



# ELEC *tronic*

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

ISSUE 98 • AUGUST 2017

## Parting Comments from former Chairman Ronald DeFilippis

As the November election for governor approaches, the question that comes to mind is the role that the Gubernatorial Public Financing Program will play in the election.

If history is any guide, the program will play an integral part in this year's contest.

The program has been a model for other state programs since its inception in the 1977 general election. Subsequently, the public financing initiative was expanded in 1981 to include primary elections as well.

The twin purposes of the program are to eliminate even the appearance of corruption and to allow qualified candidates of limited personal wealth to run for the State's highest office.

Through the years those two goals have been more than satisfied.

At the completion of this year's primary, 75 candidates had participated in the program. These candidates were able to mount credible campaigns and, in the case of six of them, become governor.

Moreover, since the start of the program there has never been a whiff of scandal.

The Gubernatorial Public Financing Program is a matching program. In other words, each private dollar raised is matched with two public dollars.

Of course, there is a viability test to determine eligibility to participate in the program. Public money is not just given out indiscriminately.

In order for candidates to qualify for the program in 2017, for instance, they must raise \$430,000 in private donations.

Once this threshold is met, \$292,000 of it is matched 2 to 1 with public dollars. A total of \$138,000 of the initial \$430,000 is not matched.

Candidates in this year's general election, who opt to participate in the program, and qualify, can receive up to \$9.3 million in public funds but are subjected to an overall expenditure limit of \$13.8 million.

Thus, to max out, candidates must raise \$4.79 million in private funds with only the \$138,000 not matched.

Candidates participating in the program as well as those not participating are subject to a contribution limit of \$4,300 per donor per election cycle.

The importance of the program to the integrity of the electoral process in New Jersey cannot be overstated.

And, in this year's election, its importance is even more enhanced by the prospect of huge dollars being spent independently by outside groups, many of whom at this juncture will not be subject to disclosing their fundraising activity under the State's campaign finance laws.

## "Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry"

### IN THIS ISSUE

Parting Comments from the former Chairman	1
DeFilippis Steps Down as ELEC Chairman; Jaso named new Chairman	2
Marguerite T. Simon, ELEC Commissioner	2
Executive Director's Thoughts	3
2017 General Gubernatorial Debate Details	5
Public Funds Disbursements	5
Training Seminars & Lobbying Reporting Dates	5
"Big Six" Second Quarter 2017	6
Independent Spending in Legislative Primary Election is Most Ever	7
Reporting Dates	9

### COMMISSIONERS:

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

The Commission's Executive Director has predicted that more than the \$41 million spent in 2013 would be spent in this year's contest.

Because of this, the importance of the public financing program as a means of offsetting the influence of these anonymous groups is considerably enhanced.

The Commission is responsible for administering the Gubernatorial Public Financing Program. In so doing, the specially hired staff carefully reviews every submission of private funds to ensure that the public's money is spent wisely and in accordance with the law.

In this year's election, the public can be assured that the gubernatorial contest will once again be conducted in a fair and impartial manner, with a public financing program as an integral part of that effort.

## DeFilippis Steps Down as ELEC Chairman; Jaso named new Chairman

ELEC Chairman Ronald DeFilippis announced his resignation on July 21, 2017. He becomes the longest-serving chairman in ELEC's history after sitting in his post nearly seven years.

On July 28, 2017, Commissioner Eric Jaso was named by Governor Chris Christie as his replacement.

"As chairman, Ron demonstrated integrity, leadership and common sense. He was a strong advocate for the agency and he will be greatly

missed," said Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director. "I want to thank him for his service, and wish the best for Ron and his wife Patti in the future."

DeFilippis, a Republican from Morris County, was nominated by Governor Chris Christie on May 15, 2010 and confirmed by the state Senate on June 24, 2010. Governor Christie named him chairman in October 2010.

