



# Newsletter

## ELECCtronic

APRIL  
2022

ISSUE

154

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

### Comments from the Chairman Eric H. Jaso

**"There is a difference between conceit and confidence. Conceit is bragging about yourself. Confidence means you believe you can get the job done."** – Johnny Unitas

With primary elections looming and general elections on the horizon, the time is ripe to review the political communication regulation, better known as the 90-day rule.

The 90-day rule requires a candidate to report to ELEC expenditures for political communications under the following circumstances:

1. When the communication is made within 90 days of any election involving the candidates;
2. When the recipients are substantially comprised of individuals eligible to vote for the candidates;
3. When the communication refers to the governmental objectives or achievements of the candidate; and,

4. When the communication is done with the cooperation or consent of the candidate.

In most instances, the rule has applied to communications produced and/or issued by a governmental entity such as a municipal, county, or state government agency.

If the four criteria mentioned above are met, the cost of producing and disseminating the communication would constitute an in-kind contribution from the governmental body to the candidate.

This expenditure would be required to be reported by the candidate, disclosed as an in-kind contribution.

Although the Legislature authorized ELEC to require candidates to disclose the cost of such communications, that authority does not enable the Commission to decree whether a governmental entity can legally spend taxpayer funds for this purpose.

As with any law or regulation there are exceptions. For example, where an incumbent officeholder seeking re-election responds in writing to a constituent's communication, the cost of that response need not be disclosed.

Further, there is no requirement to report the cost of a communication that is broadcast or circulated for the limited purpose of requiring constituents to make applications or take other actions before the date of the election, or providing information involving a public emergency.

Finally, primary candidates who are running unopposed need not report any such communications.

Apart from those exceptions, the 90-day rule applies to all candidates running for public office, including fire district and school board candidates.

As with any of New Jersey's campaign finance and lobbying statutes and regulations, ELEC's staff is available to assist with questions related to the 90-day rule. Staff can be reached at 1-888-313-3532.

Requests for advisory opinions can be submitted in writing to the Commission at ELEC, P.O. Box 185, Trenton, NJ 08625.

Additional information is also available at [www.elec.state.nj.us](http://www.elec.state.nj.us).

### IN THIS ISSUE

Comments from the Chairman	P. 1
Executive Director's Thoughts	P. 2
Ralph Martin, ELEC's Longest Serving Chairman and a Former Superior Court Judge, Has Died	P. 3
Lobbying Spending Fell 12.2 percent in 2021; Still was Third Highest Total Ever	P. 4
2022 Reporting Dates	P. 8
Training Seminars	P. 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

## 'We the People' Deserve to Know "Who Pays" for Elections

Reprinted from [insidernj.com](http://insidernj.com)

Do independent, outside groups, backed by special interests and wealthy individuals, undermine the principle of government by the people?

Similar to the U.S. Constitution, the preamble to the Constitution of the State of New Jersey establishes the philosophy of our State as it declares: "We The People of the State of New Jersey, grateful to Almighty God for civil and religious liberty which hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to him for blessing upon our endeavors to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do and ordain and establish the Constitution."

Notice the phrase, "We The People" as well as the word "Constitution" are upper case, providing each special status.

Now putting "We The People and "Constitution" together, and eliminating the wording between them, results in: "We The People . . . establish the Constitution." This arrangement makes it clear that in New Jersey the people are sovereign.

Over the past two decades, independent groups have spent an increasing amount of money attempting to influence the outcome of New Jersey elections. At the same time, many seek to keep the people in the dark in terms of their financial backers.

When these groups fail to disclose their contributions and expenditures, they are under-cutting the very heart and spirit of

the State's Constitution- government by the people.

The growing influence of independent groups is turning government by the people into government by special interests and wealthy individuals. And we often don't even know the identities of those interests and individuals.

Special interest independent spending has grown exponentially over the last two decades. It has flooded New Jersey elections with money frequently disguised from the public yet nevertheless influential over the outcome of elections.

