



ELEC *tronic*

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

ISSUE 120 • JUNE 2019

Chairman's Comments

Eric H. Jaso
*Getting the Word
Out About ELEC*

Despite the important role that the Commission has played in New Jersey's electoral process since its inception in 1973, historically few people have been familiar with what we do.

That's why in recent months ELEC has been vocally publicizing and promoting its mission. In order for members of the public to take advantage of our services, they must know what we offer.

Trenton insiders, politicians, lobbyists, citizen activists, political journalists and campaign-finance lawyers have long been familiar with the broad scope of the Commission's jurisdiction, statutory authority, and enforcement powers. However, ELEC's underlying mission of transparency and accountability compels us to make efforts to spread this awareness to the general public.

Unlike most similar agencies in other states, ELEC's jurisdiction over campaign financing extends beyond state-level

candidates to every candidate running for state, county, or local political office, from fire district commissioner to Governor.

This jurisdiction extends to all political entities participating in New Jersey elections no matter the level.

Political party committees, legislative leadership committees, political committees, and special interest PACs are required to report their contributions and expenditures on an ongoing basis.

Moreover, the Commission registers governmental affairs agents (i.e. lobbyists) and requires them to report their activity quarterly, and their financial activity annually.

Further, the Legislature granted the Commission a significant role in the enforcement of 2006 "pay-to-play" law. While the Commission has limited civil jurisdiction over infractions of the law at the local level, it primarily is responsible to oversee and enforce disclosure requirements under the law.

Lastly, and in addition to overseeing the personal financial disclosure law involving legislative and gubernatorial candidates, ELEC administers the Gubernatorial Public Financing Program.

Since first implemented in the 1977 gubernatorial election, the Public Financing Program has served New Jersey well. In fact, it has been hailed as a national model and used as a template for similar programs in other states.

For a relatively small agency with only 65 staff members, implementing the broad scope of ELEC's responsibilities could otherwise be daunting. However, our dedicated staff, often recognized as among the best in state government, has more than met that challenge.

Both by publicizing ELEC's authorities, jurisdiction, and services, as well as by letting our work and our formal actions speak for themselves, the Commission will continue to get the word out about its crucial role in New Jersey politics and government.

"Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry"

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|----|
| Comments from the Chairman | 1 |
| Executive Director's Thoughts | 2 |
| ELEC IT Chief Wins State Commendation for Innovation and Efficiency | 3 |
| Governor Murphy Conditionally Vetoes S-1500/A-1524 | 4 |
| The Digital Age Is Coming Fast to Politics (By Gianna Melillo) | 4 |
| County Parties Head into 2019 Election Year with Plumpest Coffers in a Decade | 8 |
| Reporting Dates and Training Seminars | 12 |

COMMISSIONERS:

Eric H. Jaso, Chairman
Stephen M. Holden, Commissioner
Marguerite T. Simon, Commissioner
Edwin R. Matthews, Legal Counsel

Executive Director's Thoughts

Jeff Brindle

Growing Clout "Behind Marijuana Industry Shows Importance of Expanded Lobbying "Disclosure

Reprinted from insidernj.com

Lobbying by marijuana interests soared in 2018. But the emergence of Fortune 500 companies onto the marijuana stage in New Jersey is likely to drive up spending even more in the Garden State.

Especially if history is any guide.

In 1974, the people voted down a measure that would have allowed casino gambling in Atlantic City and three other areas- Asbury Park, Vernon Valley and the Meadowlands. Those favoring the referendum spent \$576,600 while the opposition, led by a coalition of churches, spent \$35,500.

Not to be denied, proponents, assisted by out-of-state interests, undertook a second campaign two years later to secure casino gambling solely in Atlantic City. This time, they more than doubled their spending and prevailed.

The 1976 campaign saw supporters of casino gambling spend \$1.3 million. Opponents, spending just \$21,000, were overwhelmed.

In 1974 casino gambling advocates received 790,777 votes for their efforts. By 1976 support for casino gambling almost doubled, with the public casting 1,535,249 votes in favor of the

constitutional amendment permitting gaming in the Queen of Resorts.

Along with limiting gaming to just one city, what changed from two years before was the formation of the Committee to Rebuild Atlantic City and the involvement of major out-of-state corporations. Aided by Resorts International of Miami, Florida, the Committee raised \$1,232,256. Resorts contributed over \$200,000— the largest donation from one source- toward the campaign. Other companies, like Howard Johnson, Holiday Inn and Ramada, also chipped in.

Over \$1.35 million was spent on the 1976 public question, mostly by proponents of casino gambling. Adjusted for inflation, \$6 million in today's dollars was spent on the referendum, making it the second most expensive public question in the State's history. Resort's share alone today would have \$900,000 in buying power.