DeFilippis is a founding partner in the firm of Mills & DeFilippis (CPAs LLP) where he currently serves as senior partner. He was one of the few veteran campaign treasurers ever to serve on the Commission.

Jaso's nomination to the Commission was unanimously confirmed by the state Senate on March 13, 2017. He is a Republican attorney who lives in Morristown.

The Commission also includes Stephen Holden and Marguerite Simon, who also were appointed this year.

## Marguerite T. Simon Now ELEC Commissioner

Marguerite T. Simon became the 32nd person appointed to the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission since its creation in 1973 when the State Senate on June 29, 2017 unanimously approved her nomination.

She replaces Lawrence Weiss, who died while serving on the commission in 2011. Simon is a Democratic

attorney who was nominated February 27, 2017 by Governor Chris Christie.

Simon serves as counsel to the firm of Javerbaum Wurgaft Hicks Kahn Wikstrom & Sinins PC of Springfield and Englewood Cliffs. Her practice is primarily concentrated in alternate dispute resolution. She serves as a mediator and arbitrator in private party and court appointed matters.

She also served as a state Superior Court Judge in Hackensack from 1984 until her retirement in 2004 when she was Presiding Judge of General Equity.

She has taught classes and seminars at the New Jersey Judicial College, Institute for Continuing Legal Education, and Bergen Community College.

Among her awards are Super Lawyer, New Jersey, Alternative Dispute Resolution, 2010 to present; and Professional Lawyer of the Year, New Jersey Bar State Bar Association and Bergen County Bar Association, both 2006.

Simon obtained her law degree from the University of Virginia School of Law in 1961. She received her undergraduate degree from Barnard College in 1958.

Her professional affiliations include: Bergen County Bar Association, New Jersey State Bar Association and Women Lawyers in Bergen County.

She is married to Donald Howard. Together they have four children and ten grandchildren. She lives in Edgewater and Cape May.

## Executive Director's Thoughts

### Jeff Brindle

## Legal Challenges Will Not Stop Super PACS

Reprinted from Observer PolitickerNJ

There is growing concern nationally over the outsized role in elections played by super PACs and other independent groups.

In the past year, super PACs in particular have come into the cross hairs of good government advocates.

Super PACs are political fund-raising committees that can raise and spend unlimited amounts independently of candidates or parties. Unlike some other independent groups, they must publicly disclose their activities to the Federal Election Commission (FEC). They cannot make contributions to candidates.

On Nov. 4, 2016, a bipartisan group of congressional members and candidates represented by several well-known attorneys filed a federal lawsuit, *Lieu et al. v. FEC*, with the intent of ending unlimited contributions to super PACs. In effect, it would abolish them.

The lawsuit demands that the FEC reverse decisions letting super PACs accept unlimited contributions. In a response brief filed Jan. 13, 2017, the FEC said no.

While the legal skirmishing continues, the obvious intent of the lawsuit is to try to get the matter before the U.S. Supreme Court. That would give the litigants a chance to try to overturn the decision of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

Circuit in the 2010 case *SpeechNow.org v. FEC*. In that ruling, the judges abolished a \$5,000 limit on political committees and effectively created super PACs after the FEC issued advisory opinions allowing them.

"Super PACs take their cue from a judicially-made loophole that stems from a lower court decision (*SpeechNow*) that, to this day, the Supreme Court has never reviewed," said Laurence Tribe, one of the lawyers opposed to the ruling. "The Supreme Court Justices, including some who joined the *Citizens United* decision, may well be aghast at how a lower-court misinterpretation of the First Amendment gave birth to the super PAC takeover of American politics."

In Florida, a separate effort is taking place with the aim of curtailing super PACs.

Recently, the St. Petersburg City Council passed a measure that would ban super PAC activity in the city. This was a preliminary vote with a final vote to take place in July.

The ordinance assuredly will be challenged if it passes. And if so, that lawsuit likely would proceed through the 11th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals and could be taken up by the Supreme Court.