Compared to the 2005 gubernatorial election year, when there was just \$411,224 in independent spending on state elections, overall outside group spending of \$57.5 million in the 2021 New Jersey election represented an incredible increase of 13,884 percent.

While independent group spending has soared during this period, financial activity by political parties has declined. For example, in 2005 the two state parties, four legislative leadership committees and 42 county parties collectively spent \$38.7 million. By 2021, spending by those same party committees had dropped to \$30.3 million, a decrease of 22 percent from 2005.

This involvement by independent groups, and concomitant influence over elections, is not limited to statewide elections. Their financial war chests have been directed toward local elections as well. Local municipal party committees spending shrunk to \$4.4 million in 2017, half of their expenditures of ten years earlier. On the other hand, independent groups ratcheted up their spending locally.

Newark's 2014 mayoralty contest witnessed \$5.5 million spent by

independent groups. A year before \$250,000 was spent by outside groups in Jersey City. During the previous decade, two related Washington D.C.-based super PACs have twice participated in Parsippany's elections.

This column, as well as previous columns, recognizes the First Amendment right of independent groups to participate in New Jersey elections. That doesn't mean that they should have an unfair advantage over candidates and political parties. Nor does it mean that they should drown out the voice of the people nor undermine the spirit of the State Constitution's founding principle of self-government, one that the people of New Jersey have freely chosen and established.

Political parties and candidates in New Jersey are highly regulated but independent groups are not. Yet, both have the same goal, to influence the outcome of elections and thereby public policy.

Parties are regulated even to the point of how they are organized, how their committee people are to be elected, when they are to meet, and how they are to disclose their financial activity. Likewise, candidates are highly regulated in terms of how their finances can be used, limits on contributions, and disclosure.

On the other hand, independent groups are hardly regulated, except in circumstances when they expressly support or oppose a candidate; and then only are expenditures to be disclosed. Moreover, they are not limited in terms of contribution amounts as long as they are independent and there are no limitations on how their money can be used.

Thus, there is a structural imbalance in New Jersey's electoral system between candidates and parties on the one hand and independent groups on the other.

Dark money groups have an advantage over more transparent and regulated candidates and parties.

Article IV, Section IV of the U.S. Constitution guaranteed in 1787 that every State “a republican form of government,” meaning government minus a monarchy or aristocracy.

In modern times, special interest groups and wealthy individuals have used their campaign contributions and lobbying to become the new aristocracy.

Their power mushroomed after the McCain-Feingold legislation of 2002 ended unlimited contributions to national parties. This prompted many special interests to spend their money independently on elections instead of just sending checks to parties and candidates.

The trend accelerated after federal court rulings in *Citizens United v. FEC (2010)*, which led to unlimited independent spending by corporations and unions, and *Speechnow.org v. FEC (2010)*, which ruled that these new breeds of independent spending committees could accept unlimited contributions.

Though much has changed since 1787, with the nation progressively becoming more democratized, the danger presented by special interest, independent groups and super wealthy individuals to New Jersey’s electoral system is real. Transparency can alter that by making these groups more accountable to voters.

The Governor and Legislature have an opportunity to address the issues presented by the new “aristocracy” by enacting legislation that would require disclosure of contributions and expenditures by special interest independent groups when they are engaged in elections and strengthening political parties; thereby reaffirming the

constitutional principle of government by the people.

There is no better time than the present.

## Ralph Martin, ELEC’s Longest Serving Chairman and a Former Superior Court Judge, Has Died



By Joe Donohue

It has been learned that Ralph Martin, a retired Superior Court judge from Passaic County who was the longest serving chairman of the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC), passed away on April 21, 2020. He was 90 years old.

Martin served as chairman of ELEC from February 1996 through June 2004. Appointed to ELEC by former Governor Christie Whitman, he was the sole chairman to serve more than eight years.

Martin served during a time when ELEC entered the digital age with its first website in 1997. Whitman in 1998 approved a special appropriation of \$1 million to expand the site’s capabilities, including letting members of the public electronically search for candidate reports.

