantaneous donor engagement through the internet means having to be prepared to be responsive at standards set by the most responsive online accessible retailers there are.
- Converting web visitors to donors is generally tantamount to street fundraising along a country lane. The medium simply isn't productive enough to counter rates of donor attrition for the majority of organizations. One needs to advertise and search engine optimize.
- Much of the execution and administration of online fundraising and cultivation has to be done in-house if the medium is to be used efficiently. Unlike direct mail where scaled economies come from reducing individualization, the expectation of individualization is a given in online applications.

Matching the use of the medium to donor base demography is another challenge. Because its genesis is microcosmic and its principal characteristic is interactive technology, the internet could not be expected to have the rates of adoption among older adults that attended major media advances like radio, television, color television, or high definition television. In its earliest years it was simply mismatched to the mother lode age range of charity's main donor vein, people over 55. That is changing. In June last year, Pew Research Center reported that internet usage by people 50 to 64 had risen to 77%, and to 53% for people over 65. But it's still the case that small minorities of these age groups are using social applications.⁹

⁹See <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Older-adults-and-internet-use.aspx>



Finally, the rapid technological development of the medium and its social applications, the recent albeit rapid advance of its adoption, and the preferences of purveyors of its systems and applications have meant that performance measurement is in its infancy. While direct mail performance, for example, can be – although regrettably it often isn't – measured with mind-numbing precision, equivalent internet performance measurement is years away.

Smart users of the internet in fundraising will insist on measures of performance relative to fundraising's three strategic goals: donor retention, donor value development, and acquisition of donors responsive to both retention and value development. They will not measure their investments of time and money by how service providers prefer to account for themselves, in clicks, click-throughs, and impressions. In the final analysis, the internet is so far the ultimate direct response medium. How it works is of little importance. What it delivers is the point.



About NextGen

With offices outside of Philadelphia and San Francisco, NextGen is a premiere provider of strategic fundraising and direct response marketing services exclusively for the nonprofit sector. Our mission is simple: to help nonprofits better connect with their supporters so they may raise more money for their important mission.

NextGen's experienced team and partners help each organization address the many puzzle pieces that make up a fundraising program and fit them together in an effective and efficient way. Through multi-channel strategy and implementation, we aim to help nonprofits share their brand impact through smart, engaging communications.

To learn more, visit us at nextgenfr.com.



PHILADELPHIA
1235 WESTLAKES DRIVE
SUITE 130
BERWYN, PA 19312
610) 640-1555

SAN FRANCISCO
2171 FRANCISCO BLVD EAST
SUITE W
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901