

ELEC-Tronic

AN ELECTION LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION NEWSLETTER

"Furthering the Interests of an Informed Citizenry"

Election Law Enforcement Commission, P.O. Box 185, Trenton, NJ 08625
www.elec.state.nj.us (609) 292-8700 - Toll Free Within NJ 1-888-313-ELEC (3532)

Commissioners:

Jerry Fitzgerald English, Chair
 Amos C. Saunders, Vice Chair
 Albert Burstein, Commissioner
 Ronald DeFilippis, Commissioner
 James P. Wyse, Legal Counsel

Directors:

Jeffrey M. Brindle
 Joseph W. Donohue
 Carol L. Hoekje
 Evelyn Ford
 Carol Neiman
 Amy F. Davis
 Linda White
 Todd J. Wojcik
 Steven M. Dodson

Comments from the Chair Jerry Fitzgerald English

Legislative Reform – Part 3

This past January the Commission prioritized proposals for legislative reform.

In my last two columns, I discussed proposed reforms in two important areas: pay-to-play and lobbying at the local government level.

This column, the third in a series highlighting the Commission's proposals, will concern the issue of "wheeling" by county party committees.

"Wheeling" is a term of art describing the process by which county party organizations move money around between one another. It has been stated that wheeling allows for the circumvention of not only the contribution limits but the pay-to-play laws as well. Moreover, it undermines transparency.

County party committees can receive up to \$37,000 per year from each contributor. This limit is \$12,000 more than the \$25,000 limit that applies to contributions made to the two state party committees and the four legislative leadership committees (the "big six").

Further, the limit on donations to county party committees is \$29,800 more than the \$7,200 limit imposed on donations made to municipal party committees.

The Commission has recommended that the limit on contributions made to county party organizations be lowered to \$25,000.

In its wisdom, the Legislature may want to reduce the limit further; but certainly it should be at parity with the limit in place for the "big six" committees.

Along with reducing the county party organization limit the practice of wheeling should be restricted. The Commission isn't recommending a prohibition on transfers between county party organizations but rather that a reasonable contribution limit be set for money moving between organizations.

Under state law wheeling is prohibited during the primary election. In other words, a county party committee is not allowed to make a contribution to another county party committee during the primary election cycle.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 1 Comments from the Chair
- 2 Executive Director's Thoughts
- 4 Annual Lobbying Reports on ELEC's Website
- 5 New Jerseyans should Know County and Municipal Dollars Spent on Lobbying
- 6 Ken Colandrea "Profile"
- 7 "Special Interest" PACS
- 11 Dates to Remember

... Continued on page 2.

Comments from the Chair Jerry Fitzgerald English

Legislative Reform – Part 3

Continued from page 1.

However, this is not the case in the general election, when most of this activity takes place. Party organizations are unlimited in what they can contribute to other party organizations.

This fact opens up the potential for mischief. For example, a donor may give the maximum to one county party committee, the maximum to another committee, and in turn, have that second committee contribute to the first; thus circumventing the contribution limits.

Further, a vendor may seek a public contract in one county and therefore be precluded from making any contributions to that county party organization because of restrictions in the pay-to-play laws.

However, by making that same contribution to a second county organization, which in turn contributes the money to the first, the vendor is able to elude pay-to-play restrictions and receive approval for the contract.

The Commission has long suggested that “wheeling” be limited in its annual reports. This year, however, in light of the pay-to-play laws, it has included this recommendation as one of its priority proposals.

The integrity of the election and governmental processes is of paramount importance to the Commission and enactment of restrictions on wheeling will be another step in the direction of restoring trust in these processes.

Executive Director’s Thoughts Jeff Brindle

It’s hard to believe but it has been more than a year since the members of the Commission selected me as Executive Director.

For that I continue to be grateful and in their debt.

Throughout the year, staff, with the support and encouragement of the Commission, has striven to enhance the profile of the agency and bring greater transparency to the electoral and governmental processes.

So how have we done? Have we made strides toward accomplishing these twin goals?

