



ELEC tronic

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

ISSUE 125 • NOVEMBER 2019

Comments from the Chairman

Eric H. Jaso

Campaign Reporting After Election Day

"I am making a collection of the things my opponents have found me to be and, when this election is over, I am going to open a museum and put them on display."

Lyndon B. Johnson

Because Election Day is right around the corner, New Jersey candidates and campaigns should understand the processes of post-election candidate filing and termination of reporting.

Candidate and joint candidate reports are due on November 25th, the 20th day following the date of the election, which this year is November 5th.

The 20-day post-election report includes all contributions and expenditures received between the 13th day prior to the election and up to and through the 17th day following Election Day.

Candidates should therefore try to wrap up their activities and close out their accounts upon the 20-day reporting period.

However, there are exceptions to this rule. These exceptions are:

1. When a candidate maintains his or her committee for the sole purpose of receiving contributions to retire obligations incurred during the course of the campaign;
2. When a candidate keeps the account open to raise money and make expenditures to offset the costs of a recount undertaken in the context of the election in which the candidate competed; and,
3. When the candidate is an officeholder and has no intention of seeking reelection and is maintaining the committee for paying officeholder expenses.

When a candidate determines to close the account and submit a final report, the campaign treasurer and the candidate must certify that:

1. There is no remaining balance in the depository;

2. If a balance remained, the balance and assets have been transferred to an account established for a future election;
3. There are no outstanding obligations;
4. If outstanding obligations remained, the liability has been assumed by a candidate committee established by that candidate for a future election; and
5. The candidate committee or joint candidates committee has been dissolved and has finalized its business for the past election.

If a candidate committee has an outstanding obligation that does not exceed \$1,000 or ten percent of campaign expenditures, whichever is less, the campaign may conclude its operations.

Finalizing candidate reports is an important function of any campaign. For further information, candidates and treasurers can contact the Commission at 1-888-313-3532 (ELEC) or visit our website at www.elec.state.nj.us.

"Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry"

IN THIS ISSUE

Comments from the Chairman	1
Executive Director's Thoughts	2
Federal Judge Blocks Enforcement of "Dark Money" Bill as Legal Challenges Remain Pending	4
Through Third Quarter Big Six Totals Lag Other Recent Election Years	5
Handful of Districts Liven Up An Otherwise Quiet Start to Legislative General Election	7
2019 Reporting Dates	10

COMMISSIONERS:

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

Executive Director's Thoughts

Jeff Brindle

The 2002 Reform Law and Its Impact on Campaign Finance

Reprinted from insidernj.com

The modern era of campaign finance law and spending began with the enactment of the [Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act \(BCRA\)](#) in 2002.

Known as McCain/Feingold after the bill's sponsors, Senators John McCain and Russel Feingold, the law ushered in an era of independent group dominance of federal elections, and subsequently, state-wide and local elections.

BCRA, signed by President George W. Bush, served as the single most important reform of campaign finance law since *Buckley v. Valeo* in 1976.

The 2002 law came about in response to the uses of soft money by national political parties.

Soft money consisted of contributions to national political parties that were not subject to contribution limits. Wealthy donors could contribute any amount of money to the parties for supposed "party building" purposes.

As time passed, "party building" went beyond registration and get-out-the-vote to include, by the mid-1990s, generic issue ads that any discerning person understood to be in support or opposition to a candidate.

These issue-oriented ads easily evaded federal disclosure rules by leaving out obvious election-related wording like "vote for" or "vote against." *Buckley* had

ruled that disclosure requirements— at least in 1976— applied only to this type of express advocacy containing these "magic words."

The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act was enacted in part to restrict these issue ads that were unregulated but blended into electioneering communications. The law was intended to serve as an antidote to corruption and foreign money entering the nation's politics.

Though well intentioned, the law would have unintended consequences. For one, BCRA served as an open invitation for independent, outside groups to enter the pantheon of national politics. And second, it ushered in an era of endless lawsuits and unsettled campaign finance law.

