

**Part II Identification of Related Tax-Exempt Organizations**

(A) Name, address, and EIN of related organization	(B) Primary activity	(C) Legal domicile (state or foreign country)	(D) Exempt Code section	(E) Public charity status (if section 501(c)(3))	(F) Direct controlling entity
COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION 925 L STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 83-0371079	SOCIAL WELFARE - PROTECTION OF FAMILIES AND CHILDREN	CA	501 (C) (6)		N/A

CalSWEC history features a 2011 "Strategic Alliance" with this entity CFPI (now CFPIC), but does not at the same time reveal it is a related entity of the County Welfare Directors Association, a 501(c)(6) no doubt preceding it in time. Unless one happens to follow child welfare training networks, or schools of social welfare (UCBerkeley's hosts CalSWEC), who'd know? CFPI shares staff with CWDA. By forming a separate entity, the presence of CWDA is generally concealed, representing a trade organization of county employee civil servants.

Where do finances (funds) for both organizations come from? This one is clearly dependent on public grants, and the other is a business/trade-related PRIVATE association, a class populated by so many similar ones across government functions (as I have blogged at FamilyCourtMatters.WordPress.Com repeatedly) forming a virtual "alternate shadowing the visible, public gov't entities. What is the cumulative impact of this privatization and nationalization? Who would ever be able to measure it?"

BAA For Privacy Act and Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

TEEA5001L 12/23/08

Schedule R (Form 990) (2008)

@ 1-1-2017, I am still exploring the filing entity (CFPI see page header below), but (yesterday, when I first noticed its existence on a CalSWEC website, and looked it up on New Year's Eve) I already noticed that in 2008, grants were recorded as grants, but later (under same principal officer Stuart Oppenheim) "Federal and State Grants" were wrongly entered on Part VIII (revenues) under Line 2, leaving the Line 1 prompt "Government Grants" blank. In other words, there was a pretense at providing "Line 2" program services in exchange for fees, but avoiding direct admission by actually labeling it "gov't grants." Meanwhile the State of California OAG (Registry of Charitable Trusts) says it received — but many years later, has withheld uploading, the RRFs which would reveal FROM WHICH AGENCIES it got the earliest grants.

Schedule R (Form 990) 2008 CHILD AND FAMILY POLICY INSTITUTE

83-0371079

Page 2

**Part III Identification of Related Organizations Taxable as a Partnership**

Red flag here (check out other returns) - separate "entities" require separate EIN#s. The filing entity here and the "related entity" were given the same EIN# under two different names. It may be a typo, or it may be a misdirection. Further research will clarify, but if it's just a typo, it shows at BEST carelessness. //Lets Get Honest @FamilyCourtMatters.