



# Newsletter

## ELECtronic

SEPTEMBER  
2021  
ISSUE

147

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

### Comments from the Chairman

**Eric H. Jaso**

**"Don't ever be the first, don't ever be the last, and don't ever volunteer to do anything." – Traditional Advice to Recruits**

So you've volunteered (or "been volunteered") to serve as the treasurer for a political party committee. Problem is, you know almost nothing about New Jersey's campaign finance laws.

Our advice: don't panic. The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) has several ways to ease you into the job and help you become an effective and compliant committee treasurer.

First, access Commission's website at [www.elec.state.nj.us](http://www.elec.state.nj.us).

There, you will see several options. Click the Candidates & Committees tab.

Additional tabs will appear. They include Forms & Instructions, Electronic Filing,

Contribution Limits, Reporting Dates, Training & Seminars, Treasurer Training, and Statutory Authority & Regulations.

Next, click Reporting Dates. From that information, you will get a sense of when reports must be filed.

Next, become familiar with the law by downloading the "Statutory Authority & Regulations" and reading through it. This exercise will lay the groundwork for the next step, which is to review the manual applicable to political party committees.

The manual provides a summary of requirements, reflecting what you read in the Statutory Authority & Regulations. It also includes a contribution limits chart and registration and reporting forms.

If you still have difficulty understanding any part of the law or its requirements, you should not hesitate to contact the Commission.

By calling 609-292-8700 or toll free at 888-313-ELEC (3532) a live receptionist will answer your call and direct you to the appropriate compliance officer.

The Commission's trained compliance officers will walk you through the manual and answer any questions that you may have.

By speaking with a compliance officer areas of complexity can be clarified and future problems avoided.

Following your conversation with a compliance officer, he or she may suggest that you attend one of ELEC's political party committee information seminars, which throughout the pandemic have been conducted remotely.

Another option is for treasurers to undergo online training with a test to follow. This training is mandatory for treasurers of state political party committees but optional for those serving county and municipal party committees.

The bottom line as always: ELEC staff are here to help political parties, committees, candidates, and staff, whether paid or volunteer, to comply with New Jersey's campaign finance laws and regulations.

### IN THIS ISSUE

Comments from the Chairman	P. 1
Executive Director's Thoughts	P. 2
Dates Set for Gubernatorial General Election Debates	P. 3
Training Seminars	P. 4
Most Lobbied Bills Included Two State Budgets, Abortion Rights, COVID-19 Issues	P. 5
Top Legislative Battlegrounds Could Be in 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 8 <sup>th</sup> , and 16 <sup>th</sup> Districts this Fall	P. 8
2021 Reporting Dates	P. 10

### COMMISSIONERS

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

## Executive Director's Thoughts

### Jeff Brindle

## NJ Contribution Limits Safe Despite Circuit Court Ruling in Alaskan Case

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

In my first White Paper research report for ELEC in 1988, I urged that New Jersey adopt contribution limits for all candidates and that those limits be regularly inflation adjusted to withstand a constitutional challenge.

Contribution limits eventually were enacted for non-gubernatorial candidates in 1993. And the legislature required that the limits be raised every four years to offset the cost of living like those that applied to candidates for governor.

Alaska would have done well to follow New Jersey's example.

The Alaskan legislature set a \$1,000 annual limit in 1974, then slashed it to \$500 in 2006 in reaction to a referendum supported by 73 percent of Alaskan voters. The Alaskan limit applies to all candidates.

By contrast, New Jersey candidates can now receive \$2,600 per election if they are a non-gubernatorial candidate, and \$4,900 per election if they are a gubernatorial candidate.

It is no surprise, therefore, that Alaska's limit was struck down as unconstitutional on July 30, 2021 in a case called *David Thompson v. Heather Hebdon*.

Before the court's recent ruling, Alaska voters each year could give only \$500 to any candidate versus respective annual contributions of \$5,200 or \$9,800 in New Jersey.

substantially lower than the limits we have previously upheld," and "substantially lower than comparable limits in other States."

Amount an Individual Can Give a Candidate\*

Year	Alaska (Per Year)	New Jersey (Per Election)
1974	\$1,000	No limit
1993	\$1,000	\$1,500
2006	\$500	\$2,600
2021	If there is no further court action, no limit without new legislation	\$2,600

\*Alaskan limit applies to all candidates; NJ limit is for non-gubernatorial candidate

The *Hebdon* ruling did not overturn contribution limits per se. Rather, the decision, in deference to the Supreme Court's guidance, overturned Alaska's limits because they were too low and inconsistent with precedent set forth by the Supreme Court in *Randall v. Sorrell*.