Also during Martin’s tenure, ELEC undertook many new responsibilities,

including expanded public disclosure for grassroots lobbyists, state contractors and campaign fund-raisers.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s current Executive Director who served as Deputy Director during Martin’s tenure, said while Martin was “a no nonsense, get-to-the-point gentleman, nevertheless his judicial nature shone through as thoughtful and fair-minded.”

Frederick Herrmann, who served as Executive Director during Martin’s time overseeing the Commission, also praised the former ELEC chairman.

“Judge Martin was a man of great integrity, spirituality, and kindness. His time at the Commission will be remembered for his steady judicial presence and wholehearted support of the staff.” said Herrmann. “All of us who served under him will never forget how he always came early on Commission meeting days so that he could socialize with us while enjoying coffee and bagels. He was a truly good man and fine public servant.”

According to his obituary, which is available at <https://www.countrysidefuneralhome.com/obituary/ralph-martin>, Martin attended Rutgers Law School, and after graduation he was admitted to the NJ Bar Association in 1958. He practiced law from 1958 until 1973, when he was appointed as a judge of the NJ Superior Court in Paterson where he served until his retirement in 1995.

During his judicial tenure, he was assigned to both the civil and criminal division where he was the presiding judge. After his retirement, he took a position of counsel for the law firm of Williams, Caliri, Miller & Otley in Wayne, NJ where he worked until 2012.

He was a native of Clifton and long-time resident of Wayne.

## Lobbying Spending Fell 12.2 percent in 2021; Still was Third Highest Total Ever

Spending by New Jersey lobbyists during 2021 totaled \$93.7 million, a drop of more than \$13 million from 2020, according to annual reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

While the reduction based on current figures is 12.2 percent, the 2021 total is preliminary and is likely to be higher. Even at the current level, the figure is significant, according to Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director.

"At just under \$94 million, it is the third highest spending ever," Brindle said. "Lobbying expenditures typically fluctuate year-to-year depending on the issues. Even in the down years, the business of lobbying remains a major enterprise in the Garden State."

**Table 1**  
**Total New Jersey Lobbying Expenditures By Year**  
**2017-2021**

YEAR	TOTAL	CHANGE- \$	CHANGE- %
<b>2021</b>	<b>\$ 93,735,362</b>	<b>\$(13,072,282)</b>	<b>-12.2</b>
2020	\$106,807,644	\$ 5,164,902	5.1
2019	\$101,642,742	\$ 9,922,613	10.8
2018	\$ 91,720,129	\$ 1,320	0.001
2017	\$ 91,718,809	\$ 1,356,680	1.5

Brindle said spending in 2020 was unusually high for many reasons. For one thing, the arrival of the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic caused a flood of legislation and regulations. One group that faced a major impact was the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA), the state teacher's union. Its sharp increase in spending made it the largest spender in 2020.

Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of NJ, the state's largest health insurer, also was broadly affected by pandemic-related state policies. In addition, it had to hike its spending to wage what was a successful grassroots lobbying campaign to enact legislation to restructure itself. It did so through a separate entity called Move Health Care Forward NJ Inc.

Also during 2020, a social welfare non-profit group operated by supporters of Governor Phil Murphy called New Direction NJ Corp. ran heavy media advertisements promoting his policies in the year preceding his successful reelection bid. It reported no such spending in 2021.

Consequently, in 2021, the combined spending of the four groups fell 85 percent from \$18.7 million to \$2.7 million. When spending by the four groups is removed from the totals, combined spending for all other lobbying entities rose from \$88 million to \$91 million- a 3.2 percent increase.