While there remains room for continual improvement it seems to me that we have been aggressively moving toward the fulfillment of these goals.

Therefore I will use this month’s column to summarize the steps we have taken to make these goals a reality.

First, and most obvious, is this very same newsletter. The newsletter has become an effective tool for reaching the public and providing information of trends in campaigning both in the State of New Jersey and throughout the country. It has also been used to supplement ELEC’s manuals in providing useful tips on complying with the State’s campaign finance laws.

ELEC-Tronic is now sent to over 800 subscribers and is available on the Commission’s website. The contents of the newsletter have been commented upon favorably by numerous individuals in and out of government.

... Continued on page 3.

Executive Director's Thoughts Jeff Brindle

Continued from page 2.

In furtherance of the effort to bring greater transparency to government, the Commission introduced the local contributor data base last November. For the first time individuals are able to sort through local candidate reports for contributors, enabling citizens to better know who is contributing to their local candidates and if there are any pay-to-play ramifications.

This effort continues to be expanded to include May municipal candidates, school board candidates, and municipal party committees.

In addition to the local contribution data base, citizens are now able to access online reports submitted by the lobbyists and their represented entities.

The Commission has for years summarized data contained on the annual lobbyist financial reports but now all reports are individually accessible online.

In an effort to take advantage of new media, staff produced YouTube announcements featuring Chair Jerry Fitzgerald English and has included one of the T.V. interviews I did about the Commission on ELEC's website.

An important initiative undertaken throughout the year has been the continuous stream of analytical press releases issued to traditional press and the new media.

These press releases have analyzed trends in campaign financing and lobbying and have contributed to a greater awareness of the Commission and have helped to make for a more informed public.

Articles written for the New Jersey Newsroom website, the League of Municipalities Magazine, and the Bergen Record have all worked to enhance the awareness among the public of the important work undertaken by the Commission.

In the same way the initiative to bring ELEC to the public includes training sessions conducted out of Trenton for candidates and treasurers. Of course, Commission staff offers in-house training for candidates, CPC's, and lobbyists, but this new initiative has seen staff go offsite to offer training remotely.

Finally, the Commission took the step in January to prioritize recommendations for legislative reforms. Following up upon this step have been articles published in the newsletter and meetings by staff with members of both parties in the Legislature as well as with the Governor's office.

While none of the recommendations have yet been enacted, the effort has stimulated interest, exemplified by the introduction of legislation regarding reform of pay-to-play, regulation of 527 committees, and disclosure of lobbying at the local level.

In the coming year, the Commission will continue to be proactive in its attempt to fulfill its core mission of disclosure, in heightening awareness among the public, and making for a more informed electorate.

Annual Lobbying Reports On ELEC's Website

Members of the public, the media and others can now go online and conveniently view annual financial activity reports filed by lobbyists in 2010.

Lobbyists who exceed \$2,500 in receipts or expenditures in a calendar year must disclose their financial activities on an annual basis through reports due on or about February 15. Accordingly, reports filed on February 15, 2010 reflect activity covering calendar year 2009.

In 2009, total lobbyist spending reached \$57.6 million - a 3.4 percent increase. The average number of lobbyists last year was 1,001.

These reports are now available at ELEC's website: www.elec.state.nj.us. These include detailed information about Governmental Affairs Agents or Represented Entities that hire them.

ELEC has been providing a summary of information contained in annual lobbying reports for several years. Copies of reports also have been available for inspection or purchase at ELEC. But until now, they were not accessible online.

The initiative marks the first time the agency has posted actual scanned copies of the reports on its website. It is part of an ongoing effort by the agency to make available in electronic form all documents that can be shared with the public.

It is hoped that future computer software upgrades will enable the agency to accept lobbying forms electronically. It would make it easier and faster to provide website disclosure.

Among the 531 annual reports now available online, 171 were filed by lobbyists, which are named "Governmental Affairs Agents" under ELEC law.

Those reports contain the following information for calendar year 2009:

- Contact information for the lobbying firm.
- Name, address and phone number of all Governmental Affairs Agents.

