



ELEC *tronic*

An Election Law Enforcement Commission Newsletter

ISSUE 126 • DECEMBER 2019

Comments from the Chairman Eric H. Jaso

Funding Inaugural Events *“Such is the love of praise, so great the anxiety for victory.” Virgil*

After every election, the winning candidates often hold swearing-in ceremonies, inaugural balls or parties, and other victory celebrations.

These events provide the newly-elected officeholder the opportunity to publicly thank campaign workers, volunteers, supporters, and contributors.

They also provide the winning candidate with a unique opportunity to raise money for the next campaign or for other political purposes.

Swearing-in ceremonies and inaugural events attract a wide variety of attendees, from campaign staff and volunteers to campaign contributors, government contractors and lobbyists.

These events range from the small and modest to the elaborate and expensive, especially when the victor holds multiple events.

But in all the fanfare and hoopla that goes along with these celebratory events, the official-elect (and key campaign/committee staff) must remember to comply with campaign finance laws and regulations.

Any inaugural event held by or for a state, county or municipal official is subject to guidelines set forth in the ELEC Compliance manual, which states: “Funds given to, or received by, a candidate or committee for the costs of an inaugural or swearing-in celebratory event, or other election-related event, must be reported as contributions and are subject to the contribution limits and other reporting requirements of the Act.”

In other words, the event must be run through the candidate’s campaign account, and money donated or raised must be reported as political contributions, just as before the election.

All such donations are subject to contribution limits, so that if a contributor had “maxed out” prior to Election Day, he or she would be barred from contributing to inauguration events.

On the other hand, if a contributor had donated less than the maximum amount, he or she could contribute an additional amount up to the limit.

All proceeds and expenditures must be included on the campaign report filed 20 days after the election or on a future quarterly report.

So, while newly-elected candidates are certainly entitled to celebrate, they must not rest on their laurels when it comes to continued compliance with campaign finance laws.

As always, ELEC’s website contains many resources to explain these sometimes-complex requirements, and our compliance staff is ready to answer questions. (But no, you can’t invite them to your parties!)

“Furthering the Interest of an Informed Citizenry”

IN THIS ISSUE

Comments from the Chairman	1
Executive Director’s Thoughts	2
2020 Commission Meeting Schedule	3
Ballot Question and School Board Elections in Jersey City Set New Statewide Levels	4
Overall Spending on Legislative General Election was Lowest in Decade	6
Bulk of Campaign Money Pours Into Battleground Districts	10
2019 Reporting Dates	13

COMMISSIONERS:

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

Executive Director's Thoughts

Jeff Brindle

More Outreach to Leaners could Strengthen Parties and Boost Voter Turnout

Reprinted from insidernj.com

In this age of the emerging independent voter, strong political parties may be more important than ever.

Though more and more voters initially may describe themselves as “independent” in public opinion surveys, more in-depth studies suggest few voters are truly independent.

This is where political parties can help. Historically, they have been successful at getting voters to the polls. In this time of relatively low voter turnout, strong political parties could be the key to increasing overall voter participation by getting “soft” independents to vote.

Though statistics vary, research into voting behavior pegs the percentage of independent voters as having increased from 20 percent in the 1950's to almost 40 percent today.

These statistics are supported by the most recent ones published by the New Jersey Division of Elections. According to its statewide Voter Registration Summary, published September 30, 2019, 39 percent of registered voters in New Jersey are unaffiliated, or independent.

Independent voters have been largely portrayed favorably by the media. They are held up as the most informed and thoughtful of voters. The focus of pre-

election polls, often conflated with swing voters, independents are viewed as pivotal to the outcome of the election.

Believed to be free of partisan ties, independent voters are perceived as preferable to voters who most readily identify with a political party.

To many political scientists and pundits this increase in independent voters has become associated with the decline in the political party system.

At first blush, it does seem as if partisan ties have been loosened, resulting in increased numbers of voters casting their ballots free of partisan leanings. This decline in party identification has ultimately led to weakened political parties.

In-depth research into voting behavior challenges the notion that so-called “independents” have no leanings, even if their loyalty may be more limited than party faithful. They won't necessarily become volunteers or send checks even if they favor candidates from one party or the other. Since there are more independents than Republicans or Democrats these days, the loss of more tangible support is one reason for party decline.

