



# ELEC-TRONIC

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

P.O. Box 185, Trenton, NJ 08625

(609) 292-8700 - Toll Free Within NJ 1-888-313-ELEC (3532)

**"Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry"**

## Commissioners

Ronald DeFilippis  
Chairman

Walter F. Timpone  
Vice Chairman

Amos C. Saunders  
Commissioner

Edwin R. Matthews  
Legal Counsel

## Directors

Jeffrey M. Brindle  
Joseph W. Donohue  
Carol L. Hoekje  
Amy F. Davis  
Carol Neiman  
Linda White  
Todd J. Wojcik  
Shreve Marshall  
Christopher Mistichelli

## In This Issue

- **Comments from the Chairman**
- **Chinese Delegation Visit**
- **Executive Director's Thoughts**
- **2014 Meeting Schedule**
- **Independent Spending**
- **Training Seminars**
- **Lobbying Reporting Dates**
- **2014 Reporting Dates**

## **Website:**

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

## **Comments from the Chairman**

**Ronald DeFilippis**

### **ELEC EXPANDS ACCESS TO PRESS RELEASES**

In the latest in a series of steps to provide access to public documents generated by the agency, more than 400 press releases issued between 1983 and 2005 are now available on the Commission's website.

As a result voters, researchers, the political community, and the media will have the opportunity to better follow historic trends in the area of campaign financing and lobbying in New Jersey.

Highlights include a press release about the agency's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary issued in August 1998 as well as press releases accompanying white papers, or in depth research papers. Other reports mentioned in the press releases include "Technology in the Future-Strengthening Disclosure" issued in October 1992 and "Is There a PAC Plague in New Jersey," published in November 1991.

Older press releases dating back to 1983 provide news about campaign finance trends, lobbying, the gubernatorial public financing program and agency milestones, such as when commissioners began their terms.

The press release project is just the latest in an effort aimed at increasing transparency.

Recent efforts include online viewing of all advisory opinions, minutes, and annual reports dating back to 1973, when the agency was established. Moreover, the public can now undertake searches of contributions to local candidates, and view quarterly lobbying reports soon after they are filed.

As a result of its efforts, ELEC's website was recognized as "Best Official New Jersey Website" in 2010 by the Documents Association of New Jersey. Besides the above initiatives, the website lets the public view campaign fundraising reports of local and state candidates, complaints and final decisions, annual lobbying reports, agency regulations and compliance manuals, annual reports of political activity filed by public contractors, statistical information, research reports, and agency regulations.

In addition, personal financial disclosure forms filed by gubernatorial and legislative candidates are online as is the Commission's monthly newsletter.

Beginning in June 2009, when Jeff Brindle assumed the position of Executive Director, the agency undertook a determined effort to increase its New Jersey profile, an important part of which is the effort to expand transparency.

This initiative has been aided by the support of the Commissioners and the skills of Deputy Director Joe Donohue, Administrative Assistant Elbia Zeppetelli, Principal Webmaster Maryanne Garcia, Executive Secretary Maureen Tilbury, and Legal Secretary Renee Zach.

In the future look for continued efforts to bring more information to the public in a way that is accessible to all.

## VISIT FROM CHINESE DELEGATION



Executive Director Jeff Brindle, Director of Review and Investigation Shreve Marshall, and Assistant Legal Director Amanda Haines conducted a meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>, with a delegation from Wuhan City of Central China. They discussed the oversight of political contributions in relation to anti-corruption measures.

## Executive Director's Thoughts Jeff Brindle

### END OF FILIBUSTER MEANS MORE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORMS

*Reprinted from Politickernj.com*

Eliminating the filibuster rule applicable to federal judicial nominations will result in fresh challenges to campaign finance law.

These challenges, however, will come from reformist groups seeking to overturn Citizens United rather than from conservative groups looking to loosen regulations.

Last week, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid broke with nearly two centuries of tradition by invoking the nuclear option to end the practice of filibustering.

The filibuster is a device employed by senators to delay or derail nominations and legislation.

