



ELEC *tronic*

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

ISSUE 128 • FEBRUARY 2020

Comments from the Chairman

Eric H. Jaso

ELEC Ensures Transparency in Lobbying

“Ten people who speak make more noise than ten thousand who are silent” – Napoleon Bonaparte

Every February 15, Governmental Affairs Agents and Represented Entities (lobbyists) must file reports with ELEC summarizing their financial activity for the previous calendar year.

Lobbyists must disclose any financial activity conducted for the purpose of communicating with or providing benefits to a member of the Legislature, legislative staff, the Governor, his or her staff, or an officer or staff member of the executive branch. The reporting law does not cover lobbying at the local level.

Under the law, reporting is required when lobbying is undertaken for the purpose of influencing legislation, regulations, or governmental processes.

Governmental processes include contracts, grants, permits, rate setting, executive orders, fines and penalties, and procedures for purchasing.

Any Governmental Affairs Agent or Represented Entity that receives or expends more than \$2,500 in the previous calendar year is required to disclose financial activity with the Commission.

The reporting law also covers “grassroots” lobbying. Any individual or group (regardless of whether they are registered lobbyists) spending in excess of \$2,500 to communicate with the public for the purpose of influencing legislation or regulation must disclose this activity to the Commission.

The financial reports submitted by the lobbying community provide information involving five general categories: in-house salaries, compensation to contract lobbying

firms, communication, support personnel, and travel and lodging.

In its annual report to the Legislature, ELEC has recommended that the law be extended to cover lobbying at the local level of government. This would require reporting of lobbying local government entities by paid government affairs agents.

In March, the Commission will publish an analysis of lobbying activity undertaken in 2019.

This analysis will report the top ten lobbyists in terms of communication spending, the top ten special interest groups in terms of total spending, and the top ten contract lobbying firms in terms of total receipts.

The report will provide the public with a comprehensive view of lobbying activity at the State level.

“Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry”

IN THIS ISSUE

Comments from the Chairman	1
Executive Director’s Thoughts	2
In Memory of Ezanie Wilson “Bill” Bagley	3
County Parties Raised And Spent Less Than Last Assembly-Only Election Year In 2015	4
Low-Key Legislative Election Brings Low Spending by Big Six	7
2020 Reporting Dates	9

COMMISSIONERS:

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

Executive Director's Thoughts Jeff Brindle

Marijuana Referendum Plus Several Congressional District Showdowns Could Lead to Big Spending in 2020 Elections

Reprinted from insidernj.com

A controversial ballot question and a potentially competitive congressional election this fall presages significant spending by independent, outside groups. The state Legislature has placed a question on the fall ballot asking voters to legalize marijuana for recreational purposes. Also, while there are no other state elections in November, there will be federal congressional races in four districts in which Republicans will be attempting to win back seats lost to Democrats in 2018.

Combining the ballot initiative with a competitive federal election is likely to spur heavy spending, especially from independent groups. It could lead to new highs.

The ballot question follows an unsuccessful effort by pro-marijuana legislators and lobbyists to gain legalization of recreational marijuana through the legislative process.

At stake is a big piece of an American marijuana market that is expected to grow from \$13.6 billion in 2019 to nearly \$30 billion in 2025, according to New Frontier Data, an analytics firm that focuses on the cannabis industry.

Beginning in 2017, a two-year lobbying campaign was undertaken by cannabis advocates, whose goal was to have legislation passed that would legalize marijuana use. This effort was opposed by anti-marijuana groups.

As part of this effort, lobbyists employed mostly old school, direct lobbying methods and spent \$330,000 in 2017 advocating for or against legalization.

In just one year, however, spending by special interest lobbyists jumped by 319 percent. In 2018 special interest lobbyists spent \$1.4 million lobbying the Legislature on the issue, this time mostly by pro marijuana groups. Figures on 2019 activity will be available toward the beginning of March.

The heavy lobbying, however, was not enough to bring about a floor vote due to a reluctance among many legislators to embrace such a controversial measure.

Now that lawmakers have asked voters to decide the matter, spending for and against recreational marijuana use will predictably climb.