- A list of Represented Entities and fees paid by them to the lobbying firm.
- A list of Governmental Affairs Agents who served on any independent bi-state, state, county or local authority, board or commission.
- Salaries and compensation paid to Governmental Affairs Agents.
- Funds paid to support personnel.
- Communications expenses.
- Travel/lodging expenses.
- Benefits given to public officials, such as meals, travel and gifts.

Reports filed by Represented Entities, which include trade associations, unions, corporations and other groups, may include all the above information while also including assessments, fees or dues collected from members with the specific purpose of influencing state policy. There were 354 such reports filed in 2010.

Annual reports also are filed by those who communicate with the public directly about issues. This is generally known as grassroots lobbying. Six such reports were filed in 2010. Along with identifying information, these reports include funds raised through contributions, assessments, fees or dues, along with funds spent on support personnel, communications, and travel and lodging.

Finally, the website also contains 812 reports filed by Represented Entities authorizing Governmental Affairs Agents to file their annual reports for 2010.

A "lobbyist" is a person who is compensated to communicate with, or provide a benefit to, a state official covered by the lobbying law to influence legislation, regulations or governmental processes. Governmental processes include contracts, permits, rate making etc.

There is a 20-hour per calendar year threshold to trigger registration.

Registered lobbyists are required to report their lobbying activities on a quarterly basis. These reports can be viewed or obtained by visiting or contacting the Commission.

New Jerseyans should Know County and Municipal Dollars Spent on Lobbying

Benjamin Franklin lobbied the British parliament on behalf of the Continental Congress, making him the first American lobbyist.

Many individuals have followed in Franklin's footsteps, in their case lobbying on behalf of State and local government entities. So Franklin, along with his numerous political, diplomatic, and scientific exploits, can be credited with establishing this precedent as well.

To be sure, not much has been written about government employing individuals to lobby other government entities – at least not until recently.

Now, however, in light of almost insurmountable budgetary problems at every level of government, and with high property taxes impacting home owners, this activity is being given greater scrutiny.

The first shot across the bow came when the State's Comptroller, Matthew Boxer, issued a report in March 2009.

Though not recommending that public entities be prohibited from hiring lobbyists, the report recommended cost cutting measures and greater transparency.

The comptroller called for governmental agencies to report to the Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) their hiring of outside lobbying firms. It recommended that governments themselves file reports and not delegate this responsibility to the contracting firm.

Soon after taking office, Governor Chris Christie, in Executive Order 15, directed that "All existing contracts between State Authorities and lobbyists or legislative agents shall be terminated as soon as is legally permissible."

The Order required State Authorities to identify all lobbyist contracts and to not "enter into . . . any contract . . . unless expressly authorized . . . by the Governor's Office."

The existence of contracts between governmental entities and professional lobbyists has generally flown under the radar screen throughout the years and been little publicized.

But with the economic climate being what it is, and budgets stretched to the limit, greater attention is being paid to this activity.

Herb Jackson, Record reporter, wrote that lobbyists were paid \$1.3 million by municipalities and public colleges during the first six months of this year to lobby Washington.

He pointed out that local governments employed a well known lobbying firm to lobby on grants and noted that the Passaic Valley Sewerage Authority spent \$1.1 million on federal lobbying over the past decade.

The New Jersey Association of Counties has also found itself in the news recently. As reported by the Herald News, the Association received over \$200,000 in annual dues this year from county governments. The Association lobbies on behalf of county governments but is not required to disclose its activities.

The Star-Ledger reported earlier this year that at least 52 public bodies paid \$2.1 million to lobby state officials in 2009. The analysis was based on annual disclosures by lobbyists to ELEC that, under current law, are strictly voluntary.

Legislators from both parties already are moving to close this loophole. A bipartisan bill cosponsored by Senators Loretta Weinberg (D-Bergen) and Tom Goodwin (R-Mercer) would require lobbyists to file annual and quarterly reports with ELEC if they represent any government agency or political subdivision in the State of New Jersey.

