



Newsletter

ELECtronic

DECEMBER
2021

ISSUE

150

AN ELECTION LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION NEWSLETTER
"Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry"

Comments from the Chairman

Eric H. Jaso

"Somewhere in the world there is a defeat for everyone. Some are destroyed by defeat, and some made small and mean by victory. Greatness lives in one who triumphs equally over defeat and victory." – John Steinbeck

On November 3, the day after Election Day, ELEC approved disbursing \$680,528 in public funds to the Republican candidate for Governor, Jack Ciattarelli.

One might well ask: how can a candidate receive public matching funds once the election is over?

It happens because the law permits participating candidates to continue raising money for six months following a primary or general election.

The Ciattarelli campaign has received a total of \$10.5 million in public funds for the general election. Candidates participating in the Gubernatorial Public Financing Program in the general election are eligible to receive a total \$10.5 million in public funds.

Governor Phil Murphy, who also participated in the Program, likewise received the maximum \$10.5 million in public funds.

Money that campaigns raise after an election continues to be subject to contribution limits and must adhere to certain rules.

First, contributions received may not exceed \$4,900 and cannot have come from a previous contributor whose contributions in the aggregate would be more than \$4,900.

Second, all contributions received can only be spent to pay debts and to reimburse expenses incurred during the general election campaign.

Private funds may also be used to pay debts incurred prior to the election, such as outstanding obligations involving travel expenses and lodging.

Under certain circumstances, however, and with the approval of the Commission, expenses incurred after the date of the election, such as a campaign's post-election legal or other professional fees, may be paid.

ELEC's Public Financing staff scrutinize all post-election contributions submitted for match with the same diligence as during an election cycle.

Therefore, it is just as important after the election for campaigns to ensure that all funds are raised and spent in compliance with the law.

Participating candidates, win or lose, may retain public funds for six months following the general election. After that period, campaigns must repay any remaining public funds to the State.

Further, after six months candidates must repay all remaining non-public funds; however, candidates are not required to repay any amounts that exceed the total amount of public funds received by the candidate.

This election year the Public Financing Program was perhaps more important than ever. Without public funding, the candidates' voices would have been virtually drowned out by the record-breaking amount of independent spending: over \$40 million was spent by independent groups (which are not subject to the same fundraising and spending rules) during the primary and general elections.

Once again, ELEC staff did an outstanding job to ensure that campaigns complied with the law, and that public funds were distributed efficiently.

IN THIS ISSUE

- Comments from the Chairman
- Executive Director's Thoughts
- Advisory Opinion No. 1-2021
- Commission Meeting Schedule for Year 2022
- Kean Decries Influence of "Dark Money on Elections"
- Eighth and Second Legislative Districts Clashes Rank Among Top Five All-Time Costliest Races
- Independent Spending Drives Up Cost of 2021 Gubernatorial Election
- Gubernatorial Election Year Helps Pump Up County Coffers
- 2022 Reporting Dates

- P. 1
 - P. 2
 - P. 3
 - P. 3
 - P. 4
 - P. 5
 - P. 8
 - P. 11
 - P. 14
- COMMISSIONERS**
- Eric H. Jaso, Chairman
 - Stephen M. Holden, Commissioner
 - Marguerite T. Simon, Commissioner
 - Edwin R. Matthews, Legal Counsel

Executive Director's Thoughts

Jeff Brindle

We must shine a light on the shadowy dark money groups trying to influence your vote

Reprinted from nj.com

Recent video advertisements targeting three New Jersey congressmen highlight the danger to democracy and transparency presented by “Dark Money” groups that have penetrated New Jersey’s elections.

Three incumbent Democratic congressmen — Andy Kim (3rd District), Frank Pallone (5th District) and Tom Malinowski (7th District) — are targets of the same ad except with each of their images superimposed over it.

It warns they will be “cutting off access to lifesaving medicines,” “foregoing future cures” to diseases like cancer, Alzheimer’s and diabetes, and may jeopardize future pandemic vaccines if they vote for a \$3.5 trillion Democratic spending package.

“Tell Congressman... to oppose cutting Medicare. Lives depend on it.”

The ad conveniently fails to mention that the bill actually would expand services available under Medicare.

The ads were created by a shadowy group called A Healthy Future LLC of Stafford, Va. It does not file disclosure reports with either the Federal Election Commission or the Internal Revenue Service.

A recent Star-Ledger editorial spotlighted the “fearmongering ads” and suggests

they probably were underwritten by drug companies or their trade association.

“Probably” is a key term because the public can never be sure who is behind these often-deceptive ads.

Candidates from both parties often are targets of advertising by special interest groups that hide their true identities, refuse to disclose how much they are spending, and conceal where they got the money. These “Dark Money” groups refuse to disclose their contributions and expenses like candidates, parties and traditional political action committees have done for decades.

Part of the solution would be broader disclosure under campaign finance laws.