Already, \$140 million has been spent on public questions involving marijuana legalization efforts in 10 other states, according to the National Institute on Money in Politics. This includes unsuccessful and successful campaigns, sometimes in the same states. The total does not include initiatives focused solely on legalizing marijuana use for medical purposes

Illinois in 2019 became the first state to permit the use of marijuana solely through legislation and the 11th to legalize its use.

Spending on State Ballot Initiatives Seeking Legalization of Marijuana

State	Year	Totals	Outcome
Michigan	2018	\$ 6,948,539	Passed
North Dakota	2018	\$ 437,491	Failed
Arizona	2016	\$ 15,257,014	Failed
California	2016	\$ 39,215,141	Passed
Maine	2016	\$ 3,745,152	Passed
Massachusetts	2016	\$ 9,954,444	Passed
Nevada	2016	\$ 3,698,114	Passed
Ohio	2015	\$ 23,404,946	Failed
Alaska	2014	\$ 1,305,909	Passed
Oregon	2014	\$ 14,371,741	Passed
Colorado	2012	\$ 4,197,901	Passed
Oregon	2012	\$ 640,872	Failed
Washington	2012	\$ 6,187,530	Passed
California	2010	\$ 4,998,147	Failed
Colorado	2006	\$ 1,283,016	Failed
Nevada	2006	\$ 3,958,179	Failed
Alaska	2004	\$ 1,017,697	Failed
Total		\$140,621,833	

Source: National Institute on Money in Politics

Not to be overlooked, independent groups spent \$52 million participating in the 2018 US Senate election and the campaign for the House of Representatives that saw districts 2, 3, 7, and 8 flip from Republican to Democrat.

More was spent in the four congressional swing districts (\$24 million) than in the Senate race (\$22 million).

If history is any guide, independent group spending will again be substantial this year as both parties struggle to either retain or regain seats in at least four highly contested districts.

The combination of the ballot question and the federal election is a recipe for independent groups spending the likes of which New Jerseyans have never seen.

As noted, spending by special interest lobbyists has thus far been in the mode of traditional, old school lobbying. However, the fact that the issue will now be before the voters in the form of a public question means special interests will have to change tactics and turn to issue advocacy and electioneering communications to urge the public to support or oppose the measure.

This switch, combined with spending trends in other states, foreshadows millions of dollars being spent by independent organizations in the 2020 election cycle.

Unfortunately, the sources of this spending may well be largely hidden from the public as groups undertake their spending campaigns behind innocuous names that may sound publicly-spirited but are really meant to flex the clout of private interest groups.

In other words, the public may not fully know who is advocating for and against the legalization of marijuana.

New Jerseyans can expect a barrage of television, radio, direct mail, and digital advertising that might challenge the record \$25 million spent on a 2016 ballot question asking voters to allow casino gambling outside of Atlantic City. Voters, incidentally, rejected that proposal.

For the first time, a meaningful percentage of this spending may go toward digital advertising, which is extremely difficult to track. As Michael Franz points out in [Interest Groups Politics](#), this trend began in earnest at the federal level in 2018. And it has been shown that what happens at the federal level inevitably trickles down to the states.

In fact, it already has. Known digital advertising in New Jersey legislative elections shot up 835 percent from \$269,382 to \$2.5 million in 2017, according to ELEC data.

Franz writes, "Digital advertising is a clear growth market, though, such that Borrell Associates predicts that spending on those ads will likely equal spending on television in 2020."

With this in mind, and with such an intense election year ahead in New Jersey, digital advertising will surely make its mark in the Garden State.

Advocates on both sides are likely to use conventional media combined with lots of digital advertising, including banner ads on Facebook and Twitter, pre-roll ads on YouTube, streaming ads on Hulu or Pandora, or ads on news websites to reach younger voters.

As New Jerseyans ring in the New Year, citizens can expect boffo spending by outside groups, an unprecedented digital ad blitz and significant challenges to transparency in politics and elections.

In Memory of Ezanie Wilson "Bill" Bagley

By Joe Donohue

Before the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) moved its offices to 25 South Stockton Street in December 2017, it was located in the former Trenton Trust Company building at 28 West State Street for its first 44 years.