On the first point, BCRA set off an explosion of independent spending by prohibiting national political parties from receiving and spending unregulated soft money donations. Instead, donations to national political parties were now subject to contribution limits, making them "hard" money.

As a result, groups and individuals that used to write big checks to the national parties soon began spending heavily on their own in national elections. During the eight years after the law's enactment, the independent campaign activity by these special interest factions increased over 1000 percent.

The Act disallowed corporations and unions from spending their money on issue advocacy or electioneering communications, though separate, segregated employee PACs could be established.

Further, BCRA restricted "electioneering communications"— issue ads that mention

a candidate- within 30 days of a primary and 60 days of a general election but at the same time required broadcasters to sell time to candidates within 45 days of a primary and 60 days of a general election.

"If parties and groups want to run 'issue ads' during the 60-day period, they are free to do so, they merely cannot mention the name of a candidate. If they choose to mention a candidate's name, they are still free to do so, but the expenditure must be disclosed and financed with funds raised under Federal election law," said a 1997 press release by the late U.S. Senator and co-sponsor John McCain.

BCRA also contained a provision known as the millionaire's provision. This provision allowed a tripling of contribution limits for candidates opposed by self-financed candidates whose expenditures exceeded the amount spent by their non self-financed opponents.

Many of BCRA's main provisions came under attack and ushered in an era of endless lawsuits and unsettled campaign finance law, including *McConnell v. FEC*, *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life*, and *Davis v. FEC*.

Almost immediately after its enactment, Senator Mitch McConnell and a host of interest groups challenged the law. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear the case on an expedited basis.

With due haste, the Supreme Court, in December 2003, issued its decision in *McConnell v. FEC*, for the most part affirming BCRA. The court failed to rule on the millionaire's amendment, contending that the plaintiffs lacked standing. However, in *Davis v. FEC* (2008), the Court would declare the provision unconstitutional.

In terms of “electioneering” and “issue advocacy” restrictions, the Court stated “nor are we persuaded . . . that the First Amendment erects a rigid barrier between express advocacy and so-called issue advocacy . . . Indeed, the unmistakable lesson from the record in this litigation is that *Buckley’s* magic-words requirement is functionally meaningless.”

As noted above, challenges to BCRA would not end with *McConnell*. In fact, in a series of cases, the Supreme Court would whittle away at the law until in 2010 when it would all but eviscerate it in *Citizens United*.

Citizens United is a nonprofit corporation, or PAC, founded in 1988. Prior to the 2008 presidential primaries, *Citizens United* released a documentary film entitled, *Hillary: The Movie*.

The film featured commentators, who in interviews, were critical of Hillary Clinton, a candidate in the 2008 Democratic presidential primaries.

The documentary was distributed to theaters and was made available on DVD. However, *Citizens United* desired to make the film accessible on video-on-demand within 30 days of the primary.

Under BCRA, corporations and unions were prohibited from using their funds for electioneering communications. FEC regulations construed an electioneering communication to be a communication that was distributed to the public.

Citizens United felt that its documentary might fall afoul of the law and therefore sought relief from the district court.

The nonprofit corporation maintained that the reform law’s restriction on independent expenditures was

unconstitutional as applied to its documentary. It further alleged that disclaimer requirements were violative of the constitution.

In denying *Citizens United* its preliminary injunction, the federal District Court went further in granting the FEC’s request for summary judgment.

The District Court upheld disclaimer requirements and stated that BCRA was constitutional in relation to the movie as it was “susceptible of no other interpretation than to inform the electorate that Senator Clinton is unfit for office . . .”

Following the District Court’s ruling, the case was taken up by the Supreme Court.

In its most monumental campaign finance ruling in the 34 years since *Buckley*, the Court unleashed an explosion of independent group activity that has transformed the electoral system. BCRA lit the fuse that began the rapid growth of independent spending; *Citizens United* acted as accelerant.