Party officials, however, should take heart from recent research that shows the majority of voters, whether they identify as independent or not, nevertheless base their vote on partisan identification. It suggests outreach efforts by parties to independent leaners likely won't be in vain.

The new research builds upon *The American Voter*, the seminal study of voting behavior.

Jody C. Baumgartner and Peter C. Francia, authors of *Conventional Wisdom and American Elections*, assert that “While some have challenged the central role of party identification in vote choice, over time research has clearly demonstrated its powerful influence. This partisan identification develops in childhood under the influence of one's parents.”

Thus, voting is just as much a learned behavior as any other aspect of the socialization process.

The percentage of voters identifying themselves as independent has grown. The National Election Study (NES), a survey of voters funded by the National Science Foundation in 1977, shows that the number of people responding independent has grown significantly over the years.

However, this percentage is based on responses to the first question asked in the survey “generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?”

There is a follow-up question, though, which may be more significant in measuring the true extent of independents in the voting population. To those answering independent to the first question the following question is asked: “Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?”

According to Baumgartner and Francia “if we examine this group of independents further and include the response to the second question, we see that the percentage of people who claim to be closer to neither party is rather small.”

Thus, there may not be as many pure independents as the statistics suggest, but rather an increase in voters who self-

identify as independents but are actually independents who lean toward one party or the other.

While the part of the electorate identifying as independents is increasing, the research suggests that these voters lean toward one party or the other. While perhaps not as loyal as declared party members, they are still influenced by political party preferences.

It should be noted as well that these soft independents tend to vote less often than party identifiers. This depresses voter turnout and provides political parties with an opportunity to boost it. More outreach to independent leaners also could help rebuild parties by persuading them to become more active.

Strong political parties, a major function of which is to rally voters to the polls in favor of their candidates, could easily tap into soft independents who lean toward one party or the other.

These efforts would result in greater participation in elections by voters, whether strong partisans or soft independents, and redound to the public good.

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) has long championed stronger parties in New Jersey. Several proposals, published on its website and discussed through the years, would work toward a stronger party system.

Better voter turnout as parties tap not only partisan loyalists but independent leaners could be a big win for everyone.

“OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT,”
N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 et seq.

COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE FOR
CALENDAR YEAR 2020

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission has announced its meeting schedule for 2020. Unless otherwise indicated in the future, meetings will be held at the Commission’s offices at 25 South Stockton Street, 5th Floor, in Trenton. It is anticipated that meetings will begin at 11:00 a.m., unless otherwise indicated.

2020 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

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

RECENT BALLOT QUESTION AND SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS IN JERSEY CITY SET NEW STATEWIDE HIGHS

A ballot question that cost \$5.5 million and a school board election that should easily top \$600,000 both have set new records even though the numbers still are preliminary, according to reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

The ballot initiative imposed strict regulations on short-term rentals in Jersey City, the state’s second largest city. While the bulk of the spending was against the November 7, 2019 referendum, it passed by a 69 percent to 31 percent margin with 27,631 votes cast, according to the Hudson County Clerk’s office.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director, said spending on the local issue was so big it stole attention from a relatively sedate statewide election for 80 Assembly seats.

“When a local ballot election costs more than most previous statewide ballot questions, people notice,” Brindle said.

Based on inflation-adjusted dollars, the Jersey City election is now the third largest ballot question in state history, ranking behind only an unsuccessful 2016 referendum to locate casinos in northern New Jersey and a 1976 ballot vote that allowed casinos in Atlantic City. The total is preliminary because Keep Our Homes, the largest spender, has not submitted its final report.

**Table 1
Top Five New Jersey Ballot Questions All-Time
(Based on Inflation-Adjusted Numbers)**

REFERENDUM	OUTCOME	YEAR	UNADJUSTED FOR INFLATION	INFLATION-ADJUSTED
Allow two new casinos in North Jersey	Failed	2016	\$24,669,426	\$26,391,302
Allow casinos in Atlantic City	Passed	1976	\$ 1,351,865	\$ 6,114,184
Tighten short-term rental rules in Jersey City	Passed	2019	\$ 5,498,757*	\$ 5,498,757
Increase state minimum wage	Passed	2013	\$ 3,167,928	\$ 3,499,588
Allow casinos in four New Jersey locations	Failed	1974	\$ 612,500	\$ 3,197,250

*Preliminary

The price tag on the Jersey City ballot contest is five times larger than the prior top municipal ballot question in 2010.