Although the concern about the growing influence over elections by super PACs is understandable, these efforts to curb their activities are misguided.

Reaching back to the Supreme Court's landmark *Buckley v. Valeo* ruling in 1976, independent spending is

constitutionally protected speech by virtue of the First Amendment.

The court's 2010 decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* went further by saying freedom of speech prohibits the government from restricting independent political expenditures by corporations and unions.

Opponents of super PACs contend that the FEC and the *SpeechNow* judges erred by wrongly applying *Citizens United's* holdings to contributions as well as expenditures, but the *SpeechNow* ruling, approved 9-0 by a panel of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, seems unflinching in its reasoning:

"In light of the court's holding [in *Citizens United*] as a matter of law that independent expenditures do not corrupt or create the appearance of quid pro quo corruption, contributions to groups that make only independent expenditures also cannot corrupt or create the appearance of corruption. The court has effectively held that there is no corrupting 'quid' for which a candidate might in exchange offer a corrupt 'quo.'

"Given this analysis from *Citizens United*, we must conclude that the government has no anti-corruption interest in limiting contributions to an independent expenditure group such as *SpeechNow*. This simplifies the task of weighing the First Amendment interests implicated by contributions to *SpeechNow* against the government's interest in limiting such contributions."

Further, the U.S. Supreme Court, as currently constituted, is not likely to overturn *SpeechNow* or *Citizens United*.

It is highly doubtful that the high court will reimpose contribution limits on super PACs, because a majority is likely to view that as an unconstitutional curb on First Amendment rights of speech and assembly.

Last July, David Keating, who originated the *SpeechNow* lawsuit and is now president of the Center for Competitive Politics, told the Washington Post he doubts the ruling will ever be overturned.

"I think they're here to stay, because it's basically Americans getting together and speaking about the government," Keating said.

The future is no more promising for reformers, either. Aside from recently appointed Justice Neil Gorsuch, who is expected to take positions similar to those of the late Justice Antonin Scalia, three more justices may leave the court during the Trump era.

This would give the president additional opportunities to appoint justices in the mold of Scalia, assuring a conservative majority.

So, the prospects are dim for either of the two aforementioned efforts to rein in super PACs through the courts.

A better approach toward offsetting the influence of independent groups over elections at the national and state levels is to strengthen political parties and their candidates.

In New Jersey, independent group spending followed the trend started at the national level. Super PACs and other independents have been active in gubernatorial and legislative

campaigns. Last year almost \$30 million was spent supporting ballot questions, primarily involving casinos and transportation. Increasingly, outside groups also have begun participating at the local level.

In the 2013 gubernatorial and legislative elections, \$41 million was spent by independent groups, almost 200 percent more than was spent by the political parties.

In this year's gubernatorial primary such groups as New Way for New Jersey, Coalition for Progress, and Building a Better Way for New Jersey, along with six others, combined to spend \$8.8 million. These groups were supportive of potential candidates for governor.

During this year's legislative primaries, independent spending — led by \$640,574 from Garden State Forward (a 527 group funded by the New Jersey Education Association) — reached \$1.8 million. The recent budget showdown in Trenton also witnessed considerable spending by organizations other than the parties.

So it is expected that spending by independent groups during the November election will be huge.

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission has put forth recommendations to offset the growing influence over the state's elections and to reset the balance between these groups and political parties and candidates.

Under current state law, unless a super PAC or 501(c) group specifically supports or opposes a candidate in their advertisement, there is no requirement to disclose their donors or their expenditures.

They are required to report their expenditures only if they use magic words like "support" or "oppose."

The *Citizens United* ruling, as well as *SpeechNow*, while being roundly criticized by many, is often overlooked from the standpoint that both come out strongly for disclosure.

Therefore, ELEC's proposal to treat independent groups in the same way that state law treats parties, candidates and political action committees is constitutional.

In addition to its proposal to require registration and disclosure by independent groups, the commission has recommended additional steps to reset the balance between independents, parties and candidates.