The thrust of the case involved a reevaluation of *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* (1990). The ruling in this case deviated from past precedent in upholding Congress’s authority to restrict corporate independent expenditures. In turn it also constituted a reconsideration of *McConnell*, which had adhered to *Austin*.

The rationale for *Austin* was based upon an anti-distortion standard, which involved the distorting effects of aggregations of wealth represented by corporations. The ruling in *McConnell*, on the other hand, was based more on two additional standards, government interest in preventing corruption and the

appearance of corruption and a shareholder protection interest.

Buckley had connected the anti-corruption standard to upholding contribution limits but not expenditures. The shareholder standard had to do with protecting dissenting shareholders in corporations from being required to fund corporate political speech.

In making its ruling, the Supreme Court had to deal with two schools of precedent that were in conflict with each other; pre-*Austin*, which allowed independent spending by corporations and post-*Austin*, which did not.

In the end, the Supreme Court ruled that restrictions on corporate independent spending was unconstitutional as were the 30 and 60 days black-out periods before the election.

The Court did uphold the ban on direct contributions to candidates and parties by corporations as well as disclosure requirements.

In its decision, the High Tribunal stated, “The Court has subjected these requirements [disclaimer and disclosure] to ‘exacting scrutiny’ which requires a ‘substantial relation’ between the disclosure requirements and a “sufficiently important” governmental interest . . . The judgement is affirmed with regard to BCRA’s disclaimer and disclosure requirements.”

Without commenting on the merits of the Supreme Court’s position regarding the constitutional free speech rights of corporations, one thing is clear: the decision tilted the electoral landscape in favor of independent, often anonymous, groups and against traditional, fully transparent political parties and candidates.

Federal Judge Blocks Enforcement of “Dark Money” Bill As Legal Challenges Remain Pending

By Joe Donohue

U.S. District Judge Brian Martinotti on October 2, 2019 issued a preliminary injunction that prevents enforcement of S-150 pending further review of three lawsuits that contend the law is unconstitutional.

The bill was signed into law June 17, 2019 by Governor Phil Murphy after winning overwhelming bi-partisan support in both legislative houses.

It would require 527 and 501c4 non-profit groups to publicly name all donors larger than \$10,000 and expenses larger than \$3,000 if the groups promote or oppose candidates, ballot questions, legislation or regulations. Currently, state laws require groups to disclose such contributions only under very limited circumstances.

Three 501c4 groups subsequently filed separate legal challenges seeking to block enforcement of the bill.

The groups are Americans for Prosperity (AFP), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Illinois Opportunity Project (IOP). The groups contend that donor disclosure, particularly disclosure involving legislation or regulations, could expose contributors to serious harassment, cripple fund-raising and chill free speech.

After a September 17, 2019 court hearing on AFP’s complaint, Martinotti agreed in a 43-page ruling that the plaintiff is likely to prevail in its legal challenge and issued a preliminary injunction.

The judge said his action did not prevent the state Legislature from passing a “cleanup” bill that would “correct the unconstitutional weaknesses in the Act.”

Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker (D-16), who sponsored the Assembly version of S-150, has introduced two bills that he believes would fix problems in the original bill.

One bill (A-5633) would limit donor disclosure solely to independent groups that take part in elections. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently upheld election-related disclosure laws.

Zwicker’s second bill (A-5754) separately would require groups trying to promote or oppose legislation or regulations to disclose donors and expenses as “policy impact committees.”

On October 10, 2019, Senate President Stephen Sweeney and Assembly Speaker Craig Coughlin jointly filed a motion to intervene in the case.

“Undoubtedly, the values underlying the First Amendment are squarely implicated in an effort that affects political expression. However, the view of the Presiding Officers is that the application of these First Amendment values must properly reflect the changing nature of political campaigns and political expenditures in the post-Citizens United world,” states the intervention brief.