During that election, voters were asked whether they wanted to sell Trenton Water Works to a private firm. They decided no. The Trenton referendum cost \$1.1 million at the time- \$1.3 million in today’s dollars.

The biggest spender in this year’s Jersey City election was Airbnb¹, a San Francisco-based company that oversees a worldwide online marketplace for lodging, primarily in private residences. The company began operating in 2008.

Airbnb views Jersey City as a potentially lucrative market due to its proximity to New York City. It sank \$4.3 million into a committee to defeat the ballot question, which it viewed as a threat to its operations.

Airbnb’s three largest expenditures through its Keep Our Homes Committee included \$2.2 million on digital and cable television advertisements, \$713,911 on field operations and \$455,264 on direct mail sent to residents. Airbnb has not submitted its final report yet. Its most recent report showed \$181,298 in the bank and \$240,384 in outstanding debts.

¹ Its original name was Air Bed & Breakfast.

The biggest opponent of the measure was the New York Hotel and Motel Trades Council, a union that represents thousands of housekeepers, concierges and doormen in New York City and northern New Jersey.

It spent \$1.2 million through three committees it runs.

Table 2
Spending on the November 5, 2019
Jersey City Ballot Question

GROUP	RAISED	SPENT
Keep Our Homes (Airbnb)	\$4,283,495	\$4,102,197
Share Better Education Fund (Hotel Trades Council)	\$ 775,000	\$ 775,000
Hotel Trades Council, AFL-CIO and Hotel Association of NYC Labor Management Cooperation Trust Fund	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Jersey City Preservation Association Coalition	\$ 101,923	\$ 101,923
New York Hotel Trades Council PAC	\$ 66,387	\$ 66,387
Jersey City Property Owners Association	\$ 60,000	\$ 47,194
NJ Working Families Alliance	\$ 6,056	\$ 6,056
Totals	\$5,686,805	\$5,498,757

Jersey City Board of Education Race Sets New Statewide Record

Based on reports filed thus far by candidates and special interest groups, ELEC pegs spending in the Jersey City school board race at \$590,019- a new all-time high for a board of education race in New Jersey. The total is not final because some reports will not be available until mid-January.

Table 3
Costliest School Board Races in New Jersey
Ranked by Inflation-Adjusted Numbers

CITY	YEAR	RAISED	SPENT	INFLATION-ADJUSTED
Jersey City	2019	\$704,885	\$590,019*	\$590,019
Elizabeth	2014	\$261,215	\$458,992	\$498,951
Elizabeth	2013	\$357,301	\$357,401	\$394,818
Elizabeth	1999	\$214,692	\$208,994	\$322,832
Newark	2016	\$286,766	\$286,766	\$307,483

*Preliminary

Spending in the race was driven largely by the LeFrak Organization, one of Jersey City’s largest developers. It raised \$465,000 for the contest through a political committee called Fairer NJ. So far, it has reported spending \$312,036. Its next report is due in mid-January.

Table 4
Preliminary Spending Estimate for
Jersey City School Board Race

CANDIDATE/GROUP	RAISED	SPENT
Fairer NJ	\$465,000	\$312,036
Change for Children 2019 Slate	\$239,885	\$223,556
NJEA PAC	NA	\$ 30,000
Garden State Forward	NA	\$ 18,296
Jersey City Make It Better	NA	\$ 6,131
Neisha Louhar for JCBOE	\$ 500	NA
Total	\$704,885	\$590,019

New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) was active in the race, which involves the state’s second largest school district. Using its traditional, state-registered political action committee, which can make contributions, NJEA gave donations totaling \$30,000 to its preferred Jersey City school board candidates.

The union’s federal 527 political organization, Garden State Forward, can raise unlimited funds and support candidates but must spend its money independently of candidates. It reported spending \$504,202 on all New Jersey elections in 2019. NJEA endorsed state legislative candidates, county candidates and local candidates, including school board contenders.