Under New Jersey's lobbying law, registered lobbyists report their lobbying activity to ELEC on a quarterly basis. In addition, annual financial reports are disclosed to ELEC each February.

But the information contained in these reports pertains to lobbying State government only. Attempts to influence the Legislature and executive branch on legislation, regulations, and governmental processes come under the disclosure law.

. . . Continued on page 6.

New Jerseyans should Know County and Municipal Dollars Spent on Lobbying

Continued from page 5.

Lobbying on behalf of local government entities or the lobbying of local government is not required to be reported under the State's statute.

While some contract lobbying firms report their activity vis-à-vis local government voluntarily, many don't. And this leaves a big gap in disclosure and doesn't benefit the public in the least.

As part of its priority recommendations for legislative reforms, the Election Law Enforcement Commission has called for lobbying on behalf of local governmental entities by contract lobbying firms to be disclosed by these firms.

Moreover, it has called for the lobbying of local government entities on behalf of private clients to be disclosed by contract lobbying firms. With millions of dollars in public contracts issued to private businesses it's not unusual for private clients to pay lobbyists to lobby local government entities.

While the Commission is not calling for a ban on this activity, as exists in some other jurisdictions, it is calling for disclosure of lobbying at the local level.

To be sure, much of this activity may be justified on a cost/benefit basis. A municipality expending \$10,000 for a lobbyist for a return of \$100,000 in State aid may certainly be worth the expenditure but it should be up to the public to decide whether such spending merits its support.

And the only way the public can decide whether expending municipal and county dollars on lobbying is justified is if the lobbying activity is disclosed and made readily available.

The above article by Jeff Brindle appeared in NewJerseyNewsroom.com on August 18, 2010

Ken Colandrea "Profile" Assistant Computer Technician

As a former operations supervisor for US Airways, Ken Colandrea, now an Assistant Computer Technician at ELEC, often had to deal with chaos.

In his airline job, he was the person in charge of planes before they took off or once they reached the ground.

Colandrea's managerial duties required him to worry about a multitude of issues, including whether ice had to be removed from the jets; food services and cleaning; luggage; and even weight distribution within each aircraft.

"I work well under pressure because of that," he said.

His multi-tasking past was good preparation for his current job, which often requires him to juggle various chores.

The good-natured Union County native assists staff internally with computer questions. He also helps answer queries from the public.

Another one of his responsibilities is to maintain the forms on the section of ELEC's website where candidates and donors can file some reports electronically (http://www.elec.state.nj.us/elecweb/eForms/eforms_index.htm).

ELEC is gradually moving to a point when most forms and reports can be filed online. Currently, all candidates can file simple forms online. Gubernatorial and legislative candidates who raise or spend more than \$100,000 are required to file longer reports electronically, though those spending less can do so voluntarily. Other candidates and fund-raising committees can file longer reports electronically if they desire. State contractors who must abide by pay-to-play disclosure requirements also must file their reports on ELEC's website. People with questions about electronic filing can call Colandrea or other help desk associates at 609-292-8700.

Colandrea, who joined the ELEC staff in May 2005, always had a knack for tinkering and problem-solving that led him into the computer field.

... Continued on page 7.

Ken Colandrea “Profile” Assistant Computer Technician

Continued from page 6.

He won his 8th grade science fair by transforming a Campbell’s Soup can into a motor. He has taken apart laptop computers, then reassembled them. His technical inquisitiveness eventually paid off when he graduated with honors from Kean University with a bachelors degree in computer science.

Other pastimes include playing the guitar, sound mixing for church events and video editing on the high-powered computer he built from scratch at home.

He loves to travel and can indulge that interest because, after 20 years with US Airways, he obtained a buyout that included a free lifetime flying pass. Some of his destinations have included London, Hawaii, Seattle, Rome and Paris.

Closer to home, he’s a longtime Yankees fan with partial season tickets.

“Special Interest” PACs

“Special interest” political action committees (PACs) reported spending a record \$35.3 million last year, according to a new analysis by the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

The 38 percent increase, which amounts to a \$9.8 million increase, came during a year in which campaigns took place for the Governor’s seat and all 80 General Assembly seats. By comparison with PAC spending in 2005 - the last election with contests for the same seats - special interest PAC spending was up \$6.4 million, or nearly 22 percent.