The state Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) in April 2010 first issued a bipartisan call for legislation requiring independent spenders to disclose their political donors just as candidate, parties and traditional political action committees have done for decades.

It was less than four months after the U.S. Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010) permitted corporations and unions to engage in unlimited independent spending in political elections.

ELEC staff members have been working to secure such disclosure legislation ever since the Commission’s recommendation. During that period, independent spenders have become the dominant force in federal, state and even local elections in New Jersey.

Judge Martinotti’s opinion and order were issued in *Americans for Prosperity v. Grewal*, No. 3:19-cv-14228-BRM-LHG (D.N.J. Oct. 2, 2019).

Through Third Quarter Big Six Totals Lag Other Recent Election Years

The so-called Big Six political fund-raising committees have raised \$3.7 million so far this year while spending \$3.5 million, according to reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

The two state parties and four legislative leadership committees also had a combined \$1.7 million socked away in cash reserves.

With all 80 Assembly seats up for reelection this year plus a special election for the first legislative district state Senate spot, the numbers are below par for state election years dating back to 2007.

Table 1
Campaign Finance Activity by “Big Six”
January 1 through September 30, 2019

BOTH PARTIES	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH	STATEWIDE ELECTIONS (NON-FEDERAL)
2007	\$9,322,604	\$6,713,165	\$7,368,421	\$7,095,891	Senate and Assembly
2008	\$4,457,887	\$3,508,376	\$1,519,083	\$1,134,427	
2009	\$6,309,496	\$5,098,191	\$3,073,241	\$2,746,784	Governor and Assembly
2010	\$3,160,458	\$2,859,927	\$1,664,237	\$1,457,787	
2011	\$6,913,921	\$5,025,694	\$3,428,259	\$3,123,885	Senate and Assembly
2012	\$4,083,910	\$3,971,806	\$1,331,432	\$1,192,473	
2013	\$7,203,008	\$5,917,331	\$2,970,203	\$2,884,025	Governor and Both Houses
2014	\$2,444,799	\$1,887,661	\$1,388,946	\$ 765,268	
2015	\$3,896,539	\$3,579,018	\$1,984,629	\$1,346,849	Assembly only
2016	\$2,195,300	\$1,985,370	\$1,188,706	\$1,039,918	
2017	\$5,835,574	\$5,354,876	\$2,317,953	\$2,233,450	Governor and Both Houses
2018	\$3,846,796	\$3,293,435	\$1,298,934	\$1,214,430	
2019	\$3,717,926	\$3,542,777	\$1,696,720	\$1,590,657	Assembly Only*

*Also, one special Senate election

“The latest Big Six numbers are another sign of the nagging fundraising woes faced by parties within the state. Combined fundraising for the same six committees was 2.5 times greater in 2007, or more than \$9 million,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director.

Through September 30, Democrats have raised and spent more than Republicans and report larger joint coffers.

Table 2
Fundraising by "Big Six" Committees
January 1 through September 30, 2019

ACTIVITY FIRST THREE QUARTERS 2019				
REPUBLICANS	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH
New Jersey Republican State Committee	\$ 802,100	\$ 595,872	\$ 324,030	\$ 324,030
Senate Republican Majority	\$ 152,092	\$ 140,299	\$ 184,045	\$ 178,595
Assembly Republican Victory	\$ 439,250	\$ 346,223	\$ 280,059	\$ 259,303
SUB TOTAL- REPUBLICANS	\$1,393,442	\$1,082,394	\$ 788,134	\$ 761,928
DEMOCRATS				
New Jersey Democratic State Committee	\$ 876,249	\$ 852,103	\$ 126,827	\$ 97,409
Senate Democratic Majority	\$ 392,525	\$ 209,088	\$ 489,418	\$ 469,418
Democratic Assembly Campaign Committee	\$1,055,710	\$1,399,192	\$ 292,341	\$ 261,902
SUB-TOTAL- DEMOCRATS	\$2,324,484	\$2,460,383	\$ 908,586	\$ 828,729
TOTAL- BOTH PARTIES				
	\$3,717,926	\$3,542,777	\$1,696,720	\$1,590,657

While the fundraising totals of both parties are smaller than a decade ago, Democratic fundraising has improved since 2015 while Republican numbers are down.