Senator Reid resorted to the "nuclear option" to break the deadlock over President Obama's nominees for the federal bench and other executive branch appointments.

In truth, the filibuster has been increasingly used by both parties recently, as Democrats used it to block numerous Bush era nominees.

The origin of the filibuster rule is murky at best. It has been said by some that Thomas Jefferson introduced it when he presided over the senate as President Adams Vice President.

But this appears to be incorrect as statements by Jefferson indicate that he supported majority rule. Perhaps they have confused Thomas Jefferson with Jimmy Stewart's character Jefferson Smith in "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

The more plausible explanation for the genesis of the filibuster is that it came about inadvertently.

According to the Brookings Institute, a rule existed in the Senate in 1789 termed the "previous question" motion. This rule allowed for a majority to cut off debate.

In testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on rules and administration in 2010, Sarah Binder stated the following:

"In 1805, Vice President Aaron Burr was presiding over the Senate . . . . He said something like this. You are a great deliberative body. But a truly great senate would have a cleaner rule book."

Because of the house cleaning that followed, the "previous question" rule was eliminated. Without this rule, there was no way for the Senate to cut off debate with a simple majority.

While it took time for minority delegations to take advantage of this oversight, the filibuster became a tactic used by senators starting in 1837.

Ending the filibuster rule, which had required 60 votes to close debate, means that 51 senators, or a simple majority, can now confirm nominations to the bench and other executive branch offices.

Currently, there are three vacancies on the D.C. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. This court has been very influential with cases involving campaign finance law. In its recent decisions, it has generally taken a conservative approach in upholding first amendment rights of political speech and disclosure.

In *SpeechNow*, a decision rendered in 2010, the court allowed unlimited contributions to PACs, unlimited spending, and disclosure and registration.

A year later, the D.C. court opened the door to Super PACs in *Carey v. FEC*. This decision allows corporations and unions to make unlimited contributions to PACs, as long as the funds are segregated. It allows unlimited spending as long as the spending is independent and permits disclosure.

While the trend has been in the direction of loosening up campaign finance rules, the end to the filibuster rule may change the climate and usher in an era of reformist counter attack.

President Obama will have an easy road nominating three, presumably liberal judges to the D.C. court. This, in and of itself, will change the ideological blend on the court.

It is a pretty good guess that reformist groups will note this and begin their own campaign to change campaign finance law, with the ultimate aim of dismantling Citizens United.

With a newly constituted D.C. court, reformers may have an ally in their cause. While the U.S. Supreme Court is not likely to reverse course on campaign finance laws, decisions to the contrary by the D.C. court will place campaign finance reform squarely in the public eye.

The next few years will continue to be a turbulent time in the field of campaign finance law. Conservative groups will surely continue their quest for an end to contribution limits and regulatory activity in this area. But at the same time these efforts will be counter balanced by re-energized reformists who seek greater restrictions over campaign finance law.

The end to the filibuster rule will prove to be an ally to reformers who seek to redress what they consider to be ill-informed decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court in the field of campaign finance.

## 2014 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission has announced its meeting schedule for 2014. Unless otherwise indicated in the future, meetings will be held at the Commission's offices at 28 West State Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, in Trenton. It is anticipated that meetings will begin at 11:00 a.m., unless otherwise indicated.

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

## INDEPENDENT SPECIAL INTEREST SPENDING

An unprecedented explosion of independent special interest spending pushed the cost of the 2013 state elections to an all-time high, according to post-election reports filed with the Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

“While final numbers won’t be available until January, special interest groups spent nearly \$41 million independent of parties and candidates on state campaigns,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director. “As a result, total spending on this year’s state elections reached a record \$129 million.”

**Table 1  
Cumulative Campaign Spending 20 Days after Election\***

Type	Spending 2013		Spending 2009		Spending 2005	
Gubernatorial	\$ 25,884,600	20%	\$ 56,099,909	58%	\$ 86,823,722	73%
Legislative	\$ 61,838,275	48%	\$ 26,057,077	27%	\$ 32,114,738	27%
Independent Special Interest Groups	\$ 41,143,448	32%	\$ 14,924,270	15%	\$ 411,224	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$128,866,323</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 97,081,256</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$119,349,684</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*(Includes primary and general election, as well as ballot question expenditures).