Facebook’s political ad library indicates Garden State Forward spent as much as \$18,296 on 10 digital advertisements for Jersey City candidates. It also did five digital ads for Camden candidates.

Garden State Forward issued a \$195,831 check on October 21, 2019 for “literature, mail, signs and online ads.” News stories said the teacher’s union “papered the city” with mailed advertisements and Facebook confirmed it did digital ads. This suggests overall spending on the Jersey City race already is higher than \$600,000 even without factoring in further Fairer NJ or candidate reports.

Also, NJEA’s union local, Jersey City Education Association, so far has filed no disclosure reports showing expenditures in 2019 by its political action committee.

Overall Spending on Legislative General Election was Lowest in Decade

Independent Spending Lightest Since 2011

Spending on the 2019 state legislative election was the skimpiest in a decade despite a price tag of nearly \$25 million to fill a state senate seat and 80 state assembly seats, according to reports filed with the NJ Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

Candidates spent \$19 million on the general election while independent special interest groups sank another \$5.9 million into the elections, which took place November 5, 2019.

While some candidates and independent groups won’t be submitting their final reports until early next year, the final total is unlikely to surpass any previous legislative election since 2009, said Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director.

“This year’s election was the most low-key legislative race in a decade,” said Brindle. “It followed one of the most controversial, expensive legislative races in history in 2017. Maybe campaign donors needed a break.”

Table 1
Total Spending on State Legislative Elections by Year 2009-2019

YEAR	LEGISLATORS	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTALS	INFLATION-ADJUSTED TOTALS	HOUSES RUNNING
2009	\$18,584,098	\$ 15,999	\$18,600,097	\$22,244,394	A
2011	\$44,024,272	\$ 1,835,500	\$45,859,772	\$52,308,793	S, A
2013	\$43,446,977	\$15,442,717	\$58,889,694	\$64,859,127	S, A
2015	\$22,632,814	\$10,908,983	\$33,541,797	\$36,309,009	A
2017	\$44,164,473	\$23,052,344	\$67,216,817	\$70,569,431	S, A
2019*	\$19,083,965	\$ 5,856,004	\$24,939,968	\$24,939,968	A**

*Numbers are preliminary **Also special Senate election in 1st district A=Assembly S=Senate

“I also think parties and independent groups may be looking ahead and saving their money for next year, when there will be a presidential election and campaigns to fill 12 New Jersey congressional seats,” he said.

The result of \$25 million in spending in 2019 was that Republicans took the state Senate seat, which was the focus of a special election, and two Assembly seats in the First Legislative District, which spans parts of Atlantic, Cape May and Cumberland Counties.

The Democratic Senate majority shifted from 26 to 25 seats, while the Democratic Assembly majority fell from 54 to 52 seats. It was the first time Republicans have gained legislative seats in New Jersey since 2009.

Republicans also were successful in defending candidates in districts they historically have controlled, including the eighth, 21st and 25th. On the other hand, Democrats fended off Republican challenges in the second, 11th and 16th districts.

Spending was heaviest in those so-called “swing” or “battleground” districts, which the parties view as most competitive.

Candidates and independent groups combined spent 64 percent of their money in the top ten districts.

**Table 2
Top Ten Legislative Districts by Spending**

DISTRICT	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTAL
1	\$ 1,880,084	\$1,078,774	\$ 2,958,858
21	\$ 1,976,050	\$ 777,597	\$ 2,753,647
8	\$ 1,274,584	\$ 835,415	\$ 2,109,998
11	\$ 1,498,520	\$ 429,359	\$ 1,927,879
16	\$ 1,307,797		\$ 1,307,797
25	\$ 1,176,653	\$ 104,092	\$ 1,280,745
2	\$ 903,547	\$ 315,574	\$ 1,219,121
3	\$ 1,053,381		\$ 1,053,381
36	\$ 732,223		\$ 732,223
39	\$ 640,858		\$ 640,858
Top Five \$	\$ 7,937,035	\$3,121,144	\$11,058,179
Top Five %	42%	53%	44%
Top Ten \$	\$12,443,697	\$3,540,810	\$15,984,507
Top Ten %	65%	60%	64%
All Districts	\$19,083,965	\$5,856,004	\$24,939,968

Republicans made gains despite the fact that Democratic candidates spent three times more statewide on the general election- \$14.2 million versus \$4.8 million.