More recently, another casino ballot question in 2016, which would have permitted casinos in Northern New Jersey, drew nearly \$25 million in spending pro and con. It now stands as the most expensive ballot question in state history. Even though opponents defeated it, it could be back one day. Governor Phil Murphy said April 23, 2018 that he believes the state could expand in other parts of the state while continuing to stabilize Atlantic City's finances.

It took a big push by major corporations to bring a whole new industry- casinos- to New Jersey. Marijuana interests may need a similar boost.

While medical marijuana already has been legalized in the state, legislation

allowing recreational use has run into stiff resistance even though pro-marijuana spending on lobbying rose nearly 319 percent to \$1.4 million in 2018.

Governor Murphy and legislative leaders are continuing to hold meetings to try to rescue the bill, which Senate President Steve Sweeney gave only a 50-50 chance of passage on April 29, 2019.

Even as they deliberate, a sea change is taking place in the marijuana industry as it attempts to gain legitimacy and public acceptance.

Recently, Altria, the tobacco giant, invested \$1.8 million in cannabis company Cronos Group, according to an April 23, 2019 Politico story. Politico reported the next day that another major corporation, Harvest Health and Recreation, was in the process of purchasing two U.S. marijuana companies, Canna Pharmacy and Verano Holdings. Both have interests in New Jersey.

According to Sam Hutton, writing for Politico, if the New Jersey Department of Health approves the acquisition, it would have Harvest maintaining "control over one-sixth of New Jersey's marijuana market."

Moreover, Harvest would have the right to operate two marijuana dispensaries, one in Woodbridge and the other in Union County. The Union County dispensary would also involve a cultivation factory.

On April 29, 2019, NJ Advance Media reported that another major corporation, Canopy Growth, is reported to be in the process of buying Acreage Holdings, another firm active in New

Jersey. Canopy recently received a \$4 billion investment from Constellation Brands, a Fortune 500 company that makes beers like Corona, the same article said.

In 1976, Resorts International upped the stakes in the effort to secure casino gambling in Atlantic City. Similarly, the emergence of two major out-of-state corporations investing in the State's marijuana industry likely will heighten the spotlight on the issue of legalization of marijuana as the issue heats up again toward the end of May.

Or, if the bill fails to win support this year, the deeper pockets of the industry could revive interest in the future. Just as casino supporters did.

This is why up-to-date disclosure of lobbying activities is so important to the public good. There are many significant issues to be decided in New Jersey and the legalization of recreational marijuana is just one of them. An informed public in terms of who is behind varied and sundry efforts cannot be under estimated.

With so many important issues facing New Jersey, it is hoped that Governor Murphy will sign the bill and guarantee sunlight will shine over the governmental process.

ELEC IT CHIEF WINS STATE COMMENDATION FOR INNOVATION AND EFFICIENCY

Anthony Giancarli, who since December 2015 has served as Information Technology Director for the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC), is one of a select group of state government employees who gained special recognition this year.



IT Director Anthony Giancarli (left) receiving Award from Chairman Eric H. Jaso

Giancarli spearheaded efforts to modernize ELEC's computer hardware and software. He was recognized for innovation and efficiency by Governor Phil Murphy and Deirdre Webster Cobb, Chairwoman and Chief Executive Officer of the state Civil Service Commission.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director, said Giancarli's award was a source of pride for the entire agency.

"Despite often being under intense pressure due to time and budget constraints, Anthony has fulfilled our goals in making ELEC's computer system more reliable and accessible for the public," said Brindle. "He has always exhibited a pleasant, can-do manner,

and has been a great leader for our IT crew."

Giancarli was presented the award by ELEC Chairman Eric Jaso at the Commission's May 21, 2019 meeting.

"Although ELEC is a small agency, we have always been ahead of the curve. We have accomplished projects and put in place technologies ahead of some larger agencies," Giancarli said.

Recent improvements have included the addition of electronic filing for parties and continuing political committees (PACs) along with a revamp of the agency's website (www.elec.nj.gov).

Giancarli stressed that improvements to the computer system were the result of a collaborative effort that included Compliance Director Stephanie Olivo, Legal Director Demery Roberts, Deputy Legal Director Amanda Haines, Director of Review and Investigation Shreve Marshall and Director of Administration and Finance Chris Mistichelli.

Giancarli has worked at ELEC since 1998. He was born in Trenton and grew up in Ewing.

GOVERNOR MURPHY CONDITIONALLY VETOES S-1500/A-1524; ELEC DIRECTOR REMAINS HOPEFUL OF EVENTUAL PASSAGE

By Joe Donohue

Governor Phil Murphy on May 13, 2019 conditionally vetoed S-1500/A-1524, a bill seeking increased disclosure by independent special interest groups in elections and grassroots lobbying that had won overwhelming, bipartisan approval in the Legislature.