Justice Stephen Breyer articulated the Court's rationale in *Randall* when he observed "contribution limits that are too low . . . harm the electoral process by preventing challengers from mounting effective campaigns against incumbent officeholders; thereby reducing democratic accountability."

The Vermont limits struck down in *Randall* ranged from \$200 to \$400 per election, depending on the office.

In the Alaskan ruling, two members of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, on remand from the U.S. Supreme Court, overrode the court's chief justice to discard the \$500 limit along with two other limits. Among the reasons was that it was among the lowest in the nation and not inflation adjusted.

The ruling reflected the high court's observations that Alaska's individual-to-candidate \$500 limit "is

Moreover, the limit applied to all offices, "making Alaska's law the most restrictive in the country in this regard." Further, the Supreme Court noted that Alaska's limits were not adjusted for inflation, therefore making them "almost inevitably become too low" over time.

If the Alaska officials decline to appeal and there is no new legislation, an individual in Alaska could give any candidate an unlimited sum. Alaska will be back to where New Jersey was in 1974.

Some might say New Jersey's current limits are too high.

But in an era when a conservative U.S. Supreme Court is leery of too much governmental intrusion into political fundraising, those higher limits have provided constitutional insurance even though the legislature has not adjusted the non-gubernatorial limits since 2005.

Even though New Jersey's limits are far higher than those in Alaska, pending legislation could lead to even higher contribution limits or none in the Garden State. The bill is sponsored by state Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Nicholas Scutari (D-22).

A recent story by Politico reporter Matt Friedman said the bill, which initially called for an end to contribution limits in New Jersey, is facing revisions and may ultimately lead to higher contribution limits instead of total elimination along with quicker disclosure.

In a column written for [Insidernj.com](https://www.insidernj.com) in 2019 about the Alaskan case, I disagreed with many in the reformist community who feared that the Supreme Court's ruling in the case "foretold the Court's intent to end contribution limits altogether."

"There appears to be no suggestion in the Court's per curiam opinion that it intends to undue precedent vis-à-vis contribution limits but rather that it desires to have precedent upheld pursuant to its 2006 ruling in *Randall v. Sorrell*; and by extension by *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976)," I wrote two years ago.

The recent ruling by the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals in overturning Alaska's limits bears out my prediction. It was not because the limits are in and of themselves unconstitutional. It is because they are too low under the *Randal v. Sorrell* precedent cited in the Supreme Court's ruling involving the Alaskan case.

The Supreme Court's initial ruling in the Alaska case, followed by the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit decision upon remand, supports my opinion expressed in the 2019 column that early fears of the undoing of contribution limits were unfounded.

The U.S. Supreme Court has not been shy about striking down some state laws it considers objectionable.

In another recent case, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Americans for Prosperity Foundation (AFP) v. BONTA*, on July 1, 2021, ruled 6-3 as unconstitutional California's law requiring charitable organizations to disclose major donors to the State's Attorney General.

But the Alaskan ruling reinforces my belief stated in a more recent column about *Bonta* that the U.S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice John Roberts would look to precedent in making any decision on the fate of campaign finance laws and in doing so would leave them intact.

"The influence of legal precedent, so embedded in our common law tradition, will play an important role in any future Supreme Court ruling involving campaign finance law," I wrote.

This logic applies to both cases even though the Alaska case directly concerns an integral part of campaign finance law, namely contribution limits, while the California law involved an issue only tangentially related to campaign finance law.

There have always been and will be challenges to the basic tenets of campaign finance law. But precedents set by *Buckley*, *Citizens United*, and other cases upholding disclosure, and the precedent set in *Randall* upholding reasonable contribution limits, will sustain laws many believe to be in the public interest.

That is why campaign finance laws will stay intact.

## Dates Set for Gubernatorial General Election Debates

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) reviewed and approved three dates recommended by sponsors for debates involving gubernatorial candidates and their running mates.