Brindle said the independent spending spurt led to other records and milestones as well:

- The nearly \$38 million in independent spending on just the gubernatorial and legislative elections (excluding ballot questions) appears to be the fifth highest ever for any state in America.
- The estimated \$72.4 million spent on the legislative election (including independent expenditures) appears to be a new record.
- The nearly \$3 million spent to support and oppose a ballot question to raise the state minimum wage was the most ever when inflation is ignored, and the second highest on an inflation adjusted basis.
- The \$5.8 million spent in the 38<sup>th</sup> legislative district, which still is a preliminary figure, is the fourth most expensive legislative campaign in history.
- For the first time ever, independent groups spent more in one legislative district (the 16<sup>th</sup>) than the candidates spent themselves.

The majority of direct and independent spending was focused on the handful of legislative districts where the parties fought hardest for control of the Legislature. Democrats appear to have emerged from the election with the same 48-to-32 majority in the Assembly despite extremely tight margins involving two seats. They also kept a 24-to-16 edge in the Senate.

“Nearly \$26 million, or 65 percent of the funds spent directly by candidates, went to the top ten most expensive districts,” said Brindle.

“At least another \$10.5 million in independent spending was concentrated mostly on those same districts though inadequate disclosure rules make it impossible to determine exact totals,” he said. “By contrast, in 2011, the first year when there was significant independent spending in legislative races, the total was about \$1.8 million.”

“While spending totals still are preliminary, the hard-fought campaign in the 38<sup>th</sup> legislative district cost nearly \$5.8 million—currently the fourth most expensive legislative race in state history,” said Brindle. “Spending in four other districts also topped \$3 million.”

**Table 2**  
**Top Ten Legislative Districts Ranked by**  
**Spending through November 25, 2013**

District	Direct Spending	Independent Spending	Total
38	\$ 3,571,821	\$ 2,221,136	<b>\$ 5,792,957</b>
1	\$ 2,650,749	\$ 1,998,704	<b>\$ 4,649,453</b>
2	\$ 3,241,441	\$ 838,560	<b>\$ 4,080,001</b>
14	\$ 3,193,138	\$ 665,304	<b>\$ 3,858,442</b>
3	\$ 3,561,806	\$ 186,911	<b>\$ 3,748,717</b>
18	\$ 2,544,591	\$ 3,901	<b>\$ 2,548,492</b>
21	\$ 2,329,259	\$ 32,000	<b>\$ 2,361,259</b>
7	\$ 1,847,684	\$ 394,481	<b>\$ 2,242,165</b>
16	\$ 688,566	\$ 1,117,615	<b>\$ 1,806,181</b>
36	\$ 1,693,547	None	<b>\$ 1,693,547</b>

“Independent spending was so prevalent that in the 16<sup>th</sup> district, for the first time ever, it exceeded the amount spent directly by candidates,” Brindle said.

Three independent groups spent at least \$500,000 on legislative races.

Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security, a Washington, DC-based “Super PAC” formed to participate in legislative elections and bankrolled by unions, spent the most.

Of its \$8.7 million in total spending, \$8 million was funneled into legislative campaigns while the remainder was used to promote a minimum wage ballot question. Its reports link \$6.2 million in spending directly to battleground districts.

The National Association of Realtors Fund, a Chicago-based Super PAC, spent \$822,493 while NJ Workers Voices, a union sponsored political action committee that spent independently, shelled out about \$734,405 on legislative campaigns.