Democrats finished the race with \$3.5 million that it can carry into future elections. Republicans reported \$848,524 still in their tills.

**Table 3
Legislative Campaign Finance Activity
by Party through November 22, 2019**

PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Democratic Candidates	\$17,773,576	\$14,269,549	\$3,504,027
Independent Candidates	\$ 29,221	\$ 27,375	\$ 1,846
Republican Candidates	\$ 5,635,564	\$ 4,787,041	\$ 848,524
All Parties	\$23,438,362	\$19,083,965	\$4,354,397

Among independent groups involved in the election, those affiliated with Democrats also were the biggest spenders.

**Table 4
Independent Spending
by Party Affiliation**

PARTY AFFILIATION	TOTAL SPENDING
Democrat	\$4,051,254
Republican	\$ 981,203
Uncertain	\$ 823,547
Grand Total	\$5,856,004

General Majority PAC, a 527 political organization affiliated with Democrats, was the top spender. It was also one of the top three in 2017, and led all legislative spenders in 2015 and 2013 (then under the name Fund for Jobs Growth and Security).

**Table 5
Spending by Independent
Special Interest Groups**

INDEPENDENT GROUP	SPENDING
General Majority PAC	\$2,782,224
NJ Coalition of Real Estate	\$ 756,573
Garden State Forward (New Jersey Education Association) *	\$ 574,538
Working for Working Americans (Carpenters)	\$ 500,000
Stronger Foundations (Operating Engineers Local 825)	\$ 340,142
Monday Morning New Jersey	\$ 301,472
Growing Economic Opportunities (Laborers)	\$ 230,313
Just the Facts NJ	\$ 172,228
NJ League of Conservation Voters	\$ 104,022
NJ United	\$ 90,000
NJ Right to Life	\$ 4,492
Total	\$5,856,004

*May include spending in local races as well as legislative races.

Winners, most of whom were incumbents, had a big edge over losers in the election.

**Table 6
Campaign Finance Activity Winners Versus Losers**

	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Winners	\$18,311,860	\$14,229,131	\$4,082,730
Losers	\$ 5,126,501	\$ 4,854,834	\$ 271,667
Totals	\$23,438,362	\$19,083,965	\$4,354,397

None of this year's legislative races cracked the top ten most expensive legislative races of all time because those all focused on Senate races.

Spending in the 21st and eighth legislative districts cost enough, respectively, to become the fifth and 10th most expensive Assembly-only elections based on inflation-adjusted numbers.²

Table 7
Top Ten Most Expensive Assembly-Only Elections
Based on Inflation-Adjusted Numbers

RANK	YEAR	DISTRICT	TOTALS	INFLATION-ADJUSTED TOTALS
1	2005	2	\$4,458,631	\$5,875,120
2	2015	2	\$5,193,557	\$5,639,010
3	2015	1	\$3,607,734	\$3,917,170
4	2009	1	\$2,410,257	\$2,891,203
5	2019	21	\$2,753,647	\$2,753,647
6	2005	12	\$1,834,857	\$2,417,783
7	2005	14	\$1,827,804	\$2,408,490
8	2015	38	\$2,237,460	\$2,429,367
9	2005	11	\$1,742,488	\$2,296,069
10	2019	8	\$2,109,998	\$2,109,998

The analysis is based on candidate 20-day pre-election day reports due November 25 received by November 29, 2019. Independent spending totals were based on available post-election filings.

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

² Spending in the 1st legislative district was omitted because it included a state Senate election.

Bulk of Campaign Money Pours Into Battleground Districts

A few competitive legislative districts are attracting the most campaign dollars as this year’s state Assembly election³ enters its final days, according to reports filed by candidates and independent special interest groups with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC).

Among the highlights of those reports:

- The first legislative district, which includes parts of Atlantic, Cape May and Cumberland Counties and features a special election for state Senate along with campaigns for two assembly seats, so far has seen the most combined spending- \$2.5 million.
- The top five districts alone have consumed \$9.1 million in candidate and independent spending- 49 percent of the \$18.5 million waged so far on the general election.
- The top 10 districts have drawn \$12.7 million in spending- 69 percent of the total.
- Candidates already have spent \$13 million while independent groups have invested \$5.3 million.
- To date, independent spending is down sharply from 2017, when nearly \$16 million already had been spent by the final week of the campaign.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director, said while the campaign has been marked by a surprisingly large drop in independent spending, there still is plenty of drama in some district showdowns.