State, county and local candidates also are vulnerable to these types of ads just like federal candidates.

In either case, the voters of New Jersey are behind the eight ball when it comes to holding candidates accountable for misleading ads produced by “Dark Money” groups that either support them or attack their opponent.

How many times have we heard denials by a candidate who claims, “that’s an independent group that has nothing to do with my campaign.”

“Dark Money” groups blur the link between them and the candidate they support.

Under current law, most of these groups are required to disclose only their expenses to ELEC. And then only if they directly urge voters to support or defeat a candidate.

Fortunately, most of the largest groups that take part in state elections voluntarily disclose their contributions.

Without stronger disclosure laws, most disclosure could disappear if these groups decide to pursue a stealthier political strategy.

This seems to be happening at the federal level. More than \$1 billion spent on the 2020 federal elections — a new high — came from untraceable sources, according to <http://www.opensecrets.org/>.

In New Jersey, the influence of these groups has soared during the past 15 years. Independent spending in state elections grew 12,495% between 2005 and 2017, according to an analysis by the New Jersey Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

At the same time that “Dark Money” groups have grown in influence in New Jersey, spending by regulated, accountable state and county political parties fell about 29% between 2005 and 2017.

Since 2010, ELEC has called for and proposed legislative change that would require “Dark Money” groups engaged in independent spending to disclose their donors to enable voters to know who is behind these efforts to influence elections. It includes electioneering ads that tie candidates to issues in an election year.

About 25 states require far more disclosure by independent spending committees than New Jersey. Bills are pending in the legislature that should pass constitutional muster while ensuring that voters are better aware of who is calling the shots in elections.

The recent congressional ads are the latest example of why renewed focus is needed in the Legislature on ELEC’s recommendations to require disclosure by “Dark Money” groups and to strengthen political parties.

Advisory Opinion No. 1-2021 Contributions to a Segregated Account of a State Political Party Committee

By Joe Donohue

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) has unanimously declined to let a state political party committee accept unlimited contributions to pay "housekeeping" expenses such as legal, accounting, mortgage payments, collective bargaining or other business expenditures.

The Commission issued its decision through an advisory opinion at its November 16, 2021 regular monthly meeting.

The decision was prompted by an advisory opinion request filed by Rajiv D. Parikh, Esq., Genova Burns LLC on behalf of the New Jersey Democratic State Committee.

The committee contends that funds raised to pay for what it deems non-political expenses should not be subject to an annual contribution limit of \$25,000 per year for state parties.

The opinion written by Legal Director Demery J. Roberts concludes:

"All transfers of funds made by individuals, business entities, associations, groups, candidates, committees registered with ELEC, corporations, unions, and any other entity permitted to make contributions to a NJDSC segregated account used solely for non-political purposes or "Housekeeping Expenses" are contributions pursuant to the Campaign Act, and therefore subject to contribution limits.

The Commission believes that allowing the NJDSC to receive unlimited amounts of funds from a single source/contributor undermines the purpose of contribution limits, even if those funds are transferred to a segregated account used solely for non-political purposes. The risk of undue influence over the party is related to the amount of money contributed, not how those particular funds are spent."

The advisory opinion and related documents are available at this link: <https://www.elec.nj.gov/pdf/files/ao/2021/ao012021.pdf>.

Commission Meeting Schedule for Year 2022

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission has announced its meeting schedule for 2022. Unless otherwise indicated in the future, meetings will be held at the Commission's offices at 25 South Stockton Street, 5th Floor, in Trenton. It is anticipated that meetings will begin at 11:00 a.m., unless otherwise indicated.

2022 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

January	18, 11:00 a.m.
February	15, 11:00 a.m.
March	15, 11:00 a.m.
April	19, 11:00 a.m.
May	17, 11:00 a.m.
June	21, 11:00 a.m.
July	19, 11:00 a.m.
August	16, 11:00 a.m. (if necessary)
September	20, 11:00 a.m.
October	18, 11:00 a.m.
November	15, 11:00 a.m.
December	20, 11:00 a.m.

Kean Decries Influence of “Dark Money” on Elections

Former Republican Governor Tom Kean Sr. says special interest groups that try to secretly influence national, state and local elections damage democracy and called for stronger disclosure laws to reduce the threat they pose.

“I don’t mind people giving what they want to give. But I want to know who gave it and why,” said the ex-governor during the fourth interview conducted as part of an ongoing project entitled “History of the NJ Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).” Interviews can be viewed on ELEC’s website.

Kean, the state’s 48th governor, served two terms from January 1982 to January 1990. He previously had served in the state Assembly between 1968 and 1978, including two years as Assembly Speaker.

After leaving office in January 1990, he became president of Drew University where he served for 15 years. Kean gained national attention when President George W. Bush named him in December 2002 as chairman of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, also known as the 9-11 Commission.