In his 20-page conditional veto message, one objection is a provision added by the Legislature that would require all groups that try to enlist public support or opposition for legislation or regulations to publicly disclose their donors.

Currently, these grassroots lobbyists are required to identify donors only if the contributors specifically intended that their funds be used to communicate with the general public. Disclosure rarely happens under this provision.

The Governor's message shows he agrees with an ELEC recommendation that the state should require disclosure for groups that engage in electioneering activity- issue-oriented ads that include references to candidates but not explicit appeals to elect or defeat. But the veto message would limit the period of disclosure to 60 days before either the primary or general elections. The bill passed by the Legislature would permit disclosure any time after January 1 during an election year.

The Governor's message also deletes a provision that forbids an office-holder from establishing or participating in the management of an independent expenditure committee. In his message, Governor Murphy did embrace an ELEC recommendation that all public contractors with at least \$17,500 in contracts file disclosure reports with ELEC. Currently, the disclosure threshold is \$50,000.

ELEC Executive Director Jeff Brindle said while he believes the agency could address many of the Governor's concerns through regulations, he still is optimistic disclosure by independent groups will become state law.

"Hopefully, all will work together to heighten disclosure by enacting legislation that requires reporting by independent groups," Brindle said.

"It is important state officials not lose the momentum that has developed to address the issue of disclosure by independent groups. ELEC stands ready to work with the administration and the Legislature to secure this critical legislation."

THE DIGITAL AGE IS COMING FAST TO POLITICS. BUT MARYLAND'S EFFORTS TO REGULATE SOCIAL MEDIA ADS SHOWS IT POSES A MAJOR TEST



By Gianna Melillo

Gianna Melillo is a journalism and philosophy major at The College of New Jersey who served a semester as an ELEC intern in 2019.

The 2016 federal elections made clear that online political advertisements and deceptive social media campaigns can be used by foreign agents or others to try to manipulate voters.

FBI Director Christopher Wray recently told members of Congress that the agency views seriously the risk of further election tampering. "We need to keep upping our game as we anticipate in 2020 the threat being even more challenging than it has been," according to a May 7, 2019 Roll Call story.

Especially in national elections, voters can be a ripe target. A February 4, 2016 study by Pew Research Center entitled "The 2016 Presidential Campaign- A News Event That's Hard to Miss" found

that about two-thirds of U.S. adults learned information about the election from digital sources like websites or apps.

Media beat reporter Jim Rutenberg, in a May 19, 2019 New York Times article, said while “anonymous political attacks are as old as the republic itself....it has never been easier to reach millions of voters with anonymous attacks than it is now, and legislators and regulators seem ill-equipped to keep up with the changes in mass media.”

Legislation requiring more regulation of social media advertising has passed the House but is unlikely to win Senate approval.

As the Federal Election Commission continues to review ways to deter internet abuses within the scope of campaign finance laws, it issued a notable advisory opinion on May 21, 2019. In a bipartisan vote, it permitted a non-partisan group called Defending Digital Campaigns Inc. to offer low-cost or even free cybersecurity training to federal parties and candidates.

Some states have enacted laws that use broader disclosure as a partial fix.

One state is Maryland. Its experience suggests that efforts to try to prevent abuse of social media advertising in elections will be a major challenge for regulatory agencies such as the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

On May 26, 2018, Maryland Governor Larry Hogan allowed the Online Electioneering Transparency and Accountability Act (OETA) to become law without signing the bill. Adopted 44-1 by the Senate and 94-38 by the House, the

act mandated that any online platform that sells political advertising and has more than 100,000 unique monthly users must maintain an electronic library of those ads that the public can view online.

The proposal is influenced in part by a long-time disclosure policy enforced by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Since 1938, the FCC has required broadcasters to maintain publicly accessible files that show who paid for political advertisements, where they aired, and other details. Starting in 2012, these “public files” have been available on the agency’s website.

In 2016, FCC’s website expanded access to include public files maintained not just by major television broadcasters, but also by cable, radio and satellite providers. Unlike the approach mandated by Maryland, the FCC files do NOT include videos or audio files of actual ads. Another difference is that Maryland wants each platform to keep its own separate ad library. Unlike the FCC files, the ads wouldn’t be in one place.

Maryland was one of the states most targeted with Russian misinformation blitzes during the 2016 elections, according to a November 2, 2017 story by the Capital News Service. The “Old Line” state was barraged by 262 ads, compared to Wisconsin, which endured 55, the article said.

It also was one of 21 states targeted by Russian government operatives before the election, though there was no evidence of a breach, according to the State Board of Elections.

In an amicus brief filed April 19, 2019 on behalf of Maryland’s new law, which is being challenged, attorneys representing Brennan Center for Justice said:

It has now been established beyond any doubt that “[t]he Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion.” As part of a multi-faceted attack against our democratic processes, Russian operatives used gaping loopholes in American campaign finance laws to illegally purchase political advertisements and otherwise engage in an online propaganda campaign to influence the outcome of the election. These efforts continued through 2018. Outdated electoral disclosure regimes, many of which have remained static despite the meteoric rise of the internet as a mass medium, proved no barrier; the public remained in the dark.