**Table 3**  
**Spending by Independent Groups**  
**in Targeted Legislative Districts**

<b>Group</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>38</b>
Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security	\$1,782,776	\$822,377	\$171,742	\$151,546	\$520,459	\$ 920,729		\$1,841,076
Realtors PAC	\$ 164,000			\$241,000		\$ 174,969		\$ 68,437
NJ Workers Voices	\$ 51,928	\$ 9,459		\$ 1,935	\$ 1,077			\$ 30,006
Republican State Leadership Committee			\$ 15,169		\$141,055			\$ 279,442
Americans for Prosperity								
Planned Parenthood Action Fund of NJ					\$ 1,250			\$ 2,175
NJ League of Conservation Voters PAC					\$ 1,463	\$ 21,917	\$3,901	
NJ Family First		\$ 6,724						
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,998,704</b>	<b>\$838,560</b>	<b>\$186,911</b>	<b>\$394,481</b>	<b>\$665,304</b>	<b>\$ 1,117,615</b>	<b>\$3,901</b>	<b>\$ 2,221,136</b>

**Table 4**  
**Additional Spending by Independent Groups**  
**in Legislative Districts**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Total Targeted Districts</b>	<b>District either not specified or combined</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>Total Spending in Legislative Races</b>
Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security	\$ 6,210,705	\$ 1,770,899	\$ 35,460			\$ 8,017,064
Realtors PAC	\$ 648,406		\$ 73,650	\$ 32,000	\$ 68,437	\$ 822,493
NJ Workers Voices	\$ 94,405	\$ 640,000				\$ 734,405
Republican State Leadership Committee	\$ 435,666					\$ 435,666
Americans for Prosperity		\$ 400,000				\$ 400,000
Planned Parenthood Action Fund of NJ	\$ 3,425	\$ 61,191				\$ 64,616
NJ League of Conservation Voters PAC	\$ 27,281	\$ 17,322				\$ 44,603
NJ Family First	\$ 6,724					\$ 6,724
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,426,612</b>	<b>\$ 2,889,412</b>	<b>\$ 109,110</b>	<b>\$ 32,000</b>	<b>\$ 68,437</b>	<b>\$ 10,525,571</b>

Independent special interest spending on candidate and ballot question elections has nearly topped \$41 million- nearly three times the \$14.9 million spent in 2009. The figure still is preliminary.

**Table 5**  
**Estimated Independent Spending by Special Interest Groups in 2013**  
**State Campaigns through November 25, 2013**

Group	Spent	General/ Primary/Both?	Election
Garden State Forward (New Jersey Education Association)	\$ 13,967,974 <sup>(1)</sup>	Both	Gubernatorial and Legislative
Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security (also see ballot questions)	\$ 8,017,064	Both	Legislative
Committee for Our Children's Future	\$ 7,800,000	P	Gubernatorial
One New Jersey	\$ 2,800,000	P	Gubernatorial
Republican Governors Association	\$ 1,725,000	P	Gubernatorial
NJ Workers' Voices (NJ AFL-CIO- also see ballot questions)	\$ 1,071,033	Both	Gubernatorial and Legislative
National Association of Realtors	\$ 1,022,056	Both	Gubernatorial and Legislative
Republican State Leadership Committee	\$ 446,166	G	Legislative
Americans for Prosperity	\$ 400,000	G	Legislative
Latino Consumer Group Inc.	\$ 365,095	G	Gubernatorial
NJ For the People	\$ 140,350	G	Gubernatorial
Working Families Organization	\$ 110,257	G	Gubernatorial
Planned Parenthood Action Fund of NJ	\$ 64,936	G	Gubernatorial and Legislative
NJ League of Conservation Voters for a Clean Environment	\$ 44,603	G	Legislative
New Jersey Family First	\$ 6,724	G	Legislative
<b>Total-Gubernatorial and Legislative Elections</b>	<b>\$ 37,981,258</b>		
<b>STATEWIDE BALLOT QUESTIONS</b>			
Coalition to Preserve Jobs and Our Constitution Inc.	\$ 1,022,579	G	Ballot Question
Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security	\$ 686,006	G	Ballot Question
Working America <sup>(2)</sup>	\$ 614,581	G	Ballot Question
Working Families United for NJ	\$ 558,169	G	Ballot Question
NJ Workers' Voices	\$ 137,163	G	Ballot Question
Realtors for Private Property Rights	\$ 98,516	G	Ballot Question
NJ Keep It Green	\$ 45,176	G	Ballot Question
<b>Total-Ballot Questions</b>	<b>\$ 3,162,190</b>		
<b>Total- Independent Spending</b>	<b>\$ 41,143,448</b>		

(1) Figure compiled based on figures taken from 527 report filed with IRS, reported Garden State Forward contributions to Fund for Jobs, Growth and Security, and independent expenditure reports filed with ELEC.