These are: increase contribution limits to parties, exclude parties from the pay-to-play law while including PACs in it, permit county parties to give to each other, permit state parties to contribute to gubernatorial candidates, require that contractor donations to independent groups be disclosed, and at the federal level, loosen restrictions on federal accounts.

In addition to these proposals, ELEC also has offered recommendations for reforming New Jersey's pay-to-play law. These proposals have been incorporated into legislation separately introduced by Assembly Minority Leader Jon Bramnick, a Republican, and Assemblyman Troy Singleton, a Democrat. Hopefully the Legislature will consider these bills that would offset independent groups and bring back the parties in New Jersey.

## 2017 General Gubernatorial Debate Details

Sponsors of two gubernatorial debates this fall have announced the time and date of their events.

The first debate will be held at 7 pm on Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the New Jersey Performing Arts Center in Newark. The second debate will be held at 7 pm on Wednesday, October 18, 2017 at William Paterson University in Wayne.

The New Jersey Performing Arts Center is partnering with WABC-TV in New York, WPVI-TV in Philadelphia, Univision in New York and Philadelphia, NJ Advance Media, NJBIZ, NJ Spotlight, El Diario, Rutgers University, League of Women Voters NJ, Lead NJ, and National Association of Latino Elected Officials.

William Paterson’s partners include WCBS-TV in New York, WKYW-TV in Philadelphia, The Record and other Gannett New Jersey newspapers.

Republican candidate Kimberly Guadagno, who currently is Lieutenant Governor, and Democratic candidate Phil Murphy are the expected participants in the debates.

ELEC also has picked Montclair State University and partners to host a debate featuring the two candidates for lieutenant governor. However, neither gubernatorial candidate has announced their running mate yet.

Friday July 28, 2017 is the deadline for the selection.

The three winners were chosen from among 12 applicants, a record number.

## Public Funds Disbursements

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) has approved \$1.4 in public matching funds for the two-party nominees in this year’s 2017 gubernatorial general election.

The disbursement is the first to be received for the general election by Republican nominee Lt. Governor Kimberly Guadagno and the second disbursement to Democratic nominee Phil Murphy

**Disbursements of Public Funds to 2017  
Gubernatorial General Election Candidates**

CANDIDATE	DISBURSEMENTS		PARTY
	Current	Total for Election	
Guadagno, Kimberly	\$ 708,144	\$ 708,144	Republican
Murphy, Phil	\$ 667,132	\$ 1,842,071	Democrat
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 1,375,276</b>	<b>\$ 2,550,215</b>	

## Training Seminars

The seminars listed below will be held at the Offices of the Commission, located at 28 West State St., Trenton, NJ. Since space is limited, you must reserve a seat in order to attend. Please visit ELEC’s website at <http://www.elec.state.nj.us> for more information on training seminar registration.

TREASURER TRAINING FOR CANDIDATES AND COMMITTEES	
Wednesday, September 13 <sup>th</sup>	10:00 a.m.
Tuesday, October 3 <sup>rd</sup>	10:00 a.m.
TREASURER TRAINING FOR POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND PACS	
Tuesday, September 26 <sup>th</sup>	10:00 a.m.
Tuesday, December 12 <sup>th</sup>	10:00 a.m.
R-1 ELECTRONIC FILING SOFTWARE (REFS) TRAINING	
Tuesday, September 19 <sup>th</sup>	10:00 a.m.
Wednesday, October 4 <sup>th</sup>	10:00 a.m.

## Lobbying Reporting Dates

INCLUSION DATES	ELEC DUE DATE	
<b>Lobbying Quarterly Filing</b>		
1st Quarter	1/1/17 – 3/31/17	4/10/17
2nd Quarter	4/1/17 – 6/30/17	7/10/17
3rd Quarter	7/1/17 – 9/30/17	10/10/17
4th Quarter	10/1/17 – 12/31/17	1/10/18

## “Big Six” 2nd Quarter 2017

With a major election year looming this fall, the so-called Big Six committees reported a \$2.3 million cash reserve, the largest war-chest since 2013, according to the latest reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

However, the reserve lagged all statewide elections since 2007 except for 2015, when the state Assembly alone was up for reelection. This year, the governor’s seat and both legislative houses are at stake.