In the wake of the online media invasion, supporters of the Maryland law predicted it would serve as a model for other states. In a letter urging Governor Hogan to sign the bill, the Campaign Legal Center said it “has carefully reviewed the Act, and we believe it is a well-crafted and constitutional piece of legislation.”

The group added that it is “consistent with well-established Supreme Court precedent allowing for reasonable disclosure of campaign spending to ‘insure that the voters are fully informed about the person or group who is speaking’ about a candidate in the run up to an election.”

While the Maryland law is being championed by Brennan Center and Campaign Legal Center, it has not fared well thus far in the courts.

The Washington Post and other local news organizations filed a lawsuit on August 17, 2018 against the state alleging the new law violated the 1st, 4th, and 14th Amendments along with Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act.

In a case named *Washington Post v. McManus*, the plaintiffs charged that by making them create online ad databases, Maryland was violating the Constitution by compelling speech. In addition, the organizations argued the law constituted prior restraint as the news outlets would be prohibited from publishing any ads that did not comply with the law's stipulations.

The plaintiffs further asserted that the state put forward no evidence that "any newspaper website in Maryland unwittingly published advertising surreptitiously placed by foreign nationals to disrupt the 2016 elections."

On January 1, 2019, Maryland District Judge Paul Grimm ruled in favor of the news organizations and granted a preliminary injunction against the state. Maryland filed an appeal on February 4, 2019, and the Brennan Center for Justice and Campaign Legal Center have filed amicus briefs on its behalf.

The case is notable because it involves one of the first state efforts to try to thwart foreign cyber-meddling in elections. One provision of the law, for instance, prohibits the purchase of political advertisements with foreign currency. Groups with Kremlin ties bought digital advertisements in the 2016 American elections using Russian rubles.

While Maryland's attempt may be laudable, its legal approach has some pitfalls. For example, by trying to apply its rules to both traditional news websites and more recent online content curators such as Facebook, Maryland ran into years of First Amendment jurisprudence restricting government's influence on media content. In addition, websites would have to post all relevant information about an ad within 48 hours of its purchase, which smaller news organizations said would create a significant burden.

In granting an injunction, Judge Grimm said the law is in some ways too broad and in other ways too limited. He states OETA "regulates substantially more speech than it needs to while, at the same time, neglecting to regulate the primary tools that foreign operatives exploited to pernicious effect in the 2016 election."

In its rebuttal brief, Brennan Center maintains "the platforms of many American media outlets, no different than those of plaintiffs here, are known to have published advertisements placed by Russian trolls...The district court was either unaware of, or overlooked, this."

By disregarding decades of established Supreme Court precedent used to judge the legal validity of applying disclosure requirements to political advertising, "the district court erroneously struck down the Act as likely unconstitutional," the brief adds.

"The district court's failure to follow governing Supreme Court precedents in this area cannot be justified, and requires, at a minimum, a remand to the

district court for reconsideration," states the Brennan Center brief.

Brennan Center attorneys also argued that the media is not exempt from following disclosure rules. For instance, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) more than 50 years ago required newspapers to put disclaimers on paid ads that resembled editorial content. It has extended that requirement to online advertising.

"...The Act does not govern 'press' activities as such, and certainly does not 'single out the press' as the district court intimated....Rather, its disclosure provisions apply to all online platforms of sufficient size that sell political advertisements, and require that those publishers disclose factual, non-controversial information about what is ultimately a commercial transaction."

Aside from the issue of foreign intervention in American elections, candidates now rely much more heavily on online political advertisements. The Maryland law would help disclose their activities.

"Regulating online advertising was well worth Maryland's attention, even if it did not reach unpaid posts; paid online advertising has exploded in recent years, putting a premium on transparency efforts for such advertising," said Brennan Center in defense of the Maryland law.

Borrell Associates, a national advertising tracking firm based in Williamsburg, Va., says internet advertising in federal elections soared from \$71 million in 2014 to \$1.8 billion in 2018- a 2,435 percent jump. Online ads as a percentage of all advertising jumped from 3.3 percent to 20 percent.

An early glimpse of the 2020 presidential elections bears out this trend. An Axios.com report on April 23, 2019 showed that even with presidential campaigns still at an early stage, President Donald Trump since the mid-term elections has spent \$8.2 million combined on Facebook and Google ads. The leading Democratic spender, Elizabeth Warren, has shelled out \$1.4 million. All presidential candidates combined have already sunk \$17 million into online ads.