During the time when he held elected office, most spending on campaigns was done directly by candidates, parties and traditional political action committees. These groups were subject to disclosure requirements and since 1993 contribution limits that provided voters with full information about their activities.

In 2000, however, independent special interest groups that often operated secretly were starting to have an impact on federal elections. Kean was a first-

hand witness when his son, Tom Kean Jr., ran unsuccessfully for a Congressional seat (Kean Jr. went on to become state Senate Minority Leader).

During the 2000 election, the younger Kean faced political attacks from two so-called “dark money” groups that file no reports with the Federal Election Commission. He later filed a lawsuit that prompted a FEC investigation that eventually forced the groups to detail their expenditures and to pay a \$5,500 fine.

The nastiness of the 2000 Congressional primaries prompted a public hearing at which former Governor Kean was sharply critical of these groups, calling them “termites getting at the roots of democracy.”

“I don’t believe there’s a place in democracy for people who hide in the dark...If someone wants to attack you, if someone wants to attack me, that’s fine. Sign your name,” he said.

Opensecrets.org has estimated that at least \$1.1 billion was spent on federal elections between 2010 and 2020 without any disclosure about the source of the money. Millions also have been spent in recent years on New Jersey elections with little or no information about the donors behind the spending or even details of their spending.

ELEC for more than a decade has been calling on the Legislature to enact stronger disclosure laws that would make independent groups follow the same rules as candidates, parties and conventional PACs.

During his recent interview with ELEC Executive Jeff Brindle, Kean said he feels “more strongly” now about the need for such laws because “it hasn’t gotten better, its worse.”

“...If you are trying to buy my state legislator, I want you to come out and say, ‘I’m trying to buy the legislator’ so everybody knows where the money came from. And if that legislator is successful and then votes that way against the public interest, you know that too,” Kean said.

“Until you know who they are, you’ll never know why they’re doing it. And that’s very important. Democracy, you know, is fragile and you’ve got to take care of it. And we’re not taking care of it the way we should, particularly with this dark money. It’s an abomination, it really is,” he said.

On a more personal note, Kean acknowledged he always dreaded making fund-raising calls despite prodding by his campaign managers.

“I can do it for other people. I can particularly do it for causes if it is something I really believe in, you know, money to feed hungry children.” But when it came to his own campaigns, “I just didn’t like to do it.”

Brindle, who conducts the interviews, said the History of the Commission project is focused on individuals who have played a significant role in enacting or enforcing the campaign finance and lobbying laws that shape ELEC’s mission.

“These video-taped interviews hopefully will serve as a resource for policy-makers, academics, media members and any interested members of the general public. Hopefully, it will add historical perspective to many of issues that have had an impact on New Jersey’s elections and its government,” he said.

Previous interviews included current ELEC Chairman Eric Jaso, former ELEC Executive Director Lewis Thurston, and former Assembly Speaker Joe Roberts. The interviews can be viewed at: https://www.elec.nj.gov/aboutelec/ELEC_OralHistory.htm

Eighth and Second Legislative Districts Clashes Rank Among Top Five All-Time Costliest Races

Election showdowns in just two legislative districts cost a combined \$16.3 million, nearly one of three dollars spent on this year's general election, according to the latest reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission.

"Spending in the Eighth Legislative District topped \$8.5 million, third all time when adjusting for inflation," said Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director. "Outlays in the Second Legislative District reached \$7.7 million, making it the fifth most expensive ever. It also is the first time two legislative races have topped \$6 million during one election."

Spending in both districts probably was even higher because not all independent groups disclosed where they spent their money. Another first occurred as the Eighth Legislative District featured the state's most expensive race though it has been in the top five twice since 2001.

Table 1
Top Ten Costliest Legislative Races in New Jersey
History Ranked by Inflation-Adjusted Totals

DISTRICT	COUNTIES	YEAR	TOTAL SPENDING AT THE TIME	TOTAL SPENDING-INFLATION ADJUSTED
3	Gloucester/Salem/Cumberland	2017	\$24,100,941*	\$26,590,942
4	Camden/Gloucester	2003	\$ 6,142,441	\$ 9,157,245
8	Atlantic/Burlington/Camden	2021	\$ 8,543,170	\$ 8,543,170
12	Monmouth	2007	\$ 5,963,939	\$ 7,890,192
2	Atlantic	2021	\$ 7,736,931	\$ 7,736,931
2	Atlantic	2011	\$ 5,806,467	\$ 7,080,906
38	Bergen/ Passaic	2013	\$ 5,910,318	\$ 6,959,479
3	Gloucester/Salem/Cumberland	2003	\$ 4,548,302	\$ 6,780,678
1	Cape May/Cumberland	2007	\$ 4,975,772	\$ 6,582,863
38	Bergen/ Passaic	2011	\$ 5,183,499	\$ 6,321,205

*Believed to be the most expensive state legislative election in US history.

The Second Legislative District has hosted the top race three times since 2001 and ranked in the top five six times.