“Battleground or swing districts historically tend to attract the largest amounts of money and this year is no exception,” he said. “These usually are districts where margins of victory are smallest and both parties see opportunities.”

“It is conceivable, however, that the overall spending, including that of independent groups, is down because they are saving their fund-raising efforts for next year’s congressional and presidential elections,” he said.

This year, pre-election forecasts along with historical trends pointed to districts 1, 2, 8, 11, 16, 21, and 25 as potential battlegrounds. Reports filed by candidates 11 days before the election, along with separate filings by independent groups, show these seven districts all falling within the top eight for spending.

Table 1
Top Ten Legislative Districts by Spending

DISTRICT	CANDIDATES	INDEPENDENT GROUPS	TOTAL
1	\$ 1,522,849	\$ 991,711	\$ 2,514,560
21	\$ 1,388,298	\$ 764,110	\$ 2,152,408
8	\$ 1,122,952	\$ 736,672	\$ 1,859,624
11	\$ 1,208,217	\$ 273,299	\$ 1,481,516
16	\$ 1,086,573		\$ 1,086,573
2	\$ 718,698	\$ 253,515	\$ 972,213
25	\$ 784,941	\$ 104,092	\$ 889,033
3	\$ 749,123		\$ 749,123
39	\$ 449,148	\$ 90,225	\$ 539,373
19	\$ 501,425		\$ 501,425
All Districts	\$13,031,240	\$5,285,467	\$18,316,707
Top Five \$	\$ 6,328,889	\$3,019,307	\$ 9,094,681
Top Five %	49%	57%	50%
Top Ten \$	\$9,532,224	\$3,213,624	\$12,745,848
Top Ten %	73%	61%	70%

³ Also includes a special election for the first legislative district Senate seat.

“Due to legislative redistricting, the outcomes in most legislative districts heavily favor one party or the other,” said Brindle. “Barring infrequent statewide controversies like the large tax hikes in 1990, normally only a few districts are likely to shift each year from one party to another.”

One surprise in this year’s elections is the steep decline in independent spending.

The \$5.3 million in independent spending so far is 70 percent below 2017.

Table 2
Spending by Independent Special Interest Committees in New Jersey Legislative Elections

YEAR	GENERAL	HOUSES RUNNING
2007	\$ 165,000	Senate, Assembly
2009	\$ 15,999	Assembly
2011	\$ 1,835,000	Senate, Assembly
2013	\$15,442,717	Senate, Assembly
2015	\$10,724,287	Assembly
2017	\$15,875,509	Senate, Assembly
2019	\$ 5,285,467	Assembly*

*Also one special election for state Senate

“At least this year, independent spending has nose-dived,” said Brindle.

“Barring a surprise Pearl Harbor-style sneak attack in the next few days, which seems less likely with each passing day, this will go down as the smallest spending by independent groups since 2011, when they first became a significant player in legislative elections,” Brindle said.

Table 3
Spending to Date by Independent Special Interest Groups

INDEPENDENT GROUP	SPENDING
General Majority PAC	\$2,562,057
NJ Coalition of Real Estate	\$ 600,513
Garden State Forward (New Jersey Education Association)	\$ 550,875
Working for Working Americans (Carpenters)	\$ 500,000
Stronger Foundations (Operating Engineers Local 825)	\$ 340,142
Growing Economic Opportunities (Laborers)	\$ 230,313
Monday Morning New Jersey	\$ 201,472
Just the Facts NJ	\$ 142,112
NJ United	\$ 90,000
NJ League of Conservation Voters	\$ 13,487
NJ Right to Life	\$ 4,492
Total	\$5,285,467

Democrats, who control both legislative houses, continue to benefit from a major money advantage.

Table 4
Breakdown of Legislative Campaign Finance
Activity by Party through October 22, 2019

PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Democratic Candidates	\$15,382,296	\$10,169,841	\$5,212,455
Independent Candidates	\$ 24,231	\$ 10,897	\$ 13,334
Republican Candidates	\$ 4,403,991	\$ 2,850,501	\$1,553,490
All Parties	\$19,810,518	\$13,031,240	\$6,779,279

Incumbents also are maintaining their huge edge over challengers.