Digital spending in state elections also is soaring. In the second most expensive state election in U.S. history in Illinois in 2018, one candidate alone- eventual winner and now-Governor J.B. Pritzker- spent \$30 million just on digital ads, according to Politico. That is more than ALL spending by candidates in the New Jersey gubernatorial election in 2013.

As New Jersey confronts the challenge of regulating online political ads, it can learn from the travails encountered in Maryland.

In fact, legislation enacted in New York State called the Democracy Protection Act seems to have incorporated some of these lessons. Unlike Maryland, New York excluded news organizations from regulation. While imposing new reporting and disclaimer requirements on digital campaign ads in state and local elections, New York also included a direct ban on foreign entities making independent expenditures.

In addition, New York limits its regulations only to major players by regulating sites with 70 million or more unique monthly users instead of the 100,000 threshold used in Maryland.

In its 2018 report entitled "Getting Foreign Funds Out of America's Elections," Brennan Center said a key reason for requiring disclosure by "dark money" groups such as 501c4 groups that now hide their political donors is the potential for foreign abuse.

It is impossible to know whether agents of Russia or other foreign powers used dark money groups as vehicles for secret spending in American elections. Yet ever since dark money began to proliferate, critics have worried that foreign money could be secretly seeping into the political system. And over the years, a handful of investigations have revealed examples of dark money groups accepting money linked to foreign governments. The lack of transparency makes it impossible for the public to know whether the funds were spent on elections.

The report recommended these steps for lawmakers:

- **Extend spending rules to online ads**, including for electioneering communications that mention candidates before elections.
- **Create a public database of online political ads**, including those that discuss elections or broader political issues.
- **Broaden disclaimer requirements for online ads** to ensure "paid for by" notices and adapt them to the social media context, requiring disclaimers when ads are shared.
- **Require platforms to attempt to block foreign purchases** of election ads.

Notable Quotations:

"It (the Act) is not intended to harass but to give the public the information they need." Governor Bill Cahill signing law creating ELEC on 4/25/1973.

"The goals of open government are to empower people, to ensure that governmental institutions are responsive to the public, and to improve democratic practices and government operations. Transparency is an important tool that allows Americans to see what their government is doing, how powerful institutions are conforming to the laws of the land, and how "We, the People" can help to make it better. Transparency helps an open society solve problems before they become crises - and at its best, avoids those problems in the first place. It also provides the public with a better understanding of who to blame when problems arise and government fails, and who to praise when things go well. That is why open government initiatives have grown over the past half century. Done properly, transparency makes governing better and less likely to be corrupt....Simply put, information is power, and keeping information secret only serves to keep power in the hands of a few."

- "Why Critics of Transparency are Wrong," Brookings Institute, November 2014.

"Anonymous speech facilitates wrong by eliminating accountability"- Antonin Scalia

"If men were angels, no government would be necessary"- James Madison.

COUNTY PARTIES HEAD INTO 2019 ELECTION YEAR WITH PLUMPEST COFFERS IN A DECADE

County political party committees are headed into a statewide election year with \$3.3 million in combined cash reserves, their biggest stash in more than a decade, according to quarterly reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director, said the combined cash reserve reported for March 31, 2019 is nearly 60 percent higher than the figure reported two years ago.

“Combined county party cash reserves have jumped 60 percent from \$2.1 million two years ago. This is despite the cost of gubernatorial and legislative elections (2017) and a federal election (2018) along with local elections both years,” he said. The 80 seats in the state assembly and local offices are up for grabs this year.

Table 1
First Quarter Cash-on-Hand Totals
for County Political Parties 2009-2019

| YEAR | CASH-ON-HAND | YEAR | CASH-ON-HAND |
|------|--------------|------|--------------|
| 2009 | \$1,855,920 | 2015 | \$1,437,520 |
| 2010 | \$2,078,378 | 2016 | \$2,027,203 |
| 2011 | \$1,141,821 | 2017 | \$2,086,933 |
| 2012 | \$1,023,935 | 2018 | \$2,657,429 |
| 2013 | \$1,457,253 | 2019 | \$3,341,448 |
| 2014 | \$1,312,788 | | |

The last time counties had more buying power after the first quarter was in 2003, when reserves were worth \$3.6 million on an inflation-adjusted basis.

Brindle said both parties are still benefiting from a large infusion of funds during the two big election years during which they received hefty checks from wealthy self-funded candidates, checks from gubernatorial and congressional candidates, and money from national unions and other donors.

“The windfall has boosted the “bottom line” of county parties, at least in the short-term,” said Brindle.

Both parties reported their largest cash reserves since 2009. Democrats had \$2.3 million in the bank on March 31, 2019 while Republicans have saved more than \$1 million.