"One of five candidate dollars, two-thirds of funds spent by independent groups and a third of overall spending were consumed by the two districts alone," Brindle said. "Among the state's 40 legislative districts, the top ten most expensive showdowns drew 68 percent of total candidate spending, 71 percent of independent spending and 69 percent of overall spending."

Table 2
Top Ten Legislative Districts by Spending

DISTRICT	CANDIDATES	INDIES	TOTALS
8	\$ 4,047,511	\$ 4,495,659	\$ 8,543,170
2	\$ 3,377,671	\$ 4,359,261	\$ 7,736,931
11	\$ 3,887,841	\$ 277,536	\$ 4,165,376
16	\$ 2,767,008	\$ 192,749	\$ 2,959,757
3	\$ 2,916,861		\$ 2,916,861
36	\$ 2,323,349		\$ 2,323,349
21	\$ 1,790,266	\$ 224,027	\$ 2,014,293
25	\$ 1,416,844		\$ 1,416,844
39	\$ 984,817		\$ 984,817
13	\$ 885,943		\$ 885,943
Top 10	\$24,398,110	\$ 9,549,231	\$33,947,341
Top 10 %	68%	71%	69%
Top 2	\$ 7,425,181	\$ 8,854,919	\$16,280,101
Top 2 %	21%	65%	33%
All 40 Districts	\$35,632,252	\$13,542,641	\$49,174,893

Overall, the 2021 legislative general election cost \$49.2 million, including \$35.6 million spent by candidates and \$13.5 million shelled out by independent special interest groups.

While independent spending reached its third highest level in a legislative general election, overall spending ranked seventh dating back to 2001 when factoring in inflation.

Table 3
Top Ten Most Expensive Legislative General Elections Ranked by Inflation Adjusted Totals

RANK	YEAR	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTAL SPENDING AT THE TIME	TOTAL SPENDING-INFLATION ADJUSTED
1	2017	\$44,164,473	\$26,562,428	\$70,726,901	\$78,934,996
2	2013	\$43,446,977	\$15,375,071	\$58,822,048	\$69,076,144
3	2003	\$44,990,255	\$ 4,857	\$44,995,112	\$66,759,786
4	2007	\$47,231,847	\$ 165,000	\$47,396,847	\$62,406,466
5	2011	\$44,024,272	\$ 1,835,500	\$45,859,772	\$55,658,891
6	2001	\$32,550,394	\$ 3,166,463	\$35,716,857	\$55,089,317
7	2021	\$35,632,252	\$13,542,641	\$49,174,893	\$49,174,893
8	2015	\$22,632,814	\$10,908,983	\$33,541,797	\$38,634,407
9	2005	\$23,713,193	\$ 3,476	\$23,716,669	\$33,152,697
10	2019	\$21,626,895	\$ 9,283,402	\$30,910,297	\$33,075,712

American Democratic Majority, a federal 527 political organization run by South Jersey Democrats, was the biggest spender in the election, topping \$5.7 million for both the primary and general election. Most of its spending (\$4 million) went to the Eighth Legislative District.

Garden State Forward, a federal 527 political organization run by the New Jersey Education Association, the state's largest union, spent \$3.8 million. Most of its funds (\$3.5 million) were funneled into the Second Legislative District.

Table 4
Cumulative Spending to Date by Independent Committees on 2021 Legislative Elections

GROUP	PRIMARY	GENERAL	BOTH ELECTIONS
American Democratic Majority	\$ 890,253	\$ 4,830,467	\$ 5,720,720
Garden State Forward (NJEA)	\$ 198,493	\$ 3,568,154	\$ 3,766,647
Working for Working Americans (Carpenters)*		\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
Carpenters Action Fund*	\$ 25,000	\$ 1,225,000	\$ 1,250,000
New Jersey Coalition of Real Estate	\$ 533,887	\$ 291,249	\$ 825,136
Women for a Stronger New Jersey	\$ 63,512	\$ 597,054	\$ 660,566
Republican State Leadership Committee		\$ 488,965	\$ 488,965
Stronger Foundations Inc (Operating Engineers)	\$ 276,629	\$ 183,000	\$ 459,629
Turnout Project		\$ 298,705	\$ 298,705
NJ League of Conservation Voters Victory Fund		\$ 296,882	\$ 296,882
Growing Economic Opportunities (Laborers)	\$ 133,161		\$ 133,161
UA Political Action Fund (Plumbers)*		\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Building the Majority PAC		\$ 85,287	\$ 85,287
Better Days PAC	\$ 30,545	\$ 50,084	\$ 80,629
Building Stronger Communities	\$ 77,535		\$ 77,535
America's Future First	\$ 23,560		\$ 23,560
NJ Bankers Association		\$ 19,984	\$ 19,984
New Jersey Right to Life		\$ 7,810	\$ 7,810
Totals	\$2,252,576	\$13,542,641	\$15,795,216

*Contributions to American Democratic Majority.