“The good news is that this year’s cash-on-hand total is the biggest in four years. The bad news is that it is smaller than similar reserves at this point in 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director.

“Fundraising is showing a similar trend. It is higher this year than two years ago, when just one legislative house was in contention. But it is lower than the four previous election years,” he said.

Brindle said the numbers are a further sign that the two state parties and four legislative leadership committees continue to struggle financially in the wake of sharply reduced contributions from public contractors and in a period when more contributions are pouring into independent special interest groups instead of the parties.

**Table 1**  
**Campaign Finance Activity by “Big Six” at End of Second Quarter by Year**

BOTH PARTIES	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*	STATE ELECTIONS**
2007	\$5,776,859	\$2,328,316	\$8,015,277	\$7,911,808	S/A
2008	\$3,438,622	\$2,238,356	\$1,577,591	\$ 918,612	
2009	\$3,653,103	\$1,811,223	\$3,682,236	\$3,548,060	G/A
2010	\$2,175,742	\$1,637,673	\$1,835,526	\$1,666,742	
2011	\$3,684,467	\$1,915,020	\$3,329,478	\$3,051,770	S/A
2012	\$2,988,610	\$2,590,387	\$1,426,366	\$1,193,221	
2013	\$3,382,737	\$1,874,081	\$3,189,889	\$3,093,711	G/S/A
2014	\$1,276,109	\$1,319,714	\$ 800,994	\$ 287,246	
2015	\$2,476,599	\$1,983,389	\$2,160,318	\$1,624,601	A
2016	\$1,661,559	\$1,513,987	\$1,127,086	\$ 979,443	
2017	\$2,751,561	\$2,205,599	\$2,263,401	\$2,178,899	G/S/A

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

\*\*G=Gubernatorial; S=Senate; A=Assembly

**Table 2**  
**Fundraising by “Big Six” Committees January 1 through June 30, 2017**

REPUBLICANS	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND	NET WORTH*
New Jersey Republican State Committee	\$ 137,203	\$ 183,539	\$ 64,789	\$ 64,789
Senate Republican Majority	\$ 400,250	\$ 197,961	\$ 808,175	\$ 808,175
Assembly Republican Victory	\$ 242,665	\$ 114,231	\$ 484,138	\$ 484,138
<b>Sub Total-Republicans</b>	<b>\$ 780,118</b>	<b>\$ 495,731</b>	<b>\$1,357,102</b>	<b>\$1,357,102</b>
<b>DEMOCRATS</b>				
New Jersey Democratic State Committee	\$1,229,171	\$1,161,182	\$ 182,401	\$ 148,337
Senate Democratic Majority	\$ 279,483	\$ 190,955	\$ 465,795	\$ 445,795
Democratic Assembly Campaign Committee	\$ 462,789	\$ 357,731	\$ 258,103	\$ 227,665
<b>Sub Total-Democrats</b>	<b>\$1,971,443</b>	<b>\$1,709,868</b>	<b>\$ 906,299</b>	<b>\$ 821,797</b>
<b>Total-Both Parties</b>	<b>\$2,751,561</b>	<b>\$2,205,599</b>	<b>\$2,263,401</b>	<b>\$2,178,899</b>

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

“ELEC has made several recommendations to strengthen the parties, streamline the pay-to-play law and increase disclosure by independent groups. Both parties have introduced legislation that incorporates many of these ideas. I hope legislation will be enacted this year to carry out these recommendations,” said Brindle.

Big Six reports showed that Democrats have raised and spent more funds this year than

Republicans, while Republicans have larger reserves. Democrats control both legislative houses while Republicans hold the governor’s seat.