For many of those years, employees of ELEC and other building occupants were cheerfully assisted by Ezanie Wilson "Bill" Bagley. According to his Trentonian obituary, Bagley died December 15, 2019. He was 87 and had never retired.

The Trenton native was a building engineer and licensed Black Seal boiler operator. Along with his active involvement with Galilee Baptist Church, he was an avid NY Giants fan and an eternal optimist.

"If someone's office heater broke down or there were other mechanical problems, Mr. Bagley was always there to help. Even when the problem was difficult, he always knew how to solve it. It always was a pleasure to be with him," said Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director. "ELEC extends its condolences to his family and friends. He will be sorely missed."

County Parties Raised and Spent Less Than Last Assembly-Only Election Year In 2015

County party fund-raising and spending in 2019 was below comparable figures for 2015, which was the last time the Assembly led the fall ballot¹, according to reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

The 42 county party fund-raising committees collectively raised \$8.2 million and spent \$8.8 million during the past year. Those figures were 11 percent and one percent lower than corresponding numbers for 2015.

Table 1
County Party Fundraising and Spending
through Fourth Quarter 2009-2019

YEAR	RAISED	SPENT	STATE/ FEDERAL?	OFFICE
2009	\$13,854,662	\$13,306,296	State	G/A
2010	\$ 7,591,065	\$ 8,712,802	Federal	H
2011	\$ 8,449,211	\$ 8,545,440	State	S/A
2012	\$ 6,407,139	\$ 5,885,971	Federal	P/S/H
2013	\$ 9,908,851	\$10,069,188	State	G/S/A
2014	\$ 7,633,924	\$ 7,560,342	Federal	S/H
2015	\$ 9,161,877	\$ 8,883,225	State	A
2016	\$ 8,389,170	\$ 8,055,559	Federal	P/H
2017	\$14,564,574	\$14,114,921	State	G/S/A
2018	\$ 9,709,931	\$ 9,018,198	Federal	S/H
2019	\$ 8,191,320	\$ 8,821,224	State	A
2019 Versus 2015-\$	- \$ 970,557	- \$ 62,002		
2019 Versus 2015-%	-11	-1		

P=Presidential; S=US or State Senate; H=House; G=Gubernatorial; A=Assembly

Jeff Brindle, ELEC's executive director, said party officials are continuing to have fund-raising difficulties that began after new laws sharply limited contributions from public contractors in the mid-2000s and independent special interest groups began competing for donor dollars about a decade ago.

"Certainly, county parties spend more when more candidates are on the ballot. For instance, \$14.1 million was spent during the 2017 election, when there were races for governor, the state Senate and the state Assembly," he said.

"Despite these election-related fluctuations, the long-term trend is down. This decline may be reversed only with legislative changes, including bipartisan recommendations by ELEC," he said.

Some of those changes include allowing parties to accept larger contributions from all donors, including public contractors; requiring independent groups to match the same level of disclosure as parties and candidate, and lifting a ban on county-to-county party transfers in primaries.

In 2019, Democratic county party committees raised and spent more than Republican committees and ended the year with more cash in the bank.

Compared to 2015, Democrats raised and spent less while Republicans raised less but spent more. Democratic cash reserves are nearly twice the 2015 levels while Republican reserves are down.

¹ In 2019, there also was one special state Senate election in the 1st legislative district plus local races.

Table 2
Summary of Campaign Finance Activity by County Committees
January 1 through December 31
2019 Versus 2015

2019	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	\$5,281,716	\$5,695,684	\$2,018,930	\$1,836,889
Republican County Party Committees	\$2,909,604	\$3,125,540	\$ 485,959	\$ 888,015
Total-Both Parties	\$8,191,320	\$8,821,224	\$2,504,889	\$2,724,903
2015	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	\$6,075,026	\$5,882,648	\$1,134,676	\$ 909,127
Republican County Party Committees	\$3,086,851	\$3,000,577	\$ 590,138	\$1,343,584
Total-Both Parties	\$9,161,877	\$8,883,225	\$1,724,814	\$2,252,711
Difference 2019 versus 2015	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	-13.1%	-3%	78%	102%
Republican County Party Committees	-6%	4%	-18%	-34%
Total-Both Parties	-11%	-1%	45%	21%

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

Among Democratic county party committees, Camden, Gloucester, Mercer, Passaic, Salem and Union all reported more than \$100,000 cash-on-hand. Burlington, Cape May, and Hudson County reported a negative net worth, meaning they owe more than their cash reserves.