When spending by legislative candidates and independent groups is added together, Democrats, who control both legislative houses, outspent Republicans by nearly a four-to-one overall margin.

Table 5
Candidate and Independent
Group Spending by Party

PARTY	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTAL
Democrats	\$26,504,169	\$12,145,700	\$38,649,869
Republicans	\$ 9,128,083	\$ 1,396,941	\$10,525,023
Totals	\$35,632,252	\$13,542,641	\$49,174,893

The enormous funding advantage wasn't enough to stop Republicans from picking up seven legislative seats between the two houses, their biggest one-year gain since 1991. All the pickups were made in four of the five top battleground districts- 8, 2,11 and 3- where spending was heaviest. The party seized 11 of the 12 seats in the four districts.

The GOP added one state senate seat, which will reduce the Democratic majority to 24-to-16 in mid-January. In the lower house, Republicans added six state Assembly seats, which will whittle down the Democratic edge to 46-to-34.

One consolation is that Democratic legislators ended with \$10.4 million in cash reserves, much of which can be rolled into the next election. Republican legislators finished the election with \$1.9 million in the bank.

While more money didn't necessarily prevail in most battleground districts, winners still held a big money advantage over losers in the election.

Table 6
Campaign Finance Activity
Winners Versus Losers

	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Winners	\$33,474,680	\$22,413,969	\$11,060,711
Losers	\$14,421,410	\$13,218,283	\$ 1,203,127
Totals	\$47,896,089	\$35,632,252	\$12,263,838

Candidate totals in this analysis are based on 20-day post-election day reports that reflect campaign finance activity through November 19, 2021. Independent spending totals are based on reports filed as recently as November 22.

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

Independent Spending Drives Up Cost of 2021 Gubernatorial Election

A record spike in independent spending pushed the cost of the 2021 gubernatorial election to \$90.7 million, the second costliest on record when inflation is taken into account, according to the latest reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

“While the 2021 election cost the most ever in nominal dollars, it still ranks second compared to the 2005 election. What may be most significant is that independent spending reached \$41.7 million, or nearly 46 percent of total spending,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director.

“The amount of independent spending this year is an increase of 69 percent compared to the previous high of \$24.5 million,” he said. “At this rate, independent groups soon could be out-spending candidates on New Jersey’s gubernatorial elections.”

Table 1
Total Spending on Gubernatorial Election
(Includes Pre-Primary, Primary and General)

YEAR	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENT	TOTAL COST AT THE TIME	INFLATION ADJUSTED
2005	\$87,724,988	\$ 407,748	\$88,132,736	\$124,815,900
2021	\$48,957,465	\$41,709,084	\$90,666,548	\$ 90,666,548
2009	\$56,099,909	\$14,080,168	\$70,180,077	\$ 90,478,739
2017	\$54,588,644	\$24,504,152	\$79,092,796	\$ 89,246,889
2001	\$41,233,708	\$ 6,783,119	\$48,016,827	\$ 75,003,481
1981	\$19,493,157	\$ 14,600	\$19,507,757	\$ 59,357,877
1989	\$25,978,338	\$ 287,000	\$26,265,338	\$ 58,586,319
2013	\$26,821,334	\$21,350,619	\$48,171,953	\$ 57,194,385
1997	\$25,793,621		\$25,793,621	\$ 44,450,043
1993	\$22,868,517	\$ 326,000	\$23,194,517	\$ 44,396,874

“We have been predicting for more than a decade that independent special interest groups that spend separately from candidates or parties have become a major force in New Jersey elections. The trend in gubernatorial elections offers perhaps the best evidence yet,” he said.

Democratic Governor Phil Murphy, who won reelection, spent \$16.4 million directly on his general election campaign while former Republican Assemblyman and GOP gubernatorial candidate Jack Ciattarelli laid out \$15.8 million.

Table 2
Latest General Election Campaign Finance Activity**

CANDIDATE	PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Murphy, Phil	Democrat	\$16,747,434	\$16,393,069	\$354,365
Ciattarelli, Jack	Republican	\$16,361,174	\$15,828,691	\$532,483
Mele, Gregg*	Libertarian	\$ 6,000	NA	NA
Hoffman, Madelyn*	Green	\$ 1,874	NA	NA
Kuniansky, Joanne*	Socialist Workers Party	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL - CANDIDATES		\$33,116,482	\$32,221,761	\$886,848
Independent Spending - General			\$28,296,379	
TOTAL - GENERAL			\$60,518,139	
Pre-Primary/ Primary				
Candidates- Primary			\$16,735,704	
Independent Spending- Primary			\$13,412,705	
TOTAL - PRE-PRIMARY, PRIMARY AND GENERAL			\$90,666,548	

*Does not expect to spend more than \$5,800.

