



**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**  
Washington, DC 20463

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**  
kajohnson@hollandhart.com

Kelly A. Johnson  
Holland and Hart LLP  
555 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202

RE: MUR 7949 (formerly Pre-MUR 638)  
Crown Products and Services, Inc.,  
Steven Douglas Simmons and  
Douglas Schane

Dear Ms. Johnson:

On August 21, 2020, your above-referenced clients made a *sua sponte* submission to the Federal Election Commission (the “Commission”). Following discussions with the Commission’s Office of General Counsel, the original *sua sponte* submission was supplemented with additional information in 2021. On December 16, 2021, the Commission found reason to believe that Crown Products and Services, Inc. violated 52 U.S.C. §§ 30118(a) and 30122, and 11 C.F.R. §§ 114.2(b) and 110.4(b)(1)(i). In addition, the Commission found reason to believe that Steven Douglas Simmons violated 52 U.S.C. §§ 30118(a) and 30122, and 11 C.F.R. §§ 114.2(e) and 110.4((b)(1)(ii). The Commission also closed the matter as to your client Douglas Schane, and hereby admonishes him for his role in these violations of the Act. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which formed a basis for the Commission’s findings, is enclosed for your information.

In order to expedite the resolution of this matter, the Commission has authorized the Office of the General Counsel to enter into negotiations directed towards reaching a conciliation agreement in settlement of this matter prior to a finding of probable cause to believe. Pre-probable cause conciliation is not mandated by the Act or the Commission’s regulations, but is a voluntary step in the enforcement process that the Commission is offering to your clients as a way to resolve this matter at an early stage and without the need for briefing the issue of whether or not the Commission should find probable cause to believe that your clients violated the law.

MUR 7949 (previously Pre-MUR 638)  
(Crown Products and Services, Inc. *et al.*)  
Page 2

If your clients are interested in engaging in pre-probable cause conciliation, please contact Kimberly Hart, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1618 or at [khart@fec.gov](mailto:khart@fec.gov) within seven days of receipt of this letter. During conciliation, you may submit any factual or legal materials that you believe are relevant to the resolution of this matter. Because the Commission only enters into pre-probable cause conciliation in matters that it believes have a reasonable opportunity for settlement, we may proceed to the next step in the enforcement process if a mutually acceptable conciliation agreement cannot be reached within sixty days. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a), 11 C.F.R. Part 111 (Subpart A). Conversely, if your clients are not interested in pre-probable cause conciliation, the Commission may conduct formal discovery in this matter or proceed to the next step in the enforcement process. Please note that once the Commission enters the next step in the enforcement process, it may decline to engage in further settlement discussions until after making a probable cause finding.

Pre-probable cause conciliation, extensions of time, and other enforcement procedures and options are discussed more comprehensively in the Commission's "Guidebook for Complainants and Respondents on the FEC Enforcement Process," which is available on the Commission's website at [http://www.fec.gov/em/respondent\\_guide.pdf](http://www.fec.gov/em/respondent_guide.pdf).

In addition, please note that you have a legal obligation to preserve all documents, records and materials relating to this matter until such time as you are notified that the Commission has closed its file in this matter. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 1519. This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(4)(B) and 30109(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that your clients wish the matter to be made public. Please be advised that, although the Commission cannot disclose information regarding an investigation to the public, it may share information on a confidential basis with other law enforcement agencies.<sup>1</sup>

We look forward to your response.

On behalf of the Commission,



Shana M. Broussard  
Chair

Enclosures:

1. Factual and Legal Analysis

---

<sup>1</sup> The Commission has the statutory authority to refer knowing and willful violations of the Act to the Department of Justice for potential criminal prosecution, 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(5)(C), and to report information regarding violations of law not within its jurisdiction to appropriate law enforcement authorities. *Id.* § 30107(a)(9).