The dates are:

- 7 p.m. Tuesday September 28, 2021 for a debate between gubernatorial candidates in Newark organized by NJ Performing Arts Center.
- 7 p.m. Tuesday October 5, 2021 for a debate between lieutenant gubernatorial candidates in Lawrenceville arranged by NJ Globe.
- 8 p.m. Tuesday October 12, 2021 for a debate between gubernatorial candidates in Glassboro held by lead sponsor Public Media NJ Inc. (NJ PBS).

During an emergency meeting, the commission declined a request by the campaign of Governor Phil Murphy to instead hold all three debates within one week, respectively, on September 28, September 30 and October 5. In its request, Murphy's campaign said it wanted to hold all three debates as early as possible for the benefit of vote-by-mail voters. Clerks can begin distributing mail-in ballots on September 18.

Commission members said they prefer to leave the debates a little more spread out to give voters more time to process information from each debate, because they doubt all mail-in voters will instantly send in their ballots, and because extensive preparations already had been made for the three dates that previously had been set.

The commissioners also pointed out there is nothing preventing the candidates from holding earlier debates not overseen by ELEC.

Under state law, gubernatorial candidates that receive public financing for their campaigns must participate in two ELEC-sanctioned debates. Their lieutenant governor running mates must take part in a third ELEC-approved debate.

Also under the law, debates must be held between September 21 and October 22.

The gubernatorial debates will feature Murphy, a Democrat who is running for reelection, and Republican nominee Jack Ciattarelli. Both candidates are participants in the gubernatorial public financing program.

Lieutenant Governor Sheila Oliver is running for reelection along with Murphy. Ciattarelli's running mate is former state Senator Diane Allen.

The first gubernatorial debate will be held 7 p.m. Tuesday September 28 at NJ Performing Arts Center in Newark. Its partners include WABC-TV, WPVI-TV, 6-ABC Philadelphia, Twitter, Univision, WBGO-FM, NJ Advance Media (www.nj.com), and Rutgers Eagleton Institute of Politics and Rutgers School

of Public Affairs and Administration at Rutgers University.

It will be broadcast live via its television and radio affiliates. Once the live broadcast ends, it will immediately be posted on abc7ny.com and 6abc.com. It also will be available on NJ Advance Media and Rutgers University as well as Twitter websites.

The lieutenant governor's debate will be hosted 7 p.m. Tuesday October 5 at Rider University in Lawrenceville by New Jersey Globe, Rebovich Institute of Politics at Rider University, and Project Ready. While News 12 has withdrawn as a sponsor, NJ Globe is seeking another television partner. If it is unable to find one, the debate will be live-streamed via New Jersey Globe, Facebook Live, Twitter, Youtube, and LinkedIn. It also will be rebroadcast on 77 WABC radio.

The second gubernatorial debate will be held 8 p.m. October 12 at Rowan University in Glassboro and sponsored by Public Media NJ, Inc. (NJ PBS), NJ Spotlight News, Rowan Institute for Public Policy and Citizenship at Rowan University, New York Public Radio, WNYC & The Gothamist.

It will be broadcast live via television and radio, and live-streamed on njspotlight.com, Youtube, WYNC website, and Rowan University website.

The general election is November 2, 2021.

## Training Seminars

### CPC WEBINARS

#### R-3 eFile ONLY Program Training

September 16, 2021 10:00 AM

October 21, 2021 10:00 AM

November 17, 2021 10:00 AM

#### CPC/PPC Compliance Seminar AND eFile Training

September 01, 2021 10:00 AM

October 13, 2021 10:00 AM

### CANDIDATE WEBINARS

#### R-1 eFile ONLY Program Training

September 14, 2021 10:00 AM

October 05, 2021 10:00 AM

October 20, 2021 10:00 AM

November 09, 2021 10:00 AM

#### Campaign Compliance Seminar AND eFile Training

September 08, 2021 10:00 AM

September 22, 2021 10:00 AM

September 28, 2021 10:00 AM

September 30, 2021 10:00 AM

\*All webinars will run for approximately 2 hours.

## Most Lobbied Bills Included Two State Budgets, Abortion Rights, COVID-19 Issues

Two state budget bills loaded with COVID-19 spending, two bills directly spurred by the virus crisis plus a bill that would protect abortion rights in New Jersey rank among the most heavily lobbied bills in the current legislative session.