(2) Some minimum wage ads also promoted legislators.

Along with being a record for New Jersey, independent spending in the 2013 elections also is the fifth largest participation in state elections ever, according to ELEC research.

Ballot questions were excluded where possible because they play a far bigger role in elections in states with initiative and referendum such as California and Washington.

**Table 6**  
**Independent Spending on State Elections.**  
**Except Where Noted, Excludes Ballot Initiatives**

Rank	State	Year	Total
1	California	2010	\$63,076,079
2	California	2006	\$49,954,502
3	Florida*	2010	\$48,218,708
4	Wisconsin	2012	\$41,170,583
5	New Jersey	2013	\$37,981,258
6	Wisconsin	2011	\$34,600,131
7	Florida*	2006	\$31,538,738
8	Washington	2012	\$26,327,170
9	California	2012	\$23,000,000
10	Washington*	2008	\$21,398,042

\*Includes Ballot Initiatives

Sources: ELEC, National Institute on Money in State Politics, Wisconsin Democracy Project, California Fair Political Practices Commission, Washington Public Disclosure Commission.

The nearly \$3 million spent to promote and oppose a ballot question to increase the state minimum wage was the most ever invested in a New Jersey referendum if unadjusted for inflation, and the second<sup>1</sup> most with inflation factored in. The ballot question passed.

**Table 7**  
**Historical Comparison of Spending on**  
**New Jersey Ballot Questions**

Committee	Referendum	Outcome	Year	Unadjusted for Inflation	Adjusted for Inflation
Committee to Rebuild Atlantic City and its opposition	Allow casinos in Atlantic City	Passed	1976	\$ 1,351,865	\$ 5,563,230
Multiple committees for and against	Increase state minimum wage	Passed	2013	\$ 3,162,190	\$ 3,162,190
Pro- and anti-casino interests	Allow casinos in four New Jersey locations	Failed	1974	\$ 612,500	\$ 2,902,844
New Jersey Committee for Simulcasting	Allow simulcasting at state race tracks	Passed	1985	\$ 1,006,918	\$ 2,188,952
Building Our Future	Higher education bond issue	Passed	2012	\$ 2,019,690	\$ 2,019,690

Republican Governor Chris Christie finished the race with a large advantage over Democratic challenger Barbara Buono and six independent challengers. Both major party candidates qualified for public funding.



**Table 8**  
**Campaign Finance Activity by**  
**Gubernatorial Candidates through November 25, 2013**

Candidate	Party	Raised	Spent	Cash-on-Hand
Chris Christie	R	\$13,492,272**	\$13,140,635	\$ 361,720
Barbara Buono	D	\$ 3,099,954***	\$ 3,009,559	\$ 116,542
Diane Sare	I	\$ 55,713	\$ 55,961	\$ (36)
Kenneth Kaplan (1)	I	\$ 2,105	\$ 117	\$ 1,988
William Araujo (2)	I	\$ 1,042	\$ 850	\$ 193
Jeffrey Boss*	I	NA	NA	NA
Steven Welzer*	I	NA	NA	NA
Hank Schroeder*	I	NA	NA	NA
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$16,651,086</b>	<b>\$16,207,122</b>	<b>\$ 480,407</b>

\*Does not expect to raise or spend more than \$4,500.

\*\*Includes \$8.2 million from public funding.

\*\*\*Includes \$1.8 million from public funding.

(1) From 29 Day Report.

(2) From 11 Day Report.