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2  
3 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

4  
5  
6 **RESPONDENTS:** Crown Products & Services, Inc. **MUR 7949**  
7 Steven Douglas Simmons (f/k/a Pre-MUR 638)\_

8  
9 **I. INTRODUCTION**

10  
11 In this *sua sponte* submission (“Submission”), corporate respondent Crown Products &  
12 Services, Inc. (“Crown Products”) and two of its corporate executives, Steven Douglas Simmons  
13 and Douglas Schane, disclosed that Simmons and Schane made nine federal contributions  
14 totaling \$13,500 in 2018 that were unlawfully reimbursed with corporate funds.<sup>1</sup>

15 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

16 **A. Submission**

17 On August 21, 2020, Crown Products, Simmons, and Schane filed the instant  
18 Submission.<sup>2</sup> Simmons is Crown Products’ President and Chief Executive Officer, and Schane  
19 is the Eastern Regional General Manager and reports directly to Simmons.<sup>3</sup> The Submission  
20 states that Murray Energy has been, and remains an important client of Crown Products.<sup>4</sup>  
21 During the 2018 election cycle, a representative of Murray Energy invited business partners,

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents also provided supplemental materials including sworn affidavits from Simmons, Schane, Angela Koloski, Manager of Finance and Administration, and Robin Baker, Chief Financial Officer. *See* Supplemental Submission, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Mar. 18, 2021) (“Suppl. Submission”); Supplemental Submission, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Apr. 19, 2021) (“Suppl. Submission #2”); Supplemental Submission, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (May 18, 2021) (“Suppl. Submission #3”); Supplemental Submission, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (July 14, 2021) (“Suppl. Submission #4”).

<sup>2</sup> Submission at 1. Crown Products is a corporation that sells specially blended chemicals that are applied to control dust, freezing of coal, water treatment, road stabilization, and used as a fuel catalyst. *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 4-5.

1 including Crown Products’ executives, to fundraising events for several federal candidates.<sup>5</sup>  
 2 Simmons attended some of those fundraisers and subsequently made six contributions to federal  
 3 political candidates totaling \$11,500.<sup>6</sup> Simmons’s sworn affidavit states that he considered the  
 4 contributions a good business decision, and he was unaware of the unlawfulness of obtaining  
 5 reimbursement of what he considered to be business expenses.<sup>7</sup>

6 Simmons made the following federal contributions:<sup>8</sup>

<b>Contribution Date<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Amount</b>
03/22/2018	McCarthy Victory Fund	\$5,000
04/25/2018	Greg Pence for Congress	\$2,000
04/25/2018	Renacci for Ohio Victory Fund	\$3,000
09/20/2018	Marsha for Senate	\$500
09/20/2018	Hawley Victory Committee	\$500
09/20/2018	McSally Arizona Victory Committee	\$500
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,500</b>

---

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 2, 5.

<sup>7</sup> Suppl. Submission #2, Steven Douglas Simmons Affidavit ¶¶ 8-9, 11, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Apr. 14, 2021) (“Simmons Aff.”).

<sup>8</sup> Although the committee’s name is listed on the fundraising contribution sheet and check as being “Hawley Victory Fund,” the correct name of the recipient committee is “Hawley Victory Committee” as reflected by the Committee’s Statement of Organization. *See* Statement of Organization, Hawley Victory Committee (Oct. 2, 2017).

<sup>9</sup> The contributions made to Marsha for Senate, Hawley Victory Committee, and McSally Arizona Victory Committee were all made on September 20, 2018, in connection with a fundraising event as evidenced by copies of the contribution forms and checks. *See* Submission, Attachs. 7-9. However, the committees report receiving the contributions on October 19, 2018 (Marsha for Senate), October 25, 2018 (Hawley Victory Committee), and October 25, 2018 (McSally Arizona Victory Fund). *See* Post-General Report, Receipts, Marsha for Senate (Dec. 6, 2018); Post-General Report, Receipts, Hawley Victory Committee, (Dec. 5, 2018); Post-General Report, Receipts, McSally Arizona Victory Committee (Dec. 5, 2018).

