1 GALENA WEST Chief of Enforcement 2 THERESA GILBERTSON Commission Counsel 3 Fair Political Practices Commission 1102 O Street, Suite 3000 Sacramento, CA 95811 4 Telephone: (916) 323-6421 5 Facsimile: (916) 322-1932 6 Attorneys for Complainant 7 8 BEFORE THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 In the Matter of: FPPC Case No. 17/0098 11 CHRISTENSEN, SERKIN, AND STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER WALLER FOR SCHOOL BOARD 2017, 12 MICHAEL CHRISTENSEN, BRAD 13 SERKIN, AND BRAD WALLER, 14 Respondents. 15 16 INTRODUCTION 17 This matter arose from a sworn complaint submitted to the Enforcement Division of the Fair 18 Political Practices Commission. Respondent Christensen, Serkin, and Waller for School Board 2017 19 ("Committee") was the candidate-controlled committee formed to support Respondents Michael 20 Christensen ("Christensen"), Brad Serkin ("Serkin"), and Brad Waller ("Waller"). Respondent Waller 21 served as the treasurer. The Committee, Christensen, Serkin, and Waller violated the Political Reform Act¹ 22 by failing to deposit a candidate's personal funds into the designated campaign bank account before making 23 campaign expenditures and failing to make all expenditures out of the designated campaign bank account. 24 25 // 26 27 ¹ The Political Reform Act—sometimes simply referred to as the Act—is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014. All statutory references are to this code. The regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission 28 are contained in Sections 18110 through 18997 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations. All regulatory references are to this source.

//

SUMMARY OF THE LAW

The Act and its regulations are amended from time to time. The violations in this case occurred in 2017. For this reason, all legal references and discussions of law pertain to the Act's provisions as they existed at that time.

Need for Liberal Construction and Vigorous Enforcement of the Political Reform Act

When enacting the Political Reform Act, the people of California found and declared that previous laws regulating political practices suffered from inadequate enforcement by state and local authorities.² Thus, it was decreed that the Act "should be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes." One purpose of the Act is to promote transparency by ensuring that receipts and expenditures in election campaigns are fully and truthfully disclosed so that voters are fully informed and improper practices are inhibited.⁴ Another purpose of the Act is to provide adequate enforcement mechanisms so that the Act will be "vigorously enforced."⁵

One Designated Campaign Bank Account

A candidate-controlled committee must deposit all contributions and make all expenditures from the committee's designated bank account.⁶ Any loans to the candidate or committee must be deposited in the campaign bank account before being utilized.⁷ Any personal funds a candidate intends to spend on campaign-related expenses must first be deposited in the campaign bank account before the expenditure is made.⁸

² Section 81001, subdivision (h).

³ Section 81003.

⁴ Section 81002, subdivision (a).

⁵ Section 81002, subdivision (f).

⁶ Section 85201, subdivision (e).

⁷ Section 85201, subdivision (c).

⁸ Section 85201, subdivision (d) and Regulation 18524, subdivision (a).

Controlled Committee

A controlled committee means a committee that is controlled directly or indirectly by a candidate or state measure proponent. A candidate controls a committee if he or she has a significant influence on the actions or decisions of the committee. A committee can be jointly controlled by more than one candidate. On

Joint and Several Liability of Committee, Candidate, and Treasurer

It is the duty of a committee treasurer to ensure that the committee complies with the Act.¹¹ A treasurer and the controlling candidates for a committee may be held jointly and severally liable, along with the committee, for violations committed by the committee.¹²

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS

Christensen, Serkin, and Waller successfully ran in the 2013 race for the Redondo Beach Unified School District Board of Education. The three candidates ran unopposed because only three seats were open that year. In 2017, a fourth individual ran for the Board, causing a contested race. The three Respondents agreed to form a joint committee and filed an initial Statement of Organization on November 14, 2016 in anticipation of the March 7, 2017 election. According to filed campaign statements, the Committee received a total of \$10,168.56 in contributions and spent \$8,731.56 in expenditures for the election. The three Respondents were successful and are currently serving on the Board of Education.

This case was opened in response to a sworn complaint. The Enforcement Division conducted an investigation and determined that Serkin and Waller made payments using a personal credit card for various campaign expenses.

//

⁹ Section 82016.

¹⁰ Section 84102 and Regulation 18430.

¹¹ Sections 81004, 84100, and Regulation 18427.

¹² Sections 83116.5 and 91006.

Summary of Activity Outside the Designated Campaign Bank Account

Reporting Period	Payor	Payee	Description	Amount
7/1/2016 - 12/31/2016	Brad Serkin	San Diego Yard Signs	CMP - yard signs	\$1,436.50
1/1/2017 - 1/21/2017	Brad Serkin	CampaignLA	VOT - voter data	\$355.00
	Brad Serkin	CampaignLA	LIT - walk pieces	\$450.00
1/22/2017 - 2/18/2017	Brad Serkin	CampaignLA	CMP - banners	\$400.00
1/22/2017 - 2/18/2017	Brad Waller	Facebook	CMP – ads	\$25.06
1/22/2017 - 2/18/2017	Brad Waller	Facebook	CMP – ads	\$46.85
1/22/2017 - 2/18/2017	Brad Waller	Facebook	CMP – ads	\$3.65
Total				\$2,717.06

VIOLATIONS

Count 1

The Committee, Christensen, Serkin, and Waller failed to pay a total of \$2,717.06 in campaign expenditures from the designated campaign bank account, in violation of Section 85201.