Without the self-financed candidacy of former Governor Jon Corzine, direct spending in the governor's race was well below the cost of the 2009 election.

**Table 9**  
**Comparison of Campaign Finance Activity for Gubernatorial**  
**General Election Candidates 20 Days after Election**

Year	Raised	Spent	Cash-on-Hand
2013	\$ 16,651,086	\$ 16,207,122	\$ 480,407
2009	\$ 40,827,783	\$ 40,146,384	\$ 698,685
<b>Difference</b>	<b>-59%</b>	<b>-60%</b>	<b>-31%</b>

While totals for this year's legislative elections are preliminary, it appears the 2013 campaign may emerge as the most expensive in history due to the influx of independent spending.

**Table 10**  
**Total Spending on Legislative Elections by Year**

Year	Primary (Candidates)	General (Candidates)	Independent Groups	Total
2013	\$ 22,153,242	\$ 39,685,033	\$ 10,525,571	\$ 72,363,846
2011	\$ 30,135,407	\$ 38,366,364	\$ 1,835,500	\$ 70,337,271
2007	\$ 25,439,111	\$ 39,274,669	\$ 165,000	\$ 64,878,780

Democrats had a fundraising advantage that roughly matched their 2-to-1 majority in the Legislature.

**Table 11**  
**Party Breakdown of Legislative Spending**  
**through November 25, 2013**

Party	Spent
Democrats	\$ 26,545,784
Independents	\$ 83,787
Republicans	\$ 13,055,462
<b>All Parties</b>	<b>\$ 39,685,033</b>

Democrats also were the beneficiaries of an estimated \$8.8 million (84 percent) of the \$10.5 million in independent spending that ELEC was able to ascertain by party.

Following a long-standing trend, incumbents had a huge edge over challengers.

**Table 12  
Incumbents Versus Challengers  
through November 25, 2013**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Spent</b>
Incumbents	\$ 30,672,862
Challengers	\$ 9,012,171
<b>All Candidates</b>	<b>\$ 39,685,033</b>

Candidates for 80 Assembly seats spent more than candidates for 40 Senate seats not counting independent expenditures.

**Table 13  
Spending By Legislative House  
through November 25, 2013**

<b>Legislative House</b>	<b>Spent</b>
Senate Candidates	\$ 18,589,838
Assembly Candidates	\$ 21,095,195
<b>All Candidates</b>	<b>\$ 39,685,033</b>

The numbers in this report should be considered preliminary. The analysis of gubernatorial and legislative campaign finance activity is based on 20-day post-election fundraising reports received by 5 p.m. November 29, 2013. The analysis of spending by independent groups includes information from 48-hour notices filed after the election.

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

Several, but not all, independent groups also file reports with ELEC. These reports can be searched at [www.elec.state.nj.us/ELECReport/IndependentExpenditureSearch.aspx](http://www.elec.state.nj.us/ELECReport/IndependentExpenditureSearch.aspx). Some also disclose their activities in reports made public by the Internal Revenue Service at [www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Political-Organizations](http://www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Political-Organizations).

ELEC also can be accessed on Facebook ([www.facebook.com/NJElectionLaw](http://www.facebook.com/NJElectionLaw)) and Twitter ([www.twitter.com/elecny](http://www.twitter.com/elecny)). Follow us on You-Tube.

## TRAINING SEMINARS

The seminars listed below will be held at the Offices of the Commission, located at 28 West State St., Trenton, NJ. Please visit ELEC's website at <http://www.elec.state.nj.us> for more information on training seminar registration.