1           The Simmons expense reports submitted for March, April, and September 2018, covering  
2 all six contributions, list the political contributions in the “Safety Supplies” column.<sup>10</sup> The April  
3 and September 2018 expense reports identify the political contributions as “PAC,” but not the  
4 March 2018 expense report.<sup>11</sup> The Submission also provided copies of the completed donor  
5 forms and canceled checks submitted in support of the expense reports.<sup>12</sup> Prior to January 2020,  
6 Simmons’s expense reports were not subject to supervisory approval because he was the CEO of  
7 Crown Products. Instead, the expense reports were sent directly to the company’s accounting  
8 department for review and processing.<sup>13</sup> The contribution reimbursements occurred via ACH  
9 electronic transfer and were included in Simmons’s total corporate expenses for the month.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See Submission, Attachs. 1, 2 and 3. There is no accompanying description in the March 2018 Expense Report. In a supplement provided by respondents, they affirm that in the March 2018 Expense Report, Simmons did not provide any descriptions for any of his expenses, such as “Hotel,” “Airfare,” or “Safety Expenses.” See Suppl. Submission #4. Instead, Simmons left the “ACCOUNT & Description of Expenditure” column blank in that Expense Report. *Id.* Simmons states that omitting the descriptions was an oversight on his part, but he included descriptions with his April 2018 Expense Report. *Id.* Simmons also explains that he included the contributions in the “Safety Supplies” column because there was no “Miscellaneous” category that would function as a catch-all for reimbursable expenses that did not fall into any of the other categories, e.g., Hotel, Airfares, Training, etc. *Id.* Schane categorized his PAC contributions as “Business Meals & Entertainment.” *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, Attachs. 2 and 3. Simmons sought reimbursement for his September 20, 2018, contributions on his September 2018 expense report although the contributions are reported as being received by those committees on October 19 and 25, 2018. See Suppl. Submission #3.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, Attachs. 4-9.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* Simmons states that he also made a \$1,000 state contribution to the West Virginia Political Action Committee that was reimbursed by Crown Products; and contributions totaling \$10,000 for which he did not seek reimbursement because they were personal in nature and not connected to the business. Simmons Aff. ¶¶ 9, 11.

1 During the same timeframe, in response to an invitation from Murray Energy, Simmons  
 2 asked Schane to attend a fundraiser on behalf of Crown Products at which Schane made the  
 3 following three federal contributions:<sup>15</sup>

<b>Date</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Amount</b>
08/20/2018	Lou Barletta for Senate	\$500
08/20/2018	Ted Cruz Victory Committee	\$1,000
08/20/2018	Matt Rosendale for Montana	\$500
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>

4 Schane states that he asked Simmons how the contributions should be handled, and  
 5 Simmons advised that he should make the contribution himself and “seek reimbursement from  
 6 the Company on the next expense report.”<sup>16</sup> According to Schane, he believed the contributions  
 7 to be business expenses based on the company’s relationship with Murray Energy and  
 8 Simmons’s instructions.<sup>17</sup> Schane’s August 2018 expense report classified the contributions as  
 9 “Bus. Meals & Ent.” and described the expenditures as “Political Donations.”<sup>18</sup> The Submission  
 10 also provided copies of the contribution checks submitted by Schane to support the expense  
 11 report as well as Simmons’s email approval of the expense report.<sup>19</sup> Simmons, as Schane’s  
 12 supervisor, approved the expense reports and subsequent corporate reimbursement for the \$2,000  
 13 in federal contributions.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Suppl. Submission #2, Douglas Schane Affidavit ¶¶ 6, 8, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Apr. 19, 2021) (“Schane Aff.”).

<sup>16</sup> Schane Aff. ¶¶ 7, 9.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* ¶ 9.

<sup>18</sup> Submission at 3, Attach. 10.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, Attachs. 11-14. The Commission’s contribution database does not indicate that Schane had a history of regular contributions to federal political committees.