Table 3
Campaign Finance Activity of Democratic County Party Committees
January 1 through December 31, 2019

COUNTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Atlantic	\$ 167,015	\$ 164,819	\$ 8,703	\$ 8,703
Bergen	\$ 738,530	\$ 746,073	\$ 32,434	\$ 32,434
Burlington	\$ 282,321	\$ 358,207	\$ 5,652	\$ (11,927)
Camden	\$ 440,682	\$ 710,707	\$ 341,797	\$ 341,797
Cape May	\$ 112,409	\$ 109,655	\$ 3,714	\$ (37,772)
Cumberland	\$ 94,742	\$ 95,731	\$ 4,402	\$ 4,402
Essex	\$ 432,441	\$ 454,221	\$ 86,340	\$ 86,340
Gloucester	\$ 436,154	\$ 304,849	\$ 549,081	\$ 549,081
Hudson**	\$ 102,451	\$ 153,815	\$ 25,294	\$ (113,851)
Hunterdon	\$ 47,704	\$ 32,280	\$ 30,205	\$ 30,205
Mercer	\$ 170,070	\$ 130,828	\$ 197,366	\$ 197,366
Middlesex	\$ 716,734	\$ 685,683	\$ 46,407	\$ 46,407
Monmouth***	\$ 178,102	\$ 164,459	\$ 18,112	\$ 18,112
Morris**	\$ 123,747	\$ 97,024	\$ 33,662	\$ 33,662
Ocean	\$ 45,149	\$ 64,811	\$ 23,328	\$ 39,495
Passaic	\$ 445,802	\$ 546,152	\$ 286,598	\$ 286,598
Salem	\$ 31,996	\$ 34,638	\$ 102,029	\$ 102,029
Somerset	\$ 301,099	\$ 309,898	\$ 51,906	\$ 51,906
Sussex	\$ 16,362	\$ 27,148	\$ 9,446	\$ 9,446
Union	\$ 378,542	\$ 489,133	\$ 153,380	\$ 153,380
Warren***	\$ 19,664	\$ 15,553	\$ 9,073	\$ 9,073
Democrats-Total	\$5,281,716	\$5,695,684	\$2,018,930	\$1,836,889

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

2nd quarter totals *3rd quarter totals

No Republican county committees reported more than \$100,000 in cash-on-hand at the end of 2019.

Table 4
Campaign Finance Activity of
Republican County Party Committees
January 1 through December 31, 2019

COUNTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Atlantic	\$ 89,434	\$ 108,443	\$ 21,332	\$ 21,332
Bergen	\$ 160,416	\$ 151,675	\$ 18,725	\$ 18,725
Burlington	\$ 472,332	\$ 505,461	\$ 20,345	\$415,222
Camden	\$ 23,798	\$ 35,663	\$ 8,004	\$ 8,004
Cape May	\$ 141,997	\$ 152,946	\$ 22,654	\$ 22,654
Cumberland	\$ 46,381	\$ 88,617	\$ 6,626	\$ 6,626
Essex	\$ 19,244	\$ 16,798	\$ 21,954	\$ 21,954
Gloucester	\$ 47,716	\$ 55,304	\$ 21,718	\$ 21,718
Hudson***	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hunterdon**	\$ 93,232	\$ 105,552	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,070
Mercer	\$ 5,280	\$ 27,446	\$ 5,885	\$ 5,885
Middlesex	\$ 20,345	\$ 47,235	\$ 16,385	\$ 16,385
Monmouth	\$ 291,225	\$ 279,323	\$ 39,978	\$ 39,978
Morris	\$ 79,069	\$ 84,877	\$ 10,210	\$ 17,810
Ocean	\$ 159,391	\$ 148,974	\$ 16,668	\$ 16,668
Passaic	\$ 327,076	\$ 288,076	\$ 57,490	\$ 57,490
Salem**	\$ 261,959	\$ 243,711	\$ 36,845	\$ 36,845
Somerset	\$ 411,533	\$ 475,463	\$ 93,186	\$ 93,186
Sussex	\$ 65,212	\$ 83,032	\$ 16,665	\$ 16,244
Union	\$ 95,198	\$ 111,885	\$ 44,205	\$ 44,205
Warren	\$ 98,765	\$ 115,058	\$ 6,014	\$ 6,014
Republicans-Total	\$2,909,604	\$3,125,540	\$485,959	\$888,015