The ranking was based on quarterly lobbying reports filed with the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) since the start of the 219<sup>th</sup> Legislative session in January 2020.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC's Executive Director, said state budgets have ranked at or near the top of three previous lobbying studies. "What makes the current session unusual is that billions of dollars in the two adopted budgets was targeted at the COVID-19 pandemic," he said.

**Table 1**  
**Bills with Most Reporting Lobbying Activity**  
**Based on Number of Official Contacts**

Rank	Bill Numbers	Issue	Official Contacts	Status
1	S2021/A4720	Appropriates \$32.7 billion in state funds and \$13.9 billion in federal funds for fiscal year 2020-21 state budget	483	Enacted
2	A5870/S2022	Appropriates \$46.4 billion in state funds and \$21 billion in federal funds for fiscal year 2021-22 state budget	273	Enacted
3	A4848/S3030	A bill to protect and expand access to abortion in NJ	223	Introduced
4	S2559/A4179	Revises insurance coverage to cover services provided using telemedicine and telehealth	160	Passed Both Houses
5	S2380/A3999	Concerns employment benefits and coronavirus disease 2019 infections contracted by essential employees.	154	Enacted
6	A21/S21	Legalizes personal use cannabis (marijuana) for certain adults	141	Enacted
7	A4402/S2902	Imposes tax on all Wall Street financial transactions processed within New Jersey	130	Killed
8	S232/A2212	Empowers DEP to deny permits for power plants, landfills and other facilities in impoverished areas already facing substantial environmental risks	114	Enacted
9	S2515/A4676	Requires that plastic containers and packaging contain minimum amounts of recycled materials	112	Passed Senate
10	A1116/S2674	Provides for uniform regulation of small wireless facility deployment (5G) in this State.	97	Passed Assembly

For instance, more than \$1.2 billion has been set aside just to provide rental assistance and eviction prevention.<sup>1</sup>

"All budgets contain thousands of other programs as well that affect the lives of virtually every New Jersey resident," Brindle said. "It is therefore not a surprise that budgets usually draw the most intense lobbying."

The two budget bills generated at least 830 official contacts- 483 involving the fiscal year 2020-21 budget (S-2021/A-4720), 273 involving the fiscal year 2021-22 budget (A-5870/S-2022), and 74 where the fiscal year is unclear.

The next most lobbied bill has only been introduced. But it involves a perennially controversial issue- abortion.

<sup>1</sup> Katherine Landergan, "Murphy Signs Bills to Prevent Evictions, Provide Utility Assistance", Politico, August 4, 2021.

The bill (A-4848/S-3030) would adopt a state statute legalizing abortion in New Jersey at a time when federal protection is facing a serious challenge in the U.S. Supreme Court. Even without any public hearings, the bill already has spurred 223 official contacts.

Two bills directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic round out the top five most lobbied bills.

One (S-2559/A-4179) expands health insurance to apply to health care services provided via the internet, either by doctors or others. It drew 160 official contacts and has passed both houses. It is awaiting the governor's action.

A second bill (S-2380/A-3999) prompted by the pandemic extends workers compensation and other work-related benefits to essential employees who contract COVID-19. The bill, which has been signed into law, attracted 154 official contacts.

"While there is no exact way to gauge the impact of the virus outbreak on lobbying, reports filed with ELEC suggest the pandemic has been a major focus during the latest legislative session," said Brindle.

For instance, of the 16,415 official contacts reported to the agency during this session, 2,033- more than 12 percent- involved the public health crisis.

The New Jersey Business and Industry Association reported the most activity among organizations lobbying on the COVID-19 related bills identified by ELEC. Thirteen groups ranked on the top ten list (includes ties) combined to make 555 contacts- almost a third of the total.

**Table 2**  
**Groups That Reported Most Activity Among**  
**2,033 Pandemic-related Contacts Identified by ELEC**

Group	Contacts	Rank
NJ Business and Industry Association	97	1
New Jersey Hospital Association	73	2
New Jersey Education Association	66	3
Chamber of Commerce of Southern NJ	59	4
New Jersey Bankers Association	57	5
Cross State Credit Union Association	50	6
AARP NJ	47	7
Make the Road NJ	39	8
New Jersey Apartment Association, Coach USA, Insurance Council of New Jersey	36	9
Professional Insurance Agents of New Jersey, NAIOP NJ*	31	10

\*Commercial real estate

Rounding out the top ten ranked by official contacts are:

- a bill that legalized recreational use of marijuana (A-21/S-21).
- a bill (A-4402/S2902) that would have imposed a tax on Wall Street transactions occurring in New Jersey. It was blocked by heavy opposition.
- legislation (S-232/A2212) signed into law that allows state environmental officials to block permits for polluting facilities in neighborhoods already heavily exposed to such risks.
- a bill (S-2515/a-4676) approved by the state Senate that requires plastic containers and packaging include a minimum amount of recycled material.
- a bill (A-1116/S-2674) that cleared the state Assembly that standardizes local regulations for the construction of 5G telecommunications networks.