**Through November 19 for candidates

Candidate spending was relatively even, mostly because the two major party candidates each qualified for \$10.5 million in public funds available for the general election.

Murphy enjoyed a much bigger advantage when he first won election in 2017 and outspent the Republican nominee by more than two-to-one.

Candidate spending aside, Brindle said independent spending overwhelmingly supported the governor.

Brindle added: "Of the \$28.3 million in independent spending on the general election, \$23.7 million, or 84 percent, benefited the Democratic candidate while \$4.6 million, or 16 percent, aided the Republican. As I have said for years, independent groups have become very influential in New Jersey elections."

The biggest independent spender on the Democratic side was Our NJ, a committee set up by the Democratic Governors Association (DGA), which also partially funded it. It expended \$8.7 million. Murphy is the finance chairman of the group.

The biggest independent spender for Ciattarelli was the Republican Governors Association, which sank \$3.8 million into the race.

Table 3
Campaign Finance Activity by Independent Spending
Committees Involving Gubernatorial General Election

SUPPORTS	GROUP	SPENT
Murphy	Our NJ	\$ 8,733,268
Murphy	Garden State Forward (NJEA)*	\$ 5,538,434
Ciattarelli	Republican Governors Association	\$ 3,808,013
Murphy	Committee to Build the Economy	\$ 2,938,127
Murphy	Democratic Governors Association**	\$ 2,283,268
Murphy	Working for Working Americans (Carpenters)***	\$ 1,500,000
Murphy	Carpenters Action Fund***	\$ 1,000,000
Murphy	Growing Economic Opportunities (Laborers)***	\$ 900,000
Ciattarelli	Garden State Rescue	\$ 499,273
Murphy	New Direction for New Jersey	\$ 401,037
Ciattarelli	Fix NJ Now	\$ 286,233
Murphy	United HERE TIP State and Local Fund***	\$ 150,000
Murphy	NJ League of Conservation Voters	\$ 100,000
Murphy	UA Political Action Fund	\$ 75,000
Murphy	Tech for Campaigns	\$ 39,236
Murphy	International Brotherhood of Teamsters	\$ 32,040
Murphy	NEA (National Education Association) Advocacy Fund	\$ 12,450
	Totals	\$28,296,379

*Gave \$2.5 million to Our NJ and \$2.5 million to Build the Economy

**Contributed \$1,983,268 to Our NJ and \$300,000 to Turnout Project

***Contributions to Our NJ

The Republican Governors Association outspent the Democratic Governors Association by more than \$1 million. Both groups spent heavily the final week of the campaign.

Table 4
Spending in New Jersey by Democratic and Republican
Governors Associations During 2021 Election

	DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION	REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION	BOTH ASSOCIATIONS¹
Independent Spending			
Direct Independent Spending		\$3,808,013	
DGA Contribution to Our NJ	\$1,983,268		
DGA Contribution to Turnout Project	\$ 300,000		
Total Independent Spending	\$2,283,268	\$3,808,013	\$6,091,281
Contributions to Candidates or Parties			
County Parties	\$ 383,500		
Democratic State Committee Or Legislative Leadership PACs	\$ 50,000		
Local candidates	\$ 15,600		
Total Contributions to Candidates or Parties	\$ 449,100		\$ 449,100
Total All Spending	\$2,732,368	\$3,808,013	\$6,540,381

This analysis is based on 20-day post-election candidate reports due by November 22 that reflect their campaign finance activity through November 19. Independent spending totals are based on any reports filed as recently as November 22.

¹ Both associations are 527 political organizations. While they cannot make contributions to federal candidates, they can make contributions to state and local candidates along with engaging in independent spending.

Gubernatorial Election Year Helps Pump Up County Coffers

Fueled by a major state election year, combined county party fund-raising has reached levels not seen since 2009, according to quarterly reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

Through September 30, 2021, county parties have raised \$8 million and spent \$6.1 million. Those represent the largest totals since 2009, when fund-raising reached \$7.4 million and spending totaled \$6.4 million. The combined \$4.9 million cash-on-hand also is a high for the period.

Table 1
County Party Fundraising and Spending
through Third Quarter 2009-2021

YEAR	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	ELECTIONS
2009	\$7,398,692	\$6,375,763	\$2,952,853	G/A
2010	\$4,526,290	\$4,393,487	\$2,365,419	H
2011	\$4,798,299	\$3,694,423	\$2,134,219	S/A
2012	\$3,662,456	\$3,189,326	\$1,573,648	P/S/H
2013	\$5,319,655	\$4,447,403	\$2,456,395	G/S/A
2014	\$4,410,348	\$3,764,798	\$1,980,600	S/H
2015	\$4,843,498	\$4,176,856	\$2,123,801	A
2016	\$4,199,012	\$3,625,063	\$2,328,583	P/H
2017	\$6,661,677	\$5,527,347	\$3,266,399	G/S/A
2018	\$5,769,747	\$4,793,929	\$3,571,919	S/H
2019	\$4,890,874	\$5,073,468	\$2,958,486	A
2020	\$3,750,559	\$3,723,794	\$2,399,612	P/S/H
2021	\$8,011,780	\$6,138,085	\$4,949,267	G/S/A

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

“Looking at the average of the four gubernatorial elections since and including 2009, and nine non-gubernatorial elections during the same period, county parties on average have raised 42.3 percent more during gubernatorial election years,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director. “They also have spent an average of 34.6 percent more.”