Table 3
Fundraising by "Big Six" Committees
through September 30
2019 versus 2015

REPUBLICANS	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH
2015	\$2,043,497	\$1,776,238	\$1,261,726	\$ 714,128
2019	\$1,393,442	\$1,082,394	\$ 788,134	\$ 761,928
Difference-Dollars	\$(650,055)	\$(693,844)	\$(473,592)	\$ 47,800
Difference-%	-32%	-39%	-38%	7%
DEMOCRATS				
2015	\$1,853,042	\$1,802,780	\$722,903	\$ 632,721
2019	\$2,324,484	\$2,460,383	\$908,586	\$ 828,729
Difference-Dollars	\$ 471,442	\$ 657,603	\$185,683	\$ 196,008
Difference-%	25%	36%	26%	31%
BOTH PARTIES				
2015	\$3,896,539	\$3,579,018	\$1,984,629	\$1,346,849
2019	\$3,717,926	\$3,542,777	\$1,696,720	\$1,590,657
Difference-Dollars	\$(178,613)	\$ (36,241)	\$(287,909)	\$ 243,808
Difference-%	-5%	-1%	-15%	18%

Brindle said party fundraising has declined steadily since tight restrictions on contributions by public contractors took effect around 2005.

Special interest groups also have been more inclined to participate in elections on their own instead of mailing checks to candidates and parties after federal court rulings swept away contribution limits for independent spending committees.

Bi-partisan legislation recommended by ELEC and pending in the Legislature could help fortify the state’s political parties by allowing them to accept larger contributions and free them from pay-to-play restrictions.

“The decline of the parties has increased the clout of independent groups, which are far less accountable and transparent. These groups now dominate the electoral process in New Jersey and nationally,” Brindle said. “ELEC’s legislative fixes should help reverse this trend.”

State Parties and Legislative Leadership Committees are required to report their financial activity to the Commission on a quarterly basis. The reports are available on ELEC’s website at www.elec.state.nj.us. ELEC also can be accessed on Facebook (www.facebook.com/NJElectionLaw) and Twitter (www.twitter.com/elecny).

A Handful of Districts Liven Up An Otherwise Quiet Start to Legislative General Election

Two years after a legislative election that smashed spending records, the fall campaign for 80 state Assembly seats and one state Senate seat is off to a sluggish start, according to 29-day pre-election reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

Legislative candidates have raised \$14.3 million but spent just \$7.1 million so far. The total is based on reports due October 7 that reflect financial activity through October 4.

Legislators in the last election had already spent \$12.2 million- 72 percent more- though it should be noted that all 40 Senate seats also were in play during 2017.

The \$7.1 million spent this year is higher than the \$6.6 million spent in 2015, another year when Assembly candidates had the ballot to themselves. The 2019 election occurs November 5.

The main reason overall spending is down sharply is because reported independent spending to date has reached just \$728,046. That is nearly 15 times less than the \$10.7 million spent independently at this point in 2017. It is also smaller than the \$5.4 million spent by independent groups in 2015.

Table 1
Legislative Campaign Spending
For 29-Day Reporting Period

YEAR	LEGISLATIVE	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTAL	TYPE
2019*	\$ 7,109,902	\$ 728,046 ¹	\$ 7,837,948	A
2017	\$12,191,375	\$10,695,427	\$22,886,802	A/S
2015	\$ 6,589,670	\$ 5,393,739	\$11,983,409	A

*Legislative total includes spending on a special election for first legislative district state Senate seat.