While ten bills generated the most official contacts, that didn't always mean a lot of groups were involved with each issue.

The most notable example is the abortion bill, which drew the third largest number of official contacts yet involved only 10 groups, the smallest among the top ten.

Likewise, a bill involving COVID-related insurance benefits involved more groups than the 2021-22 state budget.

**Table 3**  
**Number of Groups Lobbying**  
**On Ten Most Lobbied Bills**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Number of Groups Lobbying</b>	<b>Most Active Group</b>
2020-21 State Budget	149	New Jersey Policy Perspective
COVID-19 Benefits	71	Insurance Council of New Jersey
2021-22 State Budget	68	Coach USA
Legalized Marijuana	60	ACLU NJ
Telehealth	57	Medical Society of New Jersey and NJ Association of Health Plans
Stricter Environmental Permitting	47	Chemistry Council of New Jersey
Recycled Packaging	33	American Chemistry Council
Wall Street tax	26	Coalition to Prevent the Taxation of Retirement Savings
5G Service	18	AT&T
Abortion	10	Planned Parenthood Action Fund of NJ

#### **Explanatory notes about this analysis**

While state law requires lobbyists to disclose their official contacts involving legislation and other regulated activities, the reader should be aware that such a contact can be limited or broad.

For example, a lobbyist might report that a client hospital's chief executive met with the legislative sponsor and an aide in an office. That would count as one contact.

Another lobbyist might report sending emails to all 120 members of the legislature urging them to support, oppose or modify the same bill. ELEC staff counts such an outreach effort as one official contact even though it may target more than one lawmaker.

Another caveat- while quarterly lobbying reports disclose direct attempts to influence legislation, they don't disclose more indirect efforts.

Lobbyists sometimes organize "grassroots" campaigns to mobilize the public for or against legislation using advertisements aired on television or other media. Efforts to harness legislative constituents in this way are disclosed in annual lobbying reports.

## Top Legislative Battlegrounds Could be in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 16<sup>th</sup> Districts this Fall

By Joe Donohue

While all 120 legislators face reelection this fall, the heaviest spending will take place in just a handful of legislative districts.

That is partly because Democrats have held majorities in both houses since 2001. Plus, when the two major parties redrew legislative districts a decade ago, the new maps tended to favor incumbents.

As a result, few district are truly competitive. Most spending gets targeted in five or fewer districts where party registration is even enough that the districts could swing either way. These are called battleground or swing districts.

**Spending Trends in Battleground Districts**

Legislative District	Total District Spending 2001-2019	Rank	Costliest Race	Year	Number of Years Top Race	Number of Year Among Top Five Races
3*	\$44,521,990	1	\$24,102,940	2017	2	5
2	\$32,501,185	2	\$ 5,806,467	2011	3	6
1	\$26,190,153	3	\$ 4,975,772	2007	2	6
38	\$22,855,570	4	\$ 5,910,318	2013	1	4
14	\$22,429,654	5	\$ 3,870,063	2013	1	7
16	\$10,032,838	13	\$ 3,135,361	2017	Never	3
8	\$ 9,929,031	14	\$ 3,313,428	2007	Never	2

\*The 2017 3<sup>rd</sup> District race is believed to be the costliest state legislative race in US history.

The most expensive district since 2001 is the 3<sup>rd</sup> district (Cumberland, Gloucester and Salem Counties) at \$44.5 million.

That is largely due to one extremely expensive campaign that took place in 2017 when Senate President Stephen Sweeney and New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) had a big dispute over state pension policies. The \$24 million showdown, which Sweeney won, is thought to be the costliest state legislative race in American history.

Don't expect a rematch this year. Sweeney and NJEA have patched things up and he has even received a reelection endorsement from the teacher's union.

On the other hand, the second legislative district (Atlantic County) is expected to be competitive again