**Table 2**  
**Major Reductions in Lobbying Spending**  
**2020 Versus 2021**

GROUP	2020	2021	CHANGE-\$	CHANGE-%
New Jersey Education Association (NJEA)	\$ 6,255,530	\$ 409,415	\$ (5,846,114)	
New Direction NJ Corporation	\$ 4,963,431	\$ 0	\$ (4,963,431)	
Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield Of NJ	\$ 4,283,242	\$ 1,925,837	\$ (2,357,405)	
Move Health Care Forward NJ Inc (Financed by Horizon)	\$ 3,155,075	\$ 396,500	\$ (2,758,575)	
<b>Total Spending- Top Four (in 2020)</b>	<b>\$ 18,657,278</b>	<b>\$ 2,731,752</b>	<b>\$(15,925,526)</b>	<b>-85.4%</b>
Total Lobbying spending	\$106,807,644	\$93,735,362	\$(13,072,282)	-12.2%
<b>Total Spending Without Top Four</b>	<b>\$ 88,150,366</b>	<b>\$91,003,610</b>	<b>\$ 2,853,244</b>	<b>3.2%</b>

In 2021, Public Service Enterprise Group (PSE&G) was the top spender at \$2.7 million. Even with a big reduction in spending, Horizon ranked second at \$1.9 million.

The top ten alone spent a combined \$10.3 million- nearly 11 percent of all lobbying spending in 2021.

**Table 3**  
**Top Ten Special Interest Lobbying Spenders**  
**2021 Versus 2020**

GROUP	2020	2021	DIFFERENCE \$	DIFFERENCE %
Public Service Enterprise Group (PSE&G)	\$ 872,933	\$ 2,663,960	\$ 1,791,027	205%
Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of NJ	\$4,283,242	\$ 1,925,837	\$(2,357,405)	-55%
Fuel Merchants Association of NJ	\$ 132,080	\$ 1,425,088	\$ 1,293,008	979%
Engineers Labor Employer Cooperative	\$1,249,220	\$ 1,213,934	\$ (35,285)	-3%
NJ State League of Municipalities	\$ 558,137	\$ 610,245	\$ 52,108	9%
Chemistry Council of NJ (Includes State Street Associates)	\$ 445,198	\$ 553,840	\$ 108,642	24%
NJ Business & Industry Association	\$ 485,957	\$ 518,222	\$ 32,265	7%
Comcast Corporation	\$ 442,549	\$ 485,653	\$ 43,104	10%
NJ Realtors*	\$ 431,041	\$ 479,179	\$ 48,138	11%
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia	\$ 105,647	\$ 457,519	\$ 351,872	333%
<b>Total Top Ten Spending</b>		<b>\$10,333,477</b>		
<b>Total Lobbying Spending</b>		<b>\$93,735,632</b>		
<b>Top Ten As Percent of Total</b>		<b>11%</b>		

\*Includes direct and grassroots lobbying

A surprise addition to the top ten list is the Fuel Merchants Association of NJ, which spent \$1.4 million in 2021- an increase of 979 percent. It ranks third on the list.

Since ELEC began analyzing annual lobbying reports in 2010, the group, which represents heating oil merchants, has never ranked in the top ten. Its previous high spending was \$248,920 in 2018.

The dramatic increase in its outlays was prompted by a proposal in the state's Energy Master Plan to require New Jersey homeowners to switch from fossil fuel burning heating and hot water systems to all-electric. The group launched an advocacy group called SmartHeatNJ in September 2021 to conduct a public outreach program against the switch.

One reason lobbying expenditures shot up so high in 2020 was due to a record \$18.1 million in spending on communications, including television and digital advertising.

As large spenders cut back on such media buys, communications spending fell 62 percent to \$6.9 million in 2021. At \$5.6 million, the four top communications spenders made up 80 percent of the total. All four also are among the top four overall spenders.

**Table 4**  
**Top Ten Expenditures on Communications**  
**and Total Communications Expenditures in 2021**

GROUP	AMOUNT
Public Service Enterprise Group (PSE&G)	\$ 2,108,516
Fuel Merchants Association of NJ	\$ 1,254,832
Engineers Labor Employer Cooperative	\$ 1,030,434
Move Health Care Forward NJ Inc (Horizon)	\$ 396,500
Insurance Council of NJ Inc	\$ 267,657
AARP NJ	\$ 158,153
NJ Realtors Issues Mobilization Fund	\$ 117,175
American Civil Liberties Union Inc	\$ 84,348
Cure Auto Insurance	\$ 77,855
Global Strategy Group LLC	\$ 64,274
<b>Total Communication Expenditures- Top Ten</b>	<b>\$5,559,745</b>
<b>Total Communications Expenditures- All Lobbyists</b>	<b>\$6,915,274</b>

The amount spent on “benefit passing”- gifts like meals, trips or other things of value- dispensed by lobbyists fell in 2021 to a new record low of \$1,367. That is the smallest sum since the all-time high of \$163,375 in 1992.