Table 2
First Quarter Cash-on-Hand Totals for Democratic
and Republican County Political Parties 2009-2019

| YEAR | DEMOCRATS | REPUBLICANS | TOTAL |
|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2009 | \$1,453,657 | \$ 402,623 | \$1,855,920 |
| 2010 | \$1,806,504 | \$ 271,874 | \$2,078,378 |
| 2011 | \$ 790,265 | \$ 351,556 | \$1,141,821 |
| 2012 | \$ 708,074 | \$ 315,861 | \$1,023,935 |
| 2013 | \$1,194,185 | \$ 263,068 | \$1,457,253 |
| 2014 | \$ 838,605 | \$ 474,184 | \$1,312,788 |
| 2015 | \$ 916,544 | \$ 520,976 | \$1,437,520 |
| 2016 | \$1,245,021 | \$ 782,181 | \$2,027,203 |
| 2017 | \$1,465,078 | \$ 621,855 | \$2,086,933 |
| 2018 | \$2,107,613 | \$ 549,815 | \$2,657,429 |
| 2019 | \$2,297,905 | \$1,043,544 | \$3,341,448 |

Reports filed by county parties also showed they raised \$1.6 million during the first three months of 2019. That is the best first quarter fund-raising total since 2007.

Table 3
First Quarter Fund-raising Totals
for County Political Parties 2007-2019

| YEAR | RAISED | YEAR | RAISED |
|------|-------------|------|-------------|
| 2007 | \$2,193,314 | 2014 | \$1,048,455 |
| 2008 | \$1,096,676 | 2015 | \$1,080,157 |
| 2009 | \$1,338,922 | 2016 | \$1,499,334 |
| 2010 | \$1,023,791 | 2017 | \$1,195,248 |
| 2011 | \$1,088,038 | 2018 | \$1,371,138 |
| 2012 | \$ 891,658 | 2019 | \$1,648,413 |
| 2013 | \$ 957,098 | | |

Brindle said while it is heartening to see improvement in county party finances, he is concerned the effect will be temporary. He noted that the current quarter’s fundraising figure still is 43 percent below the 2003 total of \$2.9 million.

“I remain firmly convinced that the Legislature needs to adopt ELEC recommendations that would provide a direct boost to party fund-raising,” he said. “In an era where independent special interest groups are becoming huge competitors to parties, fundamental reforms remain necessary.”

These changes include requiring independent groups to fully disclose their campaign finance activity just like parties and candidates, raising the amount parties can raise from all contributors, exempting parties from stringent pay-to-play contribution limits, and applying pay-to-play limits instead to continuing political committees (PACs).

All first quarter totals for both parties are higher when compared to the first quarter of 2015.

Table 4
Fundraising by “Big Six” Committees
January 1 Through March 31

| 2019 | RAISED | SPENT** | CASH-ON-HAND | NET WORTH* |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Democratic County Party Committees | \$ 889,350 | \$ 996,409 | \$2,297,905 | \$2,137,717 |
| Republican County Party Committees | \$ 759,063 | \$ 657,993 | \$1,043,544 | \$1,862,190 |
| Total- Both Parties | \$1,648,413 | \$1,654,402 | \$3,341,448 | \$3,999,907 |
| 2015 | RAISED | SPENT | CASH-ON-HAND | NET WORTH |
| Democratic County Party Committees | \$ 619,216 | \$ 680,649 | \$ 916,544 | \$ 653,867 |
| Republican County Party Committees | \$ 460,941 | \$ 438,164 | \$ 520,976 | \$1,387,180 |
| Total- Both Parties | \$1,080,157 | \$1,118,813 | \$1,437,520 | \$2,041,047 |
| Difference 2019 versus 2015 | RAISED | SPENT | CASH-ON-HAND | NET WORTH |
| Democratic County Party Committees | 44% | 46% | 151% | 227% |
| Republican County Party Committees | 65% | 50% | 100% | 34% |
| Total- Both Parties | 53% | 48% | 132% | 96% |

*Net worth is cash-on-hand adjusted for debts owed to or by the committee.

**Some spending totals exceed fundraising totals because the committee dipped into reserve or incurred debt.

Six Democratic county party committees - Camden, Gloucester, Mercer, Passaic, Salem and Union- reported a cash reserve above \$100,000. Middlesex reported a cash deficit, and Hudson and Middlesex reported a negative net worth.