<sup>20</sup> Submission at 3.

1 Angela Koloski, Manager of Finance and Administration, states that she processed the  
2 expense reports in the ordinary course of business but did not substantively review the entries for  
3 legal compliance with the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the “Act”).<sup>21</sup>  
4 Instead, she focused on ensuring that the expenses were appropriately classified for accounting  
5 purposes and QuickBooks entry.<sup>22</sup>

## 6 **B. Discovery of the Violations**

7 The Submission and Koloski’s affidavit state that in May 2019, Koloski had a  
8 conversation with her supervisor, Robin Baker, Chief Financial Officer, who mentioned the  
9 restrictions on company reimbursement of political contributions.<sup>23</sup> Koloski informed Baker that  
10 she recalled processing expense reports that may have contained political contributions.<sup>24</sup> Baker  
11 expressed concern and initiated a review of the company’s reimbursements dating back to 2016,  
12 excluding entries related to hotels, meals, and transportation, which comprised the majority of  
13 the company’s expense reports.<sup>25</sup> Baker’s sworn affidavit states that her previous job experience  
14 made her aware of legal limitations on corporate political contributions.<sup>26</sup> The affidavit confirms

---

<sup>21</sup> Suppl. Submission #2, Angela Koloski Affidavit ¶ 11, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Apr. 16, 2021) (“Koloski Aff.”); *see also* Submission at 3.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> Submission at 3; *see also* Koloski Aff. ¶ 12.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* ¶ 13.

<sup>26</sup> Suppl. Submission #2, Robin Baker Affidavit ¶¶ 6-7, Pre-MUR 638 (Crown Products) (Apr. 15, 2021). Baker states that, prior to joining Crown Products in September 2016, she worked for 23 years at Peabody Energy Corporation. During her employment at Peabody, she became knowledgeable about the legal limitations of corporate political contributions. *Id.* ¶¶ 2-4.

1 the discovery of the ten unlawful contribution reimbursements to Simmons and Schane.<sup>27</sup> One  
2 of the ten contributions was a state contribution made by Simmons to the West Virginia Political  
3 Action Committee.<sup>28</sup> Baker asserts that these were the only instances of reimbursements  
4 discovered in the review dating back to 2016.<sup>29</sup> Baker subsequently contacted outside counsel  
5 who advised Simmons and Schane of the improper contribution reimbursements.<sup>30</sup> In February  
6 2020, Simmons and Schane repaid the full amount of the reimbursed contributions to Crown  
7 Products.<sup>31</sup>

### 8 C. Remedial Efforts

9 The Submission states that Crown Products has taken steps to prevent a recurrence of the  
10 violations.<sup>32</sup> First, in January 2020, Crown Products modified its expense reimbursement  
11 processes to minimize the chance of future violations.<sup>33</sup> Specifically, Baker now reviews and  
12 approves all expense reports after they have been processed by the accounting department and  
13 prior to reimbursement to ensure compliance with the Act.<sup>34</sup> Second, Baker is now responsible  
14 for reviewing and authorizing Simmons's expense reports, since Simmons (as CEO) has no

---

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* ¶ 10.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 11-12; Submission at 4, Attach. 15. Although the company did not conduct an assessment of the state contribution, Simmons repaid the reimbursed amount out of an abundance of caution. Submission at 4.

<sup>32</sup> Submission at 5.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

1 supervisor to undertake that review.<sup>35</sup> Third, Simmons, Schane, Baker, and the company’s  
2 outside counsel have all now been educated on the Act’s prohibitions on corporate contributions  
3 and contributions made in the name of another.<sup>36</sup>

4 Respondents state that they have not contacted the recipient campaigns seeking a refund  
5 or disgorgement of the unlawful contributions.<sup>37</sup> When Crown Products recognized that it may  
6 have violated the Act by reimbursing Simmons and Schane, it requested repayment from the  
7 corporate executives.<sup>38</sup> Once Simmons and Schane repaid the company, Crown Products  
8 considered the contributions to be accurately linked to Schane and Simmons as reflected on the  
9 donation form completed by both upon making the contributions at the fundraiser events.<sup>39</sup>