PROPOSED PENALTY

This matter consists of one count. The maximum penalty that may be imposed is \$5,000 per count. Thus, the maximum penalty that may be imposed is \$5,000.¹³

In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular violation of the Act, the Commission considers the facts of the case, the public harm involved, and the purposes of the Act. Also, the Commission considers factors such as: (a) the seriousness of the violation; (b) the presence or absence of any intention to conceal, deceive or mislead; (c) whether the violation was deliberate, negligent or inadvertent; (d) whether the violation was isolated or part of a pattern; (e) whether corrective amendments voluntarily were filed to provide full disclosure; and (f) whether the violator has a prior record of violations. Here, the violation appears negligent, not deliberate and there is no prior enforcement history.

¹³ See Section 83116, subdivision (c).

¹⁴ Regulation 18361.5, subdivision (d).

Additionally, the Commission considers penalties in prior cases with comparable violations. *In the Matter of Friends of Frank Bigelow for Assembly 2016, Frank Bigelow, and Vona L. Copp*, FPPC Case No. 17/0079, involved respondents made campaign expenditures totaling \$2,189.78 that were not paid from the campaign bank account. In aggravation, campaign funds were used, in small amounts, for personal use and over \$500 in unitemized expenditures were not reported on campaign statements. The Commission imposed a penalty of \$2,000 for one count on December 21, 2017.

Here, Respondents made a similar amount of payments outside the campaign bank account. In aggravation to this one count, the Committee filed some campaign statements and 24-hour reports late. The late filings were filed one to five days late. Since the delays to filing were relatively minor and all disclosures were made prior to the election, these violations are not being charged as a separate count. After considering the factors listed in Regulation 18361.5 and penalties in prior similar cases, a total penalty of \$2,000 is recommended.

CONCLUSION

Complainant, the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission, and Respondents Christensen, Serkin, and Waller for School Board 2017, Michael Christensen, Brad Serkin, and Brad Waller, hereby agree as follows:

- 1. Respondents violated the Act as described in the foregoing pages, which are a true and accurate summary of the facts in this matter.
- 2. This stipulation will be submitted for consideration by the Fair Political Practices

 Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting—or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.
- 3. This stipulation resolves all factual and legal issues raised in this matter—for the purpose of reaching a final disposition without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to determine the liability of Respondents pursuant to Section 83116.
- 4. Respondents understand, and hereby knowingly and voluntarily waive, any and all procedural rights set forth in Sections 83115.5, 11503, 11523, and Regulations 18361.1 through 18361.9. This includes, but is not limited to the right to appear personally at any administrative hearing held in this matter, to be represented by an attorney at Respondents' own expense, to confront and cross-examine all witnesses testifying at the hearing, to subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial

//

administrative law judge preside over the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially reviewed.

- 5. Respondents agree to the issuance of the decision and order set forth below. Also, Respondents agree to the Commission imposing against them an administrative penalty in the amount of \$2,000. One or more cashier's checks or money orders totaling said amount—to be paid to the General Fund of the State of California—is/are submitted with this stipulation as full payment of the administrative penalty described above, and same shall be held by the State of California until the Commission issues its decision and order regarding this matter.
- 6. If the Commission declines to approve this stipulation—then this stipulation shall become null and void, and within fifteen business days after the Commission meeting at which the stipulation is rejected, all payments tendered by Respondents in connection with this stipulation shall be reimbursed to Respondents. If this stipulation is not approved by the Commission, and if a full evidentiary hearing before the Commission becomes necessary, neither any member of the Commission, nor the Executive Director, shall be disqualified because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.

1	7. The parties to this agreement may execute their respective signature pages separately. A				
2	copy of any party's executed signature page, including a hardcopy of a signature page transmitted via fax				
3	or as a PDF email attachment, is as effective and binding as the original.				
4	Dated:				
5	Galena West, Chief of Enforcement Fair Political Practices Commission				
6					
7	Dated:				
8	Michael Christensen, Respondent				
9	Dated:				
10	Brad Serkin, Respondent				
11					
12	Dated: Brad Waller, individually and on behalf of Christensen,				
13	Serkin, and Waller for School Board 2017, Respondents				
14					
15	The foregoing stipulation of the parties "In the Matter of Christensen, Serkin, and Waller for				
16	School Board 2017, Michael Christensen, Brad Serkin, and Brad Waller, FPPC Case No. 17/0098, is				
17	hereby accepted as the final decision and order of the Fair Political Practices Commission, effective upon				
18	execution below by the Chair.				
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
20					
21	Dated:				
22	Joann Remke, Chair Fair Political Practices Commission				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	7				