Table 2
Average Fundraising and Spending Through
Third Quarter by County Party Committees

Election Type		Fundraising	Spending
Non-Gubernatorial Election Years	Average	\$4,539,009	\$4,048,349
Gubernatorial Election Years	Average	\$6,847,951	\$5,622,150
	Increase	42.3%	34.6%

Brindle said county parties need more money in gubernatorial election years because they help support not just the top of the ticket but also state legislative and local elections.

“In those years, they also tend to get larger-than-usual infusions from national party committees, unions, and wealthy donors,” he said.

Democratic county committees not only are outraising and spending Republican county committees, but they have fatter cash reserves. Democratic totals are up compared to the last gubernatorial election year in 2017. Republican totals are down from 2017.

Table 3
**Summary of Campaign Finance Activity by County Committees January 1 through September 30-
 2021 Versus 2017**

2021	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	\$6,535,186	\$4,880,971	\$4,294,674	\$4,165,691
Republican County Party Committees	\$1,476,594	\$1,257,114	\$ 654,593	\$1,142,715
Total-Both Parties	\$8,011,780	\$6,138,085	\$4,949,267	\$5,308,406
2017	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	\$4,737,259	\$3,712,037	\$2,556,555	\$2,350,813
Republican County Party Committees	\$1,924,418	\$1,815,310	\$ 709,844	\$1,276,604
Total-Both Parties	\$6,661,677	\$5,527,347	\$3,266,399	\$3,627,418
Difference 2021 versus 2017	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Democratic County Party Committees	38.0%	31.5%	68.0%	77.2%
Republican County Party Committees	-23.3%	-30.7%	-7.8%	-10.5%
Total-Both Parties	20.3%	11.0%	51.5%	46.3%

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

Among Democratic county committees that have filed their quarterly reports, eleven committees-Bergen, Burlington, Camden, Essex, Gloucester, Mercer, Ocean, Passaic, Salem, Somerset and Union- reported cash balances above \$100,000.

Table 4
**Campaign Finance Activity of Democratic County Party Committees
 January 1 through September 30, 2021**

COUNTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Atlantic	\$ 208,222	\$ 170,399	\$ 42,664	\$ 42,664
Bergen	\$ 658,826	\$ 391,086	\$ 496,053	\$ 496,053
Burlington	\$ 208,659	\$ 134,035	\$ 261,193	\$ 254,818
Camden	\$ 413,993	\$ 384,506	\$ 190,200	\$ 190,200
Cape May	\$ 56,225	\$ 42,322	\$ 19,848	\$ 19,848
Cumberland	\$ 53,600	\$ 17,439	\$ 37,156	\$ 37,156
Essex	\$ 856,568	\$ 615,940	\$ 367,528	\$ 367,528
Gloucester	\$ 314,114	\$ 431,980	\$ 459,081	\$ 459,081
Hudson	\$ 254,326	\$ 212,190	\$ 93,962	\$ (44,812)
Hunterdon	\$ 101,663	\$ 41,128	\$ 88,497	\$ 88,497
Mercer	\$ 284,488	\$ 36,910	\$ 506,018	\$ 506,018
Middlesex	\$ 584,172	\$ 706,602	\$ 20,250	\$ 20,250
Monmouth	\$ 328,589	\$ 264,491	\$ 64,181	\$ 64,181
Morris	\$ 330,969	\$ 292,027	\$ 47,079	\$ 47,079
Ocean	\$ 230,685	\$ 129,989	\$ 114,389	\$ 130,556
Passaic	\$ 606,819	\$ 290,753	\$ 696,791	\$ 696,791
Salem	\$ 7,750	\$ 22,115	\$ 101,172	\$ 101,172
Somerset	\$ 330,799	\$ 212,502	\$ 205,587	\$ 205,587
Sussex	\$ 25,741	\$ 21,912	\$ 17,117	\$ 17,117
Union	\$ 515,824	\$ 372,194	\$ 384,360	\$ 384,360
Warren	\$ 163,154	\$ 90,450	\$ 81,547	\$ 81,547
Democrats-Total	\$6,535,186	\$4,880,971	\$4,294,674	\$4,165,691

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

NA-not available

The Union county committee was the only Republican committee reporting a cash balance above \$100,000.