Total Spending by Special Interest PACs				
2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
\$35,263,902	\$25,462,804	\$32,667,372	\$28,956,659	\$28,862,346

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director, said candidates may be relying more heavily on special interest PACs in part because pay-to-play laws

have sharply reduced the amount of donations from public contractors since 2005. For instance, about one in every 4.5 dollars received by individual legislators - about \$6.8 million, or 22 percent of their receipts - were provided by special interest PACs. By comparison, all special interest PACs combined gave just under \$6 million to individual legislators in 2005 - or 16 percent.

(See Appendix, Table 1).

“With a large falloff in contributions from contractors, one consequence is that many candidates may be more dependent on other special interest groups to fund their New Jersey campaigns,” said Brindle. Last year’s high-stakes election drew major funding from out-of-state PACs and other groups, he added. Between 2005 and 2009, the number of special interest PACs rose by a net increase of 63. The number of special interest PACs jumped by 10 between 2008 and 2009 to a total of 587.

Among all special interest PACs last year, labor union PACs were the heaviest spenders. Their outlay totaled \$24 million - more than the other seven types of PACs combined. **(See Appendix, Table 2).**

Twenty of the top twenty-five PAC spenders were established by labor unions. The other five included PACs operated by three professional associations, one trade association and an ideological group.

While union PACs were the major fundraisers, their percentage relative to overall special interest PAC spending was only slightly higher than four years earlier - 68 percent in 2009 versus 63 percent in 2005. **(See Appendix, Tables 2 and 3).**

To best gauge the impact of special interest PACs within New Jersey, ELEC developed a list of the top twenty-five contributors to state, county and local candidates or committees. Together, these contributors donated more than \$11.3 million to state, county and local committees. More than half of the receipts of individual legislators - \$3.4 million, or 11 percent of total receipts by individual legislators - came from just the top twenty-five special interest PACs. **(See Appendix, Table 4 for Top 25 Listing).**

... Continued on page 8.

"Special Interest" PACs

Continued from page 7.

Collectively, the top 25 PACs also spent \$3.8 million on lobbying in 2009. That includes \$2.25 million in grassroots lobbying directly related to the governor's race.

PACs, technically known as continuing political committees, are required to file with ELEC when, during a calendar year, they contribute in excess of \$4,900 to state and/or local candidates. Each quarter, they are required to file reports with ELEC that list their contributions and expenditures.

For purposes of this analysis, special interest PACs are defined as those that identified themselves as a business, labor union, professional association, ideological group, civic association, trade association, or simply "other." The list also includes PACs formed by employees of regulated industries such as banks and insurance companies, which cannot use corporate funds for campaign contributions.

Many PACs are formed by groups with a clear economic or ideological stake in New Jersey politics. These include individual businesses or unions, trade associations representing clients like the chemical industry or car dealers, groups that support or oppose gun or abortion rights and other ideological causes.

However, individuals that appear to be closely connected to parties and candidates may have formed special interest PACs to promote their political interests. Sometimes these PACs have generic sounding names without any mention of a candidate or party. But these groups seem to focus their spending in ways that benefit a particular candidate or party.

One clue to this activity was a much higher turnover rate between 2005 and 2009 within the three PAC categories - other ongoing, ideological and civic associations - that are most vaguely defined. Turnover by these types of PACs was about five times the rate exhibited by professional, union or regulatory industry PACs. **(See Appendix, Table 5).**

"We suspect that there is a growing number of so-called "special interest" PACs in recent years that really appear to be appendages of parties or candidates. For some, it is just an extra way to promote a particular candidate," Brindle said.

"It becomes a problem, however, if the PACs are used to try to circumvent state contribution limits. For instance, public contractors generally are subject to a \$300 limit," said Brindle.

"These PACs should not be used to indirectly funnel larger contributions to candidates. This is an ongoing concern for the Commission."

