



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

DEMOCRATIC PARTY
SCIOTO COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Secretary of State of Ohio
Democratic Party Executive Committee
Scioto County
P.O. Box 41
Minford, Ohio 45653

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, to which the Democratic Party Executive Committee, Scioto County, Ohio (the Committee), agreed, solely to assist the Committee in evaluating its compliance with certain requirements included in Ohio Rev. Code Sections 3517.1012, 3517.13(X)(1), 2(b), (3)(a), and (4), 3517.17, and 3517.18, for the year ended December 31, 2010. The Committee is responsible for complying with these requirements. We followed the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards for agreed-upon procedures engagements and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the Committee. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Cash Receipts

1. We inquired of the Committee whether they deposited all gifts from corporations, labor organizations and all gifts restricted to operations into the same fund into which they deposit amounts received from the State Tax Commissioner. Management informed us they received no such gifts.
2. We footed each *Statement of Political Party Restricted Fund Deposits* Ohio Rev. Code Section 3517.17 requires (Deposit Form 31-CC), filed for 2010. We noted no computational errors.
3. We compared bank deposits reflected in 2010 restricted fund bank statements to total deposits recorded in Deposit Form 31-CC filed for 2010. The bank deposit amounts agreed to the deposits recorded in the Form.
4. We scanned the Committee's 2010 bank statements and noted they reflected four quarterly payments received from the State Tax Commissioner pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code 3517.17(A). The Deposit Form 31-CC reported the sum of these four payments without exception. In addition, the Deposit Form 31-CC reported monthly interest receipts from the bank statements.
5. We scanned other recorded 2010 receipts for evidence that a corporation or labor organization may have exceeded the \$10,000 annual gift limit Ohio Rev. Code 3517.13(X)(3)(a) imposes. We found no evidence that any corporation or labor organization exceeded this limit.

Cash Reconciliation

1. We recomputed the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2010 reconciliation for the bank account used for receipts and disbursements restricted pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code Section 3517.1012(A). We found no computational errors.
2. We agreed the bank balance on the reconciliation to the bank statement balance as of December 31, 2010. The balances agreed.
3. There were no reconciling items appearing on the reconciliation as of December 31, 2010.

Cash Disbursements

1. We footed the *Statement of Expenditures* (Disbursement Form 31-B), filed for 2010. We noted no computational errors. We did not note where *Statement of Political Party Restricted Fund Disbursements* Ohio Rev. Code Section 3517.17 requires (Disbursement Form 31-M) was filed for 2010 restricted fund disbursements.
2. Per Ohio Rev. Code 3517.13(X)(1), we scanned Disbursement Form 31-B filed for 2010 and inquired of management whether they transferred any cash from the restricted fund to any other political party account into which contributions may be made or from which contributions or expenditures may be made. We found no evidence of prohibited transfers.
3. We compared the amounts on checks or other disbursements reflected in 2010 restricted fund bank statements to disbursement amounts reported on Disbursement Form 31-B filed for 2010. We found no discrepancies. We noted that withdrawals were made from the bank account for the purchase of money orders which were used to make disbursements. Disbursement Form 31-B reported the purchase of the money orders and the expenditures for which the money orders were used.
4. Except as noted, for each disbursement on Disbursement Form 31-B filed for 2010, we traced the payee and amount to payee invoice. The payee and amount recorded on Disbursement Form 31-B agreed to the payee and amount on the invoice. An invoice was not provided for a \$100.58 component of the disbursement in the amount of \$565.97; however, a statement from the vendor indicating invoice number, date, and amounts supported the total of \$565.97. Invoices were not provided for the purchase of the money orders totaling \$6 outside of the withdrawal amount appearing on the bank statement, which included money order purchase and money order disbursement amounts. One disbursement was a reimbursement to the First Vice Chair which was supported by invoices in which the total agreed to the amount reimbursed. Money orders were used to make disbursements. We were unable to trace the payee and amount to canceled checks.
5. We scanned the payee for each 2010 disbursement for evidence that it might represent a contribution or campaign-related disbursement, both of which Ohio Rev. Code 3517.13(X)(2)(b) prohibit. We found no evidence that any restricted fund disbursements represented contributions or campaign-related disbursements.
6. The Democratic Party Executive Committee used money orders to make disbursements and canceled items were not received. We were unable to compare the endorsement to the payee listed on the check because the Party did not received copies of the front and reverse side of the canceled item.

Cash Disbursements (Continued)

7. We scanned each 2010 restricted fund disbursement recorded on Form 31-B for evidence that it represented a transfer from the restricted fund to any other state or county political party, which Ohio Rev. Code 3517(X)(4) prohibits. We found no evidence of any transfers.
8. We compared the purpose of each disbursement listed on 2010 Disbursement Form 31-B to the purpose listed on the vendor invoice and to the purposes Ohio Rev. Code Section 3517.18 permits. An invoice was not provided for a \$100.58 portion of disbursement in the amount of \$565.97 described as supplies - headquarters on Disbursement Form 31-B. Also, an invoice was not provided for money order purchases totaling \$6. We found no instances where the purpose described on the invoice or the purpose indicated on Disbursement Form 31-B violated the restrictions of Ohio Rev. Code Section 3517.18.

We were not engaged to, and did not examine each *Statement of Political Party Restricted Fund Deposits* and *Statement of Political Party Restricted Fund Disbursements* filed for 2010, the objective of which would have been to opine on compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that we would have reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Secretary of State of Ohio and for the Democratic Party Executive Committee and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone else.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

March 11, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SCIOTO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

SCIOTO COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
APRIL 12, 2011**