Table 5
Campaign Finance Activity of
Republican County Party Committees
January 1 through September 30, 2021

COUNTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
Atlantic	\$ 66,948	\$ 37,559	\$ 36,699	\$ 36,699
Bergen	\$ 59,173	\$ 75,438	\$ 8,078	\$ (1,922)
Burlington	\$ 77,878	\$ 80,457	\$ 11,408	\$ 517,131
Camden	\$ 21,626	\$ 22,645	\$ 10,288	\$ 10,288
Cape May	\$ 94,917	\$ 88,063	\$ 50,621	\$ 50,621
Cumberland	\$ 38,364	\$ 18,204	\$ 23,382	\$ 23,382
Essex	\$ 12,500	\$ 19,922	\$ 18,911	\$ 18,911
Gloucester	\$ 27,910	\$ 46,697	\$ 33,031	\$ 33,031
Hudson**	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hunterdon***	\$ 63,053	\$ 55,082	\$ 20,633	\$ 20,633
Mercer	\$ 15,113	\$ 5,830	\$ 9,707	\$ 9,706
Middlesex	\$ 6,389	\$ 17,182	\$ 1,781	\$ 1,781
Monmouth	\$ 245,825	\$ 220,413	\$ 79,223	\$ 79,223
Morris	\$ 136,436	\$ 118,997	\$ 36,994	\$ 29,394
Ocean	\$ 118,070	\$ 112,349	\$ 61,391	\$ 61,391
Passaic	\$ 210,070	\$ 186,786	\$ 56,372	\$ 56,372
Salem	NA	NA	NA	NA
Somerset	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sussex	\$ 87,808	\$ 50,048	\$ 57,447	\$ 57,447
Union	\$ 130,111	\$ 61,467	\$106,190	\$ 106,190
Warren	\$ 64,404	\$ 39,974	\$ 32,440	\$ 32,440
Republicans-Total	\$1,476,594	\$1,257,114	\$654,593	\$1,142,715

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

**Does not expect to spend more than \$7,200 in 2021.

***Through Second Quarter

NA-not available

The numbers in this analysis are based on reports filed by noon November 8, 2021. 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).

2022 Reporting Dates

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
FIRE COMMISSIONER – February 19, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 1/18/2022	1/21/2022
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	1/19/2022 – 2/5/2022	2/8/2022
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	2/6/2022 – 3/8/2022	3/11/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 2/6/2022 through 2/19/2022		
SCHOOLBOARD – APRIL 19, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 3/18/2022	3/21/2022
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	3/19/2022 – 4/5/2022	4/8/2022
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	4/6/2022 – 5/6/2022	5/9/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 4/6/2022 through 4/19/2022		
MAY MUNICIPAL – (90-DAY START DATE: FEBRUARY 9, 2022) – MAY 10, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 4/8/2022	4/11/2022
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	4/9/2022 – 4/26/2022	4/29/2022
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	4/27/2022 – 5/28/2022	5/31/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 4/27/2022 through 5/10/2022		
RUNOFF (JUNE)** – JUNE 14, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	4/27/2022 – 5/31/2022	6/3/2022
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	6/1/2022 – 7/1/2022	7/5/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 6/1/2022 through 6/14/2022		
PRIMARY (90 DAY START DATE: MARCH 9, 2022)*** – JUNE 7, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 5/6/2022	5/9/2022
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	5/7/2022 – 5/24/2022	5/27/2022
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	5/25/2022 – 6/24/2022	6/27/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/25/2022 – 6/7/2022		
GENERAL (90 DAY START DATE: AUGUST 10, 2022)*** – NOVEMBER 8, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	6/25/2022 – 10/7/2022	10/11/2022
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	10/8/2022 – 10/25/2022	10/28/2022
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	10/26/2022 – 11/25/2022	11/28/2022
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 10/26/2022 through 11/8/2022		
RUN–OFF (DECEMBER)** – December 6, 2022		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	10/26/2022 – 11/22/2022	11/25/2022
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	11/23/2022 – 12/23/2022	12/27/2022
48 Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 11/23/2022 through 12/6/2022		

PACS, PCFRS & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS

1 st Quarter	1/1/2022 – 3/31/2022	4/18/2022
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2022 – 6/30/2022	7/15/2022
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2022 – 9/30/2022	10/17/2022
4 th Quarter	10/1/2022 – 12/31/2022	1/17/2023

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AGENTS (Q-4)

1 st Quarter	1/1/2022 – 3/31/2022	4/11/2022
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2022 – 6/30/2022	7/11/2022
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2022 – 9/30/2022	10/11/2022
4 th Quarter	10/1/2022 – 12/31/2022	1/10/2023

*Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or January 1, 2022 (Quarterly filers).

**A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2022 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 April 14, 2022 for the Primary Election candidates and June 20, 2022 for the Independent General Election candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2021 filing is needed for the Primary 2022 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 9, 2021.

A second quarter 2022 filing is needed by Independent/ Non-partisan General Election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 11, 2022.

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