Partly as a reaction to this proliferation of PACs, the Commission, on a bi-partisan basis, has unanimously endorsed a recommendation urging the Legislature to empower the agency to prevent one group from establishing numerous PACs, which may serve as conduits to evade contribution limits and "pay-to-play" laws. Federal Election Commission guidelines regulating affiliated PACs could be a model, Brindle said.

More information about special interest PACs in New Jersey is available in two previous ELEC White Paper reports: "Non-connected, Ideological PACs in the Garden State" at <http://www.elec.state.nj.us/pdffiles/whitepapers/white10.pdf> and "Is There a PAC Plague in New Jersey?" at <http://www.elec.state.nj.us/pdffiles/whitepapers/white7.pdf>.

The figures contained in this press release have been taken from committee reports on file with the Commission as of June 1, 2010. Amendments to reports filed after that date are not included.

This press release is a compilation of figures reported to the Commission, and is not intended to express any opinion concerning the accuracy or completeness of any filed report. Further, although the Commission has taken all reasonable precautions to prevent mathematical or typographical errors, the possibility of their existence cannot be entirely eliminated. Copies of reports are available on ELEC's website at www.elec.state.nj.us.

... Continued on page 9.

“Special Interest” PACs

Continued from page 8.

APPENDIX
TABLE 1

	2009	2005
Fundraising by Individual Legislators	\$30,838,778	\$38,080,719
Donations received from Special Interest PACs	\$6,787,844	\$5,961,036
Special Interest PACs as Percent of Total Fundraising	22 %	16 %

APPENDIX
TABLE 2

PAC Type	Total Spending in 2009	% of Total PAC Spending
Union	\$ 23,980,211	68%
Professional	\$ 3,888,084	11%
Trade Association	\$ 1,906,401	5%
Ideological	\$ 1,728,059	5%
Business	\$ 1,465,769	4%
Regulated Industry	\$ 964,859	3%
Other Ongoing Committee	\$ 679,282	2%
Civic Association	\$ 651,238	2%
TOTAL	\$ 35,263,902	100%

APPENDIX
TABLE 3

PAC Type	Total Spending in 2005	% of Total PAC Spending
Union	\$ 18,188,783	66%
Professional	\$ 3,215,543	9%
Ideological	\$ 2,667,998	6%
Business	\$ 1,673,655	5%
Trade Association	\$ 1,441,021	6%
Regulated Industry	\$ 771,738	3%
Other Ongoing Committee	\$ 735,669	2%
Civic Association	\$ 167,989	3%
TOTAL	\$ 28,862,346	100%

... Continued on page 10.

"Special Interest" PACs

Continued from page 9.