*Net worth is cash-on-hand adjusted for debts owed to or by the committee. **3rd quarter totals.

***Expects to spend less than \$6,300 during year. NA= No reports available

The numbers in this analysis are based on reports filed by noon January 24, 2020. 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).

Low-Key Legislative Election Brings Low Spending by Big Six

Fund-raising and spending in the 2019 state election by the so-called Big Six committees were the lowest in more than a decade, according disclosure reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

As a group, the committees - the two state parties and four legislative leadership committees- raised \$7.2 million, spent \$8 million and reported \$660,067 in leftover funds. Fund-raising and spending were higher in the six previous state election years dating back to 2007.

“With just the state Assembly running for reelection plus a special state Senate election in the first legislative district, it was a relatively low-profile election,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director. “That may be one reason why Big Six spending was fairly subdued for a state election year.”

Brindle noted that if the nearly \$8.7 million in spending in the 2015 legislative race had been increased just to offset inflation, the Big Six would have spent \$9.3 million in 2019. Instead, spending fell to \$8 million.

**Table 1
Campaign Finance Activity in State Election Years
by “Big Six” January 1 through December 31, 2019**

BOTH PARTIES	RAISED	SPENT*	CASH-ON-HAND	ELECTION TYPE
2007	\$19,177,655	\$23,367,064	\$ 377,324	S/A
2009	\$12,368,082	\$12,919,862	\$1,297,457	G/A
2011	\$15,035,468	\$15,547,359	\$1,028,142	S/A
2013	\$13,885,028	\$14,727,957	\$ 841,599	G/S/A
2015	\$ 8,027,793	\$ 8,661,126	\$ 979,220	A
2017	\$12,243,328	\$13,348,131	\$ 738,454	G/S/A
2019	\$ 7,155,435	\$ 8,016,939	\$ 660,067	A**

S= State Senate; G=Gubernatorial; A=Assembly

*Spending may exceed fundraising because committee tapped reserve funds.

**Also, special state Senate election in 1st legislative district.

He said ELEC-recommended legislative initiatives that have bipartisan backing could boost party committees.

“The long-term financial decline of party committees must be reversed because they are more accountable and transparent than the fast-spreading array of independent special interest committees that now dominate the electoral landscape in New Jersey,” Brindle said. “Higher contribution limits for party committees, an exemption from pay-to-play restrictions, and a requirement that independent spenders fully disclose their donors just like parties and candidates would help reinvigorate the parties.”

Democrats, who still retain a majority in both legislative houses, lost the one Senate seat in contention and two assembly seats. All three are in the first legislative district. Democrats now hold a 25-15 edge in the Senate and a 52-28 majority in the Assembly. Democrats have controlled the legislature since January 2002.

Democratic committees raised and spent more than Republican committees and had more leftover funds.

Compared to four years ago, when the Assembly also was alone on the ballot, fund-raising, spending and cash-on-hand was down for both parties though net worth figures are higher.