<b>BUSINESS ENTITY PAY-TO-PLAY TRAINING</b>	
January 24, 2014	2:00 p.m.
February 24, 2014	2:00 p.m.
March 14, 2014	10:00 a.m.
March 26, 2014	10:00 a.m.
<b>LOBBYING ANNUAL TRAINING</b>	
January 7, 2014	10:00 a.m.
January 13, 2014	10:00 a.m.
January 23, 2014	10:00 a.m.
January 29, 2014	10:00 a.m.
<b>TREASURER TRAINING FOR CANDIDATES AND JOINT CANDIDATES COMMITTEES</b>	
March 18, 2014	10:00 a.m.
April 2, 2014	10:00 a.m.
April 22, 2014	10:00 a.m.
September 11, 2014	10:00 a.m.
September 30, 2014	10:00 a.m.
<b>TREASURER TRAINING FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES AND PACS</b>	
March 19, 2014	10:00 a.m.
June 26, 2014	10:00 a.m.
September 23, 2014	10:00 a.m.
December 10, 2014	10:00 a.m.
<b>R-1 ELECTRONIC FILING SOFTWARE (REFS) TRAINING</b>	
March 20, 2014	10:00 a.m.
April 3, 2014	10:00 a.m.
April 23, 2014	10:00 a.m.
July 23, 2014	10:00 a.m.
September 9, 2014	10:00 a.m.
October 1, 2014	10:00 a.m.

## 2014 LOBBYING REPORTING DATES

	<b>INCLUSION DATES</b>	<b>ELEC DUE DATE</b>
<b>Lobbying Quarterly Filing</b>		
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1/1/14 – 3/31/14	4/10/14
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4/1/14 – 6/30/14	7/10/14
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7/1/14 – 9/30/14	10/10/14
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	10/1/14 – 12/31/14	1/12/15

## 2014 REPORTING DATES

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATES
<b>Fire Commissioner - 2/15/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	Inception of campaign* - 1/14/14	1/17/2014
11-day pre-election	1/15/14 - 2/1/14	2/4/2014
20-day post-election	2/2/14 - 3/4/14	3/7/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 2/2/2014 through 2/15/2014		
<b>School Board Election - 4/23/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	Inception of campaign* - 3/22/14	3/25/2014
11-day pre-election	3/23/14 - 4/9/14	4/14/2014
20-day post-election	4/10/14 - 5/10/14	5/13/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/10/2014 through 4/23/2014		
<b>May Municipal Election - 5/13/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	Inception of campaign* - 4/11/14	4/14/2014
11-day pre-election	4/12/14 - 4/29/14	5/2/2014
**20-day post-election	4/30/14 - 5/30/14	6/2/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/30/2014 through 5/13/2014		
<b>Runoff Election (June)** - 6/10/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day pre-election	4/30/14 - 5/27/14	5/30/2014
20-day post-election	5/28/14-6/27/14	6/30/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 5/28/14 through 6/10/14		
<b>Primary Election - 6/3/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	Inception of campaign* - 5/2/14	5/5/2014
11-day pre-election	5/3/14 - 5/20/14	5/23/2014
20-day post-election	5/21/14 - 6/20/14	6/23/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 5/21/14 through 6/3/14		
90 Day Start Date: 3/5/14		
<b>General Election - 11/4/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	6/21/14 - 10/3/14	10/6/2014
11-day pre-election	10/4/14 - 10/21/14	10/24/2014
20-day post-election	10/22/14 - 11/21/14	11/24/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 10/22/14 through 11/4/14		
<b>Runoff Election** - 12/2/2014</b>		
29-day pre-election	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day pre-election	10/22/14 - 11/18/14	11/21/2014
20-day post-election	11/19/14 - 12/19/14	12/22/2014
48 Hour Notice Reports Start on 11/19/14 through 12/2/14		
<b>PACs, PCFRs &amp; Campaign Quarterly Filers</b>		
1st Quarter	1/1/14 - 3/31/14	4/15/2014
2nd Quarter***	4/1/14 - 6/30/14	7/15/2014
3rd Quarter	7/1/14 - 9/30/14	10/15/2014
4th Quarter	10/1/14 - 12/31/14	1/15/2015

\* Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or from January 1, 2014 (Quarterly filers).

\*\* A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2014 Runoff election is not required to file a 20-day post-election report for the corresponding prior election (May Municipal or General).

\*\*\* A second quarter report is needed by Independent General Election candidates if they started their campaign before May 6, 2014.