Table 5
Campaign Finance Activity of
Democratic County Party Committees
January 1 through March 31, 2019

| COUNTY | RAISED | SPENT | CASH-ON-HAND | NET WORTH* |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Atlantic | \$ 22,297 | \$ 15,136 | \$ 13,669 | \$ 13,669 |
| Bergen | \$154,356 | \$130,647 | \$ 63,686 | \$ 44,055 |
| Burlington | \$ 23,536 | \$ 62,037 | \$ 43,037 | \$ 25,459 |
| Camden | \$118,992 | \$137,327 | \$ 593,488 | \$ 593,488 |
| Cape May** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cumberland | \$ 5,250 | \$ 14,616 | \$ 2,272 | \$ 2,272 |
| Essex | \$ 56,900 | \$ 85,970 | \$ 79,050 | \$ 79,050 |
| Gloucester | \$ 2,074 | \$ 46,288 | \$ 373,563 | \$ 373,563 |
| Hudson | \$ 4,501 | \$ 60,980 | \$ 20,179 | \$ (118,966) |
| Hunterdon | \$ 11,617 | \$ 6,057 | \$ 21,105 | \$ 21,105 |
| Mercer | \$ 0 | \$ 16,116 | \$ 142,009 | \$ 142,009 |
| Middlesex | \$180,941 | \$197,738 | \$ (1,441) | \$ (1,441) |
| Monmouth | \$ 75,083 | \$ 31,450 | \$ 48,100 | \$ 48,100 |
| Morris | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Ocean | \$ 25,431 | \$ 13,089 | \$ 55,332 | \$ 71,499 |
| Passaic | \$ 91,009 | \$ 64,212 | \$ 413,745 | \$ 413,745 |
| Salem | \$ 2,917 | \$ 2,162 | \$ 105,425 | \$ 105,425 |
| Somerset | \$ 27,943 | \$ 31,629 | \$ 34,934 | \$ 34,934 |
| Sussex | \$ 2,293 | \$ 4,045 | \$ 18,481 | \$ 18,481 |
| Union | \$ 84,211 | \$ 76,910 | \$ 271,271 | \$ 271,271 |
| Warren | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Democrats-Total | \$889,350 | \$996,409 | \$2,297,905 | \$2,137,717 |

*Net worth is cash-on-hand adjusted for debts owed to or by the committee.

**Does not expect to spend more than \$6,300 for the year.

NA= Not Available

Among Republican county party committees that have filed their reports, Salem and Somerset Counties reported a cash reserve larger than \$100,000. Burlington, Salem and Somerset Counties reported net worth totals above \$100,000.

Table 6
Campaign Finance Activity of
Republican County Party Committees
January 1 through March 31, 2019

| COUNTY | RAISED | SPENT | CASH-ON-HAND | NET WORTH* |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Atlantic | \$ 6,851 | \$ 5,702 | \$ 41,491 | \$ 41,491 |
| Bergen | \$ 34,495 | \$ 23,544 | \$ 20,935 | \$ 20,935 |
| Burlington | \$ 57,500 | \$ 75,924 | \$ 35,050 | \$ 852,417 |
| Camden | \$ 4,700 | \$ 3,980 | \$ 19,189 | \$ 19,189 |
| Cape May | \$ 80,079 | \$ 26,212 | \$ 88,030 | \$ 88,030 |
| Cumberland | \$ 12,283 | \$ 17,726 | \$ 43,418 | \$ 43,418 |
| Essex | \$ 0 | \$ 475 | \$ 19,032 | \$ 19,032 |
| Gloucester | \$ 56,721 | \$ 35,752 | \$ 29,306 | \$ 29,306 |
| Hudson | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Hunterdon | \$ 37,370 | \$ 22,108 | \$ 28,652 | \$ 28,652 |
| Mercer | \$ 4,775 | \$ 4,773 | \$ 28,353 | \$ 28,353 |
| Middlesex | \$ 1,540 | \$ 5,538 | \$ 39,277 | \$ 39,277 |
| Monmouth | \$ 12,564 | \$ 32,971 | \$ 7,669 | \$ 7,669 |
| Morris | \$ 11,012 | \$ 14,846 | \$ 12,184 | \$ 13,463 |
| Ocean | \$ 49,000 | \$ 33,598 | \$ 35,312 | \$ 35,312 |
| Passaic | \$ 44,317 | \$ 38,929 | \$ 23,878 | \$ 23,878 |
| Salem | \$221,385 | \$217,828 | \$ 269,874 | \$ 269,874 |
| Somerset | \$ 72,512 | \$ 55,970 | \$ 173,658 | \$ 173,658 |
| Sussex | \$ 16,951 | \$ 11,493 | \$ 40,652 | \$ 40,652 |
| Union | \$ 27,843 | \$ 17,408 | \$ 71,328 | \$ 71,328 |
| Warren | \$ 7,165 | \$ 13,216 | \$ 16,255 | \$ 16,255 |
| Republicans-Total | \$759,063 | \$657,993 | \$1,043,544 | \$1,862,190 |

*Net worth is cash-on-hand adjusted for debts owed to or by the committee.

NA=Not available.

The numbers in this analysis are based on reports filed by noon May 6, 2019. They have yet to be verified by ELEC staff, and should be considered preliminary.

Individual reports can be reviewed on ELEC's website (www.elec.state.nj.us).