Table 2
Campaign Finance Activity by
"Big Six" Committees in 2019

REPUBLICANS	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
New Jersey Republican State Committee	\$1,977,714	\$1,959,996	\$ 135,520	\$135,520
Senate Republican Majority	\$ 457,592	\$ 601,019	\$ 28,824	\$ 28,824
Assembly Republican Victory	\$ 715,434	\$ 861,683	\$ 40,783	\$ 40,783
Sub Total – Republicans - 2019	\$3,150,740	\$3,422,698	\$ 205,127	\$205,127
Versus 2015 (Dollars)	\$ (175,943)	\$ (248,657)	\$(435,848)	\$101,750
Versus 2015 (Percent)	-5%	-7%	-68%	98%
DEMOCRATS				
New Jersey Democratic State Committee	\$1,367,380	\$1,436,043	\$ 34,019	\$ 4,600
Senate Democratic Majority	\$ 600,809	\$ 517,216	\$ 389,574	\$369,574
Democratic Assembly Campaign Committee	\$2,036,506	\$2,640,982	\$ 31,347	\$ 908
Sub Total – Democrats - 2019	\$4,004,695	\$4,594,241	\$ 454,940	\$375,082
Versus 2015 (Dollars)	\$(696,415)	\$(395,530)	\$ 116,695	\$216,106
Versus 2015 (Percent)	-15%	-8%	35%	136%
Both Parties				
Total - 2019	\$7,155,435	\$8,016,939	\$ 660,067	\$580,209
Versus 2015 (Dollars)	\$ (872,358)	\$ (644,187)	\$(319,153)	\$317,856
Versus 2015 (Percent)	-11%	-7%	-33%	121%

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

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/elecnj).

2020 Reporting Dates

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
FIRE COMMISSIONER – FEBRUARY 15, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 1/14/2020	1/17/2020
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	1/15/2020 – 2/1/2020	2/4/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	2/2/2020 – 3/3/2020	3/6/2020
48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 2/2/2020 through 2/15/2020		
APRIL SCHOOL BOARD – APRIL 21, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 3/20/2020	3/23/2020
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	3/21/2020 – 4/7/2020	4/13/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	4/8/2020 – 5/8/2020	5/11/2020
48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/8/2020 through 4/21/2020		
MAY MUNICIPAL – MAY 12, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 4/10/2020	4/13/2020
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	4/11/2020 – 2/28/2020	5/1/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	4/29/2020 – 5/29/2020	6/1/2020
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 4/29/2020 through 5/12/2020		
RUNOFF (JUNE) ** – JUNE 9, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	4/29/2020 – 5/26/2020	5/29/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	5/27/2020 – 6/26/2020	6/29/2020
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/27/2020 through 6/9/2020		
PRIMARY (90-DAY START DATE: MARCH 4, 2020) *** – JUNE 2, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 5/1/2020	5/4/2020
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	5/2/2020 – 5/19/2020	5/22/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	5/20/2020 – 6/19/2020	6/22/2020
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/20/2020 through 6/2/2020		
GENERAL (90-DAY START DATE: AUGUST 5, 2020) – NOVEMBER 3, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	6/20/2020 – 10/2/2020	10/5/2020
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	10/3/2020 – 10/20/2020	10/23/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	10/21/2020 – 11/20/2020	11/23/2020
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 10/21/2020 through 11/3/2020		
RUNOFF (DECEMBER)** – DECEMBER 8, 2020		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	10/21/2020 – 11/24/2020	11/27/2020
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	11/25/2020 – 12/25/2020	12/28/2020
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 11/25/2020 through 12/8/2020		

PACs, PCFRs & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS		
1 st Quarter	1/1/2020 – 3/31/2020	4/15/2020
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2020 – 6/30/2020	7/15/2020
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2020 – 9/30/2020	10/15/2020
4 th Quarter	10/1/2020 – 12/31/2020	1/15/2021
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AGENTS (Q-4)		
1 st Quarter	1/1/2020 – 3/31/2020	4/13/2020
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2020 – 6/30/2020	7/10/2020
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2020 – 9/30/2020	10/13/2020
4 th Quarter	10/1/2020 – 12/31/2020	1/11/2021

*Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or January 1, 2020 (Quarterly filers)

**A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2020 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 19, 2020 for the Primary Election Candidates and June 12, 2020 for the Independent General Election Candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2019 filing is needed for the Primary 2020 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 4, 2019. A second quarter is needed by Independent/Non-Partisan General Election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 5, 2020.

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