State Parties and Legislative Leadership Committees are required to report their financial activity to the Commission on a quarterly basis. The reports are available on ELEC’s website at [www.elec.state.nj.us](http://www.elec.state.nj.us). 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)).

## Independent Spending in Legislative Primary Election Is Most Ever; Primary Ends with Lots of Leftover Funds

Independent special interest committees spent \$1.2 million on the 2017 legislative primary, a new high, according to reports filed 20 days after the June 6 election with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

“While the amounts are much smaller compared to independent spending in general elections, we are now witnessing a steady surge of independent spending in primary races. The 2017 total is nearly double the total from 2013,” said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s executive director.

Independent spending did comprise a larger percentage share of the 2015 total primary spending (7 % versus 4%) even though independent outlays were lower than this year. However, Brindle said he has no doubt the long-term trend is clearly up.

“This is another sign that independent spending is taking on a larger role in New Jersey elections,” said Brindle. “The sooner the Legislature broadens disclosure requirements for these groups, the sooner the public will have a complete picture of the role these groups are playing.”

Based largely on the bipartisan recommendations of ELEC, both parties have introduced legislation that would require far broader disclosure by independent groups that participate in New Jersey elections.

During the 2017 primary, three districts- 3, 24 and 26- drew the heaviest concentration of independent spending.

Not adjusting for inflation, the \$14.8 million in post-primary reserves is a new high. The 2011 total adjusted for inflation is slightly larger (\$14.9 million).

Democrats control 24 of 40 seats in the Senate, and 52 of 80 seats in the Assembly. They have more than a two-to-one advantage over Republicans in total reserves. Most cash-on-hand is expected to be included in funds transferred to the fall general election.

“The majority party usually has an edge in fund-raising, and this year is no exception,” Brindle said. He noted that in recent legislative elections, Democrats also have benefited from support from independent special interest committees. Brindle added, however, that “this advantage can change from year to year.”

“While we still can expect major skirmishes in a handful of so-called battleground districts, Democrats clearly are in strong financial position to defend their majorities,” he said.

The numbers in this report should be considered preliminary. The analysis is based on legislative fundraising reports received by 5 pm. on June 29, 2017.

**Table 1**  
**Spending by Candidates and Independent Groups in Legislative Primary Elections**

YEAR	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENTS	TOTAL	% INDEPENDENTS
2017	\$27,665,721	\$1,177,389	\$28,843,110	4%
2015	\$12,527,364	\$ 924,723	\$13,452,087	7%
2013	\$22,153,242	\$ 635,354	\$22,788,596	3%
2011	\$27,258,440	None	\$27,258,440	NA

He pointed out that in 2011, independent groups spent \$1.8 million in the general election- just \$500,000 more than this year’s primary. Two years ago, independent groups spent \$10.7 million in the general election with just Assembly members running.

Reports filed by legislative candidates showed that they completed the 2017 primary with \$14.8 million in reserves, one of the largest bounties ever left over to roll into fall legislative elections.

**Table 2**  
**Independent Spending in**  
**Legislative Primary Elections**

INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE	3	12	24	26	31	40	STATEWIDE	TOTALS
Garden State Forward	\$317,800						\$322,774	\$ 640,574
Stronger Foundations Inc			\$ 73,300	\$211,800				\$ 285,100
National Association of Realtors Fund			\$ 81,026	\$ 36,455				\$ 117,481
Better Education for Kids Inc.					\$80,726			\$ 80,726
Local Government Voter Education		\$36,058						\$ 36,058
NJ Coalition of Real Estate				\$ 15,000				\$ 15,000
New Jersey Family First						\$2,450		\$ 2,450
<b>TOTALS</b>	\$317,800	\$36,058	\$154,326	\$263,255	\$80,726	\$2,450	\$322,774	\$1,177,389

**Table 3**  
**Campaign Finance by Legislative Candidates**  
**in 2017 Primary Election Versus Earlier Elections**

YEAR	RAISED	SPENT	RESERVES*	ELECTIONS? **
2017	\$34,875,842	\$27,665,721	\$14,774,600	G/S/A
2015	\$14,661,031	\$12,527,364	\$ 6,644,378	A
2013	\$28,111,870	\$22,153,242	\$13,398,825	G/S/A
2011	\$34,165,804	\$27,258,440	\$13,698,365	S/A

\*\*Cash-on-Hand or Transferred to General Election.