APPENDIX
TABLE 4

Name of PAC	Type of PAC	Gubernatorial	Legislative/ State Parties	County or Local	Total
NJ State Laborers PAC (1)	Union	\$ 56,800	\$ 364,140	\$ 826,835	\$ 1,247,275
NJ Education Association PAC (2)	Union	\$ 525,713	\$ 602,145	\$ 0	\$ 1,127,858
NJ State Carpenters Non-Partisan Political Education Committee	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 454,350	\$ 618,440	\$ 1,079,590
AFSCME Public Employees Organized to Promote Legislative Equality (3)	Union	\$ 146,666	\$ 140,700	\$ 620,000	\$ 907,366
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #351	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 203,400	\$ 595,494	\$ 805,694
Local Union 164 IBEW COPE Fund (4)	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 164,200	\$ 363,157	\$ 533,957
CWA NJ Political Education Committee	Union	\$ 0	\$ 211,300	\$ 301,575	\$ 512,875
Realtors PAC	Professional	\$ 500	\$ 424,715	\$ 30,745	\$ 455,960
Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 9	Union	\$ 3,400	\$ 221,250	\$ 227,479	\$ 452,129
Democrat Republican Independent Voter Education (Teamsters) (5)	Union	\$ 2,300	\$ 53,900	\$ 302,966	\$ 359,166
Local 32BJ SEIU NY/NJ American Dream Fund	Union	\$ 0	\$ 119,611	\$ 229,125	\$ 348,736
Local 322 Committee for Political Education (Plumbers and Pipefitters)	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 78,100	\$ 228,638	\$ 313,538
International Brotherhood Of Electrical Workers Committee on Political Education (Trenton)	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 90,650	\$ 215,200	\$ 312,650
International Union of Painters and Allied Trades Political Action Together Legislative and Educational Committee	Union	\$ 4,400	\$ 100,000	\$ 188,860	\$ 293,260
IBEW PAC (Washington DC) (6)	Union	\$ 2,300	\$ 100,850	\$ 177,970	\$ 281,120
NJ Organization for a Better State	Ideological	\$ 0	\$ 270,250	0	\$ 270,250
District Council of Northern NJ	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 85,120	\$ 177,855	\$ 269,775
NJ State Association of Pipe Trades PAC Fund	Union	\$ 0	\$ 96,400	\$ 167,000	\$ 263,400
Laborers Local 472 PAC	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 179,800	\$ 64,200	\$ 250,800
1199/SEIU NY State Political Action Fund	Union	\$ 3,400	\$ 97,300	\$ 138,700	\$ 239,400
CAR PAC	Trade Association	\$ 500	\$ 220,154	\$ 0	\$ 220,654
IBEW LU 400 COPE Fund	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 59,700	\$ 138,290	\$ 204,790
NJ Dental PAC	Professional	\$ 6,800	\$ 182,619	\$ 3,100	\$ 192,519
IBEW Local 456 COPE Fund	Union	\$ 6,800	\$ 113,100	\$ 63,490	\$ 183,390
NJ Funeral Directors PAC	Professional	\$ 0	\$ 174,136	\$ 0	\$ 174,136
TOTALS		\$813,979	\$4,806,590	\$5,679,579	\$11,300,148

(1) Does not include \$500,000 donation by Laborer's Political League to grassroots lobbying activity related to 2009 Governor's race.

(2) Does not include \$744,512 spent through separate political committee in 2009 on local school board elections.

(3) Does not include \$1.75 million donation to grassroots lobbying activity related to 2009 Governor's race and \$2.25 million given directly to Democratic Governor's Association.

(4) Does not include \$30,400 contributed directly to Democratic Governor's Association.

(5) Does not include \$250,000 given directly to Democratic Governor's Association.

(6) Does not include \$325,000 given directly to Democratic Governor's Association.

... Continued on page 11.

“Special Interest” PACs

Continued from page 10.

APPENDIX
TABLE 5

Type of PAC	New Since 2005	2009 Total	% New
Other Ongoing	55	115	48%
Ideological	53	124	43%
Civic Association	21	44	48%
Regulated Industry	3	34	9%
Professional	6	67	9%
Union	16	119	13%

The above News Release by Jeff Brindle was released on August 18, 2010.

DATES TO REMEMBER

2010 Reporting Dates		
GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 2, 2010		
	PERIOD COVERED	REPORT DUE DATE
29-day pre-election	6/26/10 – 10/1/10	October 4, 2010
11-day pre-election	10/2/10 – 10/19/10	October 22, 2010
20-day post-election	10/20/10 – 11/19/10	November 22, 2010
48 Hour Notice Reports start on 10/20/10 through 11/2/10		
PACs & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS		
	PERIOD COVERED	REPORT DUE DATE
3 rd Quarter	7/1/10 – 9/30/10	October 15, 2010
4 th Quarter	10/1/10 – 12/31/10	January 18, 2011

Treasurer Training for Candidates and Committees	
Seminars are conducted at 10:00 a.m. at the Commission's offices at 28 West State Street, 8 th floor, in Trenton.	
Treasurer Training Seminars for Candidates and Joint Candidates Committees:	Treasurer Training Seminars for Political Party Committees and PACs:
Monday, September 13	Monday, September 27
Wednesday, September 29	Thursday, December 9

[Late and non-filing of reports are subject to civil penalties determined by the Commissioners](#)