

On Aug 1, 2010, at 11:01 PM, shtgunjohnny@aol.com wrote:

Mr. Glatz, With regard to the differing expense reports, was this some type of accounting problem? They were obviously reported somewhere or you would not have found them. Where were they reported? Is there any possible reason other than deception for the expenses to be reported elsewhere?

John Patchell ATA Delegate Delaware

Response from Robert Glatz

John,

For the most part, the differences in the number arise for the following reasons

-

- * The ATA directly booked and paid for an expense for the EC member e.g. hotel rooms. Since it wasn't on the EC members expense report, they didn't count it as a reimbursement.
- * The ED could have paid for meals and entertainment which then would not have showed up on an EC members' credit card.
- * The EC expenses got charged to a different account than the accounts historically reported in the supplemental financial statement disclosure. For example (and I'm not sure this is the way this actually got treated, but it is illustrative), they may charge the Shot Show to marketing expense and then not report the reimbursement.

I don't know that there was any conscious deception until the real amounts were pointed out to them. Then, there was a strong desire not to own up to the actual amounts being reimbursed. The excuse used was "this is the way we have always reported it". My position has been and still is that we need to at least understand what we spend on the EC and only partially reporting reimbursements is at best misleading.

I hope this helps.