\*\*G=Gubernatorial, S=Senate, A=Assembly

**Table 4**  
**Party Reserves as**  
**of June 23, 2017**

PARTY	CASH-ON-HAND	TRANSFERRED TO GENERAL	TOTAL RESERVES
Democrats	\$6,199,491	\$5,494,019	\$11,693,510
Republicans	\$1,014,204	\$2,066,886	\$ 3,081,090
Both Parties	\$7,213,695	\$7,560,905	\$14,774,600



## Reporting Dates

ELECTION	48-HOUR START DATE	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
<b>FIRE COMMISSIONER -2/18/2017</b>			
	2/5/2017- through 2/18/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		Inception of campaign* - 1/17/17	1/20/2017
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		1/18/17 - 2/4/17	2/7/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		2/5/17 - 3/7/17	3/10/2017
<b>APRIL SCHOOL BOARD- 4/25/2017</b>			
	4/12/2017 through 4/25/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		Inception of campaign* - 3/24/17	3/27/2017
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		3/25/17 - 4/11/17	4/17/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		4/12/17 - 5/12/17	5/15/2017
<b>MAY MUNICIPAL – 5/9/2017</b>			
	4/26/2017 through 5/9/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		Inception of campaign* - 4/7/17	4/10/2017
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		4/8/17 - 4/25/17	4/28/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		4/26/17 - 5/26/17	5/30/2017
<b>RUNOFF (JUNE)**- 6/13/2017</b>			
	5/31/2017 through 6/13/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		4/26/17 - 5/30/17	6/2/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		5/31/17 - 6/30/17	7/3/2017
<b>PRIMARY (90 DAY START DATE: 3/8/2017)***</b>			
	5/24/2017 through 6/6/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		Inception of campaign* - 5/5/17	5/8/2017
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		5/6/17 - 5/23/17	5/26/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		5/24/17 - 6/23/17	6/26/2017
<b>GENERAL (90 DAY START DATE: 8/9/2017)***</b>			
	10/25/2017 through 11/7/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		6/24/17 - 10/6/17	10/10/2017
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		10/7/17 - 10/24/17	10/27/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		10/25/17 - 11/24/17	11/27/2017
<b>RUNOFF (DECEMBER)**- 12/5/2017</b>			
	11/22/2017 through 12/5/2017		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date		No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date		10/25/17 - 11/21/17	11/24/2017
20-day Postelection Reporting Date		11/22/17 - 12/22/17	12/26/2017
<b>PACs, PCFRs &amp; CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS</b>			
1st Quarter		1/1/17 - 3/31/17	4/17/2017
2nd Quarter		4/1/17 - 6/30/17	7/17/2017
3rd Quarter		7/1/17 - 9/30/17	10/16/2017
4th Quarter		10/1/17 - 12/31/17	1/16/2018

\* Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or from January 1, 2017 (Quarterly filers).

\*\* A candidate committee or joint candidates' committee that is filing in a 2017 Runoff election is not required to file a 20-day postelection report for the corresponding prior election (May Municipal or General).

\*\*\* Form PFD-1 is due on April 13, 2017 for Primary Election Candidates and June 16, 2017 for Independent General Election Candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2016 filing is needed for Primary 2017 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 8, 2016. A second quarter 2017 filing is needed by Independent/Non-Partisan General Election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 10, 2017.

## HOW TO CONTACT ELEC

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

In Person: 28 W. State Street, 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