2019 Reporting Dates

| | INCLUSION DATES | REPORT DUE DATE |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| FIRE COMMISSIONER - FEBRUARY 16, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | Inception of campaign* - 1/15/19 | 1/18/2019 |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 1/16/2019 - 2/2/2019 | 2/5/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 2/3/2019 - 3/5/2019 | 3/8/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 2/3/2019 through 2/17/2019 | | |
| APRIL SCHOOL BOARD – APRIL 16, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | 3/15/2019* | 3/18/2019 |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 3/16/2019 - 4/2/2019 | 4/5/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 4/3/2019 - 5/3/2019 | 5/6/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/3/2019 through 4/16/2019 | | |
| MAY MUNICIPAL – MAY 14, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | 4/12/2019* | 4/15/2019 |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 4/13/2019 - 4/30/2019 | 5/3/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 5/1/2019 - 5/31/2019 | 6/3/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/1/2019 through 5/14/2019 | | |
| RUNOFF (JUNE) ** - JUNE 11, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | No Report Required for this Period | |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 5/1/2019 - 5/28/2019 | 5/31/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 5/29/2019 - 6/28/2019 | 7/1/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/29/2019 through 6/11/2019 | | |
| PRIMARY (90-DAY START DATE: MARCH 6, 2019)*** - JUNE 4, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | Inception of campaign* - 5/3/2019 | 5/6/2019 |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 5/4/2019 - 5/21/2019 | 5/24/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 5/22/2019 - 6/21/2019 | 6/24/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/22/2019 through 6/5/2019 | | |
| GENERAL (90-DAY START DATE: AUGUST 7, 2019)*** - NOVEMBER 5, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | 6/22/2019 - 10/4/2019 | 10/7/2019 |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 10/5/2019 - 10/22/2019 | 10/25/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 10/23/2019 - 11/22/2019 | 11/25/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 10/23/2019 through 11/5/2019 | | |
| RUNOFF (DECEMBER)** - DECEMBER 3, 2019 | | |
| 29-day Preelection Reporting Date | No Report Required for this Period | |
| 11-day Preelection Reporting Date | 10/23/2019 - 11/19/2019 | 11/22/2019 |
| 20-day Postelection Reporting Date | 11/20/2019 - 12/20/2019 | 12/23/2019 |
| 48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 11/20/2019 through 12/3/2019 | | |

PACs, PCFRs & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 1 st Quarter | 1/1/2019 - 3/30/2019 | 4/15/2019 |
| 2 nd Quarter | 4/1/2019 - 6/30/2019 | 7/15/2019 |
| 3 rd Quarter | 7/1/2019 - 9/30/2019 | 10/15/2019 |
| 4 th Quarter | 10/1/2019 - 12/31/2019 | 1/15/2019 |

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AGENTS (Q-4)

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 1 st Quarter | 1/1/2019 - 3/30/2019 | 4/10/2019 |
| 2 nd Quarter | 4/1/2019 - 6/30/2019 | 7/10/2019 |
| 3 rd Quarter | 7/1/2019 - 9/30/2019 | 10/10/2019 |
| 4 th Quarter | 10/1/2019 - 12/31/2019 | 1/10/2020 |

*Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or from January 1, 2019 (Quarterly filers).

**A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2019 Runoff election is not required to file a 20-day postelection report for the corresponding prior election (May Municipal or General).

***Form PFD-1 is due on April 15, 2019 for the Primary Election Candidates and June 14, 2019 for the Independent General Election Candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2018 filing is needed for the Primary 2019 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 6, 2018. A second quarter is needed by Independent/Non-Partisan General Election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 9, 2018.

ELEC Training Sessions

The seminars listed will be held at the Election Law Enforcement Commission
25 South Stockton Street, 1st Floor

For registration information, please visit ELEC’s website at:
https://www.elec.nj.gov/seminar_train/SeminarTraining.html

| IN-PERSON TRAINING SEMINARS BEGINS AT 10:00 AM | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| CAMPAIGN TREASURER | 9/12/2019 | 10/1/2019 | |
| PAC (CPC/PPC) | 6/13/2019 | 9/17/2019 | 10/3/2019 |
| ELEC EFILE (R-1 FILERS) | 7/18/2019 | 9/19/2019 | |
| ELEC EFILE (R-3 FILERS) | 9/24/2019 | | |

HOW TO CONTACT ELEC

www.elec.state.nj.us

In Person: 25 South Stockton Street, 5th Floor, Trenton, NJ
By Mail: P.O. Box 185, Trenton, NJ 08625
By Telephone: (609) 292-8700 or Toll Free Within NJ 1-888-313-ELEC (3532)

DIRECTORS:

Jeffrey M. Brindle
Joseph W. Donohue
Demery J. Roberts
Amanda Haines
Stephanie A. Olivo
Anthony Giancarli
Shreve Marshall
Christopher Mistichelli