### 10 **III. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

#### 11 **A. Law**

12 The Act and Commission regulations prohibit a corporation from making a contribution  
13 to a federal committee (other than an independent-expenditure-only committee) and any person,  
14 including a corporation, from making a contribution in the name of another person.<sup>40</sup> The term  
15 “person” for purposes of the Act and Commission regulations includes corporations.<sup>41</sup> Further,

---

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> *See* Suppl. Submission #4.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*

<sup>39</sup> *Id.*

<sup>40</sup> *See* 52 U.S.C. §§ 30118(a) and 30122; *see also* *United States v. O’Donnell*, 608 F.3d 546, 550 (9th Cir. 2010) (concluding that the plain language of section 30122 [formerly section 441f] encompasses straw donor contributions whether accomplished through the advancement or reimbursement of funds).

<sup>41</sup> *Id.* § 30101(11); 11 C.F.R. § 100.10.

1 the Act prohibits an officer or director of a corporation from consenting to the making of a  
2 corporate contribution.<sup>42</sup> A person also may not knowingly permit one's name to be used to  
3 effect the making of a contribution in the name of another.<sup>43</sup>

4 **B. The Commission Found Reason to Believe that Simmons and Crown**  
5 **Products Violated Sections 30118(a) and 30122**  
6

7 The Submission states that Simmons caused Crown Products to use corporate funds to  
8 reimburse \$13,500 in federal contributions made by himself and Schane during the 2018 election  
9 cycle.<sup>44</sup> Simmons, as a corporate officer, sought and received reimbursement for his federal  
10 contributions (\$11,500) and instructed Schane to make contributions and seek reimbursement  
11 from the company for his contributions (\$2,000).<sup>45</sup> Simmons, as Schane's supervisor, approved  
12 via email the reimbursements with corporate funds.<sup>46</sup> The contribution reimbursements occurred  
13 via ACH electronic transfer and were included in Simmons's and Schane's total corporate  
14 expenses for the month.<sup>47</sup>

15 This information establishes that there is reason to believe that Crown Products made  
16 prohibited corporate contributions in the names of others in violation of sections 30118(a) and  
17 30122 of the Act; and that Simmons, as a corporate officer, consented to the making of  
18 prohibited contributions in violation of section 30118(a). In addition, the information establishes

---

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* § 30118(a), 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(e).

<sup>43</sup> 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(1)(i).

<sup>44</sup> *See* Submission at 2-3, Exhs. 2-9, 11-13.; *see also* Simmons Aff. ¶ 11.

<sup>45</sup> Submission at 2-3.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

1 that Simmons, as a conduit, allowed his name to be used for the purpose of making contributions  
2 in the name of another in violation of 52 U.S.C. § 30122 and 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)((1)(ii).  
3 Schane, as a conduit, acknowledges that he was asked to make contributions to the various  
4 federal candidates and committees and sought reimbursement based on Simmons's  
5 instructions.<sup>48</sup>

6 Accordingly, the Commission found reason to believe that Crown Products and Services,  
7 Inc., violated 52 U.S.C. §§ 30118(a) and 30122, and 11 C.F.R. §§ 114.2(b) and 110.4(b)(1)(i).  
8 In addition, the Commission found reason to believe that Steven Douglas Simmons violated  
9 52 U.S.C. §§ 30118(a) and 30122, and 11 C.F.R. §§ 114.2(e) and 110.4((b)(1)(ii).

10 **C. Under the Circumstances, the Commission Made Non-Knowing**  
11 **and Willful Findings in this Matter**  
12

13 The Act prescribes additional monetary penalties for violations that are knowing and  
14 willful.<sup>49</sup> A violation of the Act is knowing and willful if the “acts were committed with full  
15 knowledge of all the relevant facts and a recognition that the action is prohibited by law.”<sup>50</sup>  
16 Such a finding does not require proving knowledge of the specific statute or regulation the  
17 respondent allegedly violated.<sup>51</sup> Instead, it is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent “acted

---

<sup>48</sup> See Schane Aff.