Table 5
Breakdown of Spending by Incumbents
and Challengers through October 22, 2019

PARTY	RAISED	SPENT	CASH-ON-HAND
Incumbents	\$15,659,237	\$ 9,511,870	\$6,147,366
Challengers	\$ 4,151,282	\$ 3,519,369	\$ 631,912
All Candidates	\$19,810,518	\$13,031,240	\$6,779,279

The analysis is based on candidate 11-day pre-election day reports due October 25, 2019 and received by October 29, 2019. Independent spending totals were based on filings through October 31, 2019.

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

2019 Reporting Dates

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
FIRE COMMISSIONER - FEBRUARY 16, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* - 1/15/19	1/18/2019
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	1/16/2019 - 2/2/2019	2/5/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	2/3/2019 - 3/5/2019	3/8/2019
48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 2/3/2019 through 2/17/2019		
APRIL SCHOOL BOARD – APRIL 16, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	3/15/2019*	3/18/2019
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	3/16/2019 - 4/2/2019	4/5/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	4/3/2019 - 5/3/2019	5/6/2019
48-Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/3/2019 through 4/16/2019		
MAY MUNICIPAL – MAY 14, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	4/12/2019*	4/15/2019
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	4/13/2019 - 4/30/2019	5/3/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	5/1/2019 - 5/31/2019	6/3/2019
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/1/2019 through 5/14/2019		
RUNOFF (JUNE) ** - JUNE 11, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	5/1/2019 - 5/28/2019	5/31/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	5/29/2019 - 6/28/2019	7/1/2019
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/29/2019 through 6/11/2019		
PRIMARY (90-DAY START DATE: MARCH 6, 2019)*** - JUNE 4, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* - 5/3/2019	5/6/2019
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	5/4/2019 - 5/21/2019	5/24/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	5/22/2019 - 6/21/2019	6/24/2019
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/22/2019 through 6/5/2019		
GENERAL (90-DAY START DATE: AUGUST 7, 2019)*** - NOVEMBER 5, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	6/22/2019 - 10/4/2019	10/7/2019
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	10/5/2019 - 10/22/2019	10/25/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	10/23/2019 - 11/22/2019	11/25/2019
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 10/23/2019 through 11/5/2019		
RUNOFF (DECEMBER)** - DECEMBER 3, 2019		
29-day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11-day Preelection Reporting Date	10/23/2019 - 11/19/2019	11/22/2019
20-day Postelection Reporting Date	11/20/2019 - 12/20/2019	12/23/2019
48-Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 11/20/2019 through 12/3/2019		

PACs, PCFRs & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS

1 st Quarter	1/1/2019 - 3/30/2019	4/15/2019
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2019 - 6/30/2019	7/15/2019
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2019 - 9/30/2019	10/15/2019
4 th Quarter	10/1/2019 - 12/31/2019	1/15/2019

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AGENTS (Q-4)

1 st Quarter	1/1/2019 - 3/30/2019	4/10/2019
2 nd Quarter	4/1/2019 - 6/30/2019	7/10/2019
3 rd Quarter	7/1/2019 - 9/30/2019	10/10/2019
4 th Quarter	10/1/2019 - 12/31/2019	1/10/2020

*Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or from January 1, 2019 (Quarterly filers).

**A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2019 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 15, 2019 for the Primary Election Candidates and June 14, 2019 for the Independent General Election Candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2018 filing is needed for the Primary 2019 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 6, 2018. A second quarter is needed by Independent/Non-Partisan General Election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 9, 2018.

HOW TO CONTACT ELEC

www.elec.state.nj.us

In Person: 25 South Stockton Street, 5th Floor, Trenton, NJ
 By Mail: P.O. Box 185, Trenton, NJ 08625
 By Telephone: (609) 292-8700 or Toll Free Within NJ 1-888-313-ELEC (3532)

DIRECTORS:

Jeffrey M. Brindle
 Joseph W. Donohue
 Demery J. Roberts
 Amanda Haines
 Stephanie A. Olivo
 Anthony Giancarli
 Shreve Marshall
 Christopher Mistichelli