“It is still early in the race. In some elections, the heaviest spending comes during the last week or two of the campaign,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director.

¹ General Majority PAC (\$393,337) and Garden State Forward (\$334,709).

“However, it also could be that most of this year’s races are not viewed as very competitive. Both parties and independent groups may be saving their campaign dollars until next year, when presidential and congressional elections will take place,” he said.

The 2017 legislative election featured the highest spending (nearly \$19 million) ever nationally in a state legislative race. It involved the third legislative district. None of the 2019 legislative skirmishes are likely to come close to that figure.

Based on historical trends and pre-election forecasts, the top six districts reporting the most fundraising- 1,8,11,16,21, and 25- all are viewed among the most likely “battleground” districts this fall. There are 40 legislative districts in New Jersey.

“Battleground districts tend to be those with the tightest voting margins in previous elections. Both parties view them as winnable, so they tend to be the most expensive elections,” said Brindle.

Nearly 40 percent of all campaign funds have poured into the top six districts. Nearly two-thirds of total spending statewide has occurred in those six districts alone.

For the top 10 districts, the percentages are even higher- 52 percent of fundraising and 73 percent of spending.

Table 2
Legislative District Spending Top Ten
Districts Through October 4, 2019

DISTRICT	RAISED	SPENT	CASH
21	\$1,252,504	\$ 960,897	\$ 291,608
11	\$ 956,552	\$ 771,013	\$ 185,539
16	\$ 858,584	\$ 757,495	\$ 101,089
1*	\$ 982,847	\$ 665,917	\$ 316,930
8	\$ 789,708	\$ 535,828	\$ 253,880
25	\$ 626,357	\$ 391,026	\$ 235,331
19	\$ 607,384	\$ 373,257	\$ 234,127
2	\$ 516,172	\$ 286,586	\$ 229,586
14	\$ 510,814	\$ 244,358	\$ 266,456
38	\$ 317,308	\$ 189,323	\$ 127,985
Totals- Top 6	\$5,466,551	\$4,082,175	\$1,384,376
Top 6 as % of All 40 Districts	38%	57%	19%
Totals- Top 10	\$7,418,229	\$5,175,700	\$2,242,529
Top 10 As % of All 40 Districts	52%	73%	31%

*Includes spending on state Senate special election. All other districts involve Assembly candidates only.

“Battleground districts always dominate spending,” said Brindle. “Spending in most other districts around the state is lighter because incumbents of both parties face little risk of losing due to redistricting.”

Democrats hold a 54-to-26 margin in the Assembly. They have held the majority since 2002, and they are raising and spending more money than Republican or independent candidates.

Table 3
Breakdown of Legislative Campaign Finance
Activity by Party through October 4, 2019

PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Democratic Candidates	\$10,999,897	\$5,733,701	\$5,266,196
Independent Candidates	\$ 16,854	\$ 4,465	\$ 12,389
Republican Candidates	\$ 3,269,185	\$1,371,736	\$1,897,449
All Parties	\$14,285,936	\$7,109,902	\$7,176,034

Incumbents benefit from a big advantage over challengers in terms of fundraising, raising more than four times more money than newcomers and spending nearly three times more. They also have more than seven times more cash to spend with the election less than a month away.

Table 4
Breakdown of Spending by Incumbents
and Challengers through October 4, 2019

PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Incumbents	\$11,458,563	\$5,160,075	\$6,298,488
Challengers	\$ 2,827,374	\$1,949,828	\$ 877,546
All Candidates	\$14,285,936	\$7,109,902	\$7,176,034

The numbers in this report should be considered preliminary. The analysis is based on reports received by October 15, 2019.

Reports filed by legislative candidates are available online on ELEC's website at www.elec.state.nj.us. A downloadable summary of data from those reports is available in both spreadsheet and PDF formats at www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/statistics.htm.

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.

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