<sup>49</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(5)(B), (d).

<sup>50</sup> 122 Cong. Rec. 12,197, 12,199 (May 3, 1976).

<sup>51</sup> *United States v. Danielczyk*, 917 F. Supp. 2d 573, 579 (E.D. Va. 2013) (quoting *Bryan v. United States*, 524 U.S. 184, 195 & n.23 (1998) (holding that, to establish a violation is willful, government needs to show only that defendant acted with knowledge that conduct was unlawful, not knowledge of specific statutory provision violated)).

1 voluntarily and was aware that his conduct was unlawful.”<sup>52</sup> This knowledge may be shown by  
2 circumstantial evidence from which the respondents’ unlawful intent reasonably may be  
3 inferred.<sup>53</sup> For example, a person’s awareness that an action is prohibited may be inferred from  
4 “the elaborate scheme for disguising . . . political contributions.”<sup>54</sup>

5 The Commission has found violations involving corporate reimbursement schemes to be  
6 knowing and willful when respondents falsified documents, took active steps to conceal illegal  
7 activities, kept multiple sets of financial records, or were deemed to be in possession of  
8 information warning that their conduct was illegal.<sup>55</sup> In this case, the available information does  
9 not establish that Simmons, Crown Products, or Schane knew that the corporate reimbursements  
10 were unlawful at the time they were made. Further, the available information does not establish  
11 that any of the respondents sought to conceal the reimbursements. The records provided indicate  
12 that Simmons and Schane sought reimbursements for political contributions. The violations  
13 occurred over a short period of time, between March and October 2018.

14 Under the circumstances here, the Commission does not find that the violations of 52  
15 U.S.C. §§ 30118 and 30122 were knowing and willful, or that it needs to conduct additional fact-

---

<sup>52</sup> *Id.* (citing jury instructions in *United States v. Edwards*, No. 11-61 (M.D.N.C. 2012), *United States v. Acevedo Vila*, No. 108-36 (D.P.R. 2009), *United States v. Feiger*, No. 07-20414 (E.D. Mich. 2008), and *United States v. Alford*, No. 05-69 (N.D. Fla. 2005)).

<sup>53</sup> *Cf. United States v. Hopkins*, 916 F.2d 207, 213 (5th Cir. 1990) (quoting *United States v. Bordelon*, 871 F.2d 491, 494 (5th Cir. 1989)). *Hopkins* involved a conduit contribution scheme, and the issue before the Fifth Circuit concerned the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the defendants’ convictions for conspiracy and false statements under 18 U.S.C. §§ 371 and 1001.

<sup>54</sup> *Hopkins*, 916 F.2d. at 214-15. As the *Hopkins* court noted, “It has long been recognized that ‘efforts at concealment [may] be reasonably explainable only in terms of motivation to evade’ lawful obligations.” *Id.* at 214 (quoting *Ingram v. United States*, 360 U.S. 672, 679 (1959)).

<sup>55</sup> *See* MUR 7027 (MV Transportation, Inc., *et al.*); MUR 6465 (The Fiesta Bowl, Inc.); MUR 6143 (Galen Capital); MUR 5818 (Feiger, Feiger, Kenney, Johnson and Giroux, P.C.).

MUR (Crown Products & Services, *et al.*)

Factual and Legal Analysis

Page 11 of 11

1 finding because the respondents disclosed the violations, cooperated in completing the *sua*  
2 *sponte* submission, and credibly appear to have implemented the necessary remedial and  
3 compliance measures.<sup>56</sup>

4

---

<sup>56</sup> See MUR 6889 (Nat'l Air Transp. Ass'n); see also MUR 5765 (Crop Production Services, Inc.); 5643 (Carter's, Inc.) (same).