While total spending fell 12.8 percent in 2021, the number of lobbyists barely dipped from 920 in 2020 to 916 in 2021. The number peaked at 1,043 in 2008.

With a myriad of new issues reaching the forefront of public policy in Trenton during the last few years, including COVID-19, marijuana legalization, wind energy production and legalized abortion, lobbyists reported a record number of clients for the third straight year. The number was 2,283- up 11 from 2,272 in 2020.

An analysis of fees paid by represented entities to governmental affairs agents showed that the most money came from the health care industry. Miscellaneous health care firms paid \$7.1 million while hospitals spent \$2.8 million to hire multi-client firms. These two categories combined totaled \$9.9 million.

Rounding out the top ten business sectors were energy, insurance, finance, transportation, pharmaceutical, telecommunications, real estate and marijuana industry firms. These ten sectors alone paid \$32.5 million to professional lobbying firms- about half the fees paid to governmental affairs agents. The spending totals do not include direct spending by companies or associations.

**Table 5**  
**Fees Paid to Governmental Affairs Agents**  
**Ranked by Top Ten Business Sectors in 2021**

<b>BUSINESS SECTOR</b>	<b>FEES PAID TO LOBBYISTS</b>
Health Care- Miscellaneous	\$ 7,152,583
Energy	\$ 5,329,258
Insurance	\$ 3,692,105
Finance	\$ 2,770,772
Health Care- Hospitals	\$ 2,770,642
Transportation	\$ 2,727,536
Pharmaceuticals	\$ 2,505,071
Telecommunications	\$ 1,939,246
Real Estate	\$ 1,841,147
Marijuana	\$ 1,827,772
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,556,132</b>

Of the nearly \$66.2 million in reported receipts by 82 governmental affairs agents (lobbyists) that reported receipts, \$42.3 million – nearly 64 percent- went to the top ten multi-client firms.

**Table 6**  
**Top Ten Multi-Client Lobbying**  
**Firms Ranked by 2021 Receipts**

FIRM	RECEIPTS
Princeton Public Affairs Group Inc	\$10,496,670
Public Strategies Impact LLC	\$ 7,439,342
CLB Partners Inc	\$ 4,504,650
MBI Gluckshaw	\$ 3,904,559
Kaufman Zita Group LLC	\$ 3,599,506
Gibbons PC	\$ 3,180,567
Optimus Partners LLC	\$ 2,727,875
Mercury Public Affairs	\$ 2,406,656
Capital Impact Group	\$ 2,011,342
McCarter & English	\$ 2,007,149
<b>Total Top Ten</b>	<b>\$42,278,315</b>
<b>Total Governmental Affairs Agent Receipts</b>	<b>\$66,253,034</b>
<b>Percent Top Ten</b>	<b>63.8%</b>

The big drop in communication outlays was the chief cause of the decline in overall lobbying expenditures between 2020 and 2021.

**Table 7**  
**Lobbying Expenses by Category**

CATEGORY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	CHANGE-%
Salary <sup>1</sup>	\$51,886,231	\$54,931,497	\$ 56,148,622	\$ 55,465,036	\$56,645,455	2%
Support Personnel	\$ 2,395,907	\$ 2,463,181	\$ 2,650,872	\$ 2,152,834	\$ 2,555,537	19%
Fees <sup>2</sup>	\$ 4,603,279	\$ 2,261,072	\$ 2,826,599	\$ 4,976,172	\$ 3,590,197	-28%
Communication Costs <sup>4</sup>	\$ 8,510,409	\$ 6,929,935	\$ 13,717,962	\$ 18,141,915	\$ 6,915,274	-62%
Travel	\$ 449,989	\$ 541,575	\$ 486,061	\$ 168,658	\$ 138,370	-18%
Benefit Passing <sup>3</sup>	\$ 6,042	\$ 2,331	\$ 5,180	\$ 2,783	\$ 1,367	-51%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$67,851,858</b>	<b>\$67,129,591</b>	<b>\$ 75,835,295</b>	<b>\$ 80,907,398</b>	<b>\$69,846,200</b>	<b>-14%</b>
Compensation to Governmental Affairs Agent Not Included on Annual Reports	\$23,866,952	\$24,590,538	\$ 25,807,447	\$ 25,900,246	\$23,889,162	-8%
<b>Adjusted Total*</b>	<b>\$91,718,809</b>	<b>\$91,720,129</b>	<b>\$101,642,742</b>	<b>\$106,807,644</b>	<b>\$93,735,362</b>	<b>-12%</b>

1- Salary includes in-house salaries and payments to outside agents.

2- Fees include assessments, membership fees and dues.

3- Benefit passing includes meals, entertainment, gifts, travel and lodging.

4- Communication costs include: printed materials, postage, telephone calls, faxes, receptions, and, in 2006 and years following, also includes direct mail pieces, newspaper advertisements, and television and radio broadcasts.

Lobbying summary data shown for 2021 should be considered preliminary.

The analysis reflects a review of reports received as of 5 pm March 8, 2022. In New Jersey, lobbyists who raise or spend more than \$2,500 were required to file a report on February 15<sup>th</sup> that reflects activity from the prior calendar year.

Summary information about lobbyist activities in 2021 can be obtained at the following website:

[http://www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/gaa\\_annual.htm](http://www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/gaa_annual.htm). Copies of annual reports also are available on ELEC's website.

## 2022 Reporting Dates

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
<b>FIRE COMMISSIONER – FEBRUARY 19, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>SCHOOLBOARD – APRIL 19, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>MAY MUNICIPAL – (90-DAY START DATE: FEBRUARY 9, 2022) – MAY 10, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>RUNOFF (JUNE)** – JUNE 14, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>PRIMARY (90 DAY START DATE: MARCH 9, 2022)*** – JUNE 7, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>GENERAL (90 DAY START DATE: AUGUST 10, 2022)*** – NOVEMBER 8, 2022</b>		
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		
<b>RUN-OFF (DECEMBER)** – DECEMBER 6, 2022</b>		
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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1/1/2022 – 3/31/2022	4/18/2022
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4/1/2022 – 6/30/2022	7/15/2022
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7/1/2022 – 9/30/2022	10/17/2022
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	10/1/2022 – 12/31/2022	1/17/2023

**GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AGENTS (Q-4)**

1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1/1/2022 – 3/31/2022	4/11/2022
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4/1/2022 – 6/30/2022	7/11/2022
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7/1/2022 – 9/30/2022	10/11/2022
4 <sup>th</sup> 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.

## Training Seminars

**CPC WEBINARS**

R-3 eFile <b>ONLY</b> Program Training	CPC/PPC Compliance Seminar <b>AND</b> eFile Training
April 20, 2022 at 10:00 AM	April 7, 2022 at 10:00 AM
	April 12, 2022 at 10:00 AM

**CANDIDATE WEBINARS**

R-1 eFile <b>ONLY</b> Program Training	Campaign Compliance Seminar <b>AND</b> eFile Training
May 5, 2022 at 10:00 AM	April 5, 2022 at 10:00 AM
June 7, 2022 at 10:00 AM	April 26, 2022 at 10:00 AM

\*All webinars will run for approximately 2 hours.

**HOW TO CONTACT ELEC**

[www.elec.state.nj.us](http://www.elec.state.nj.us)

In Person: 25 South Stockton Street, 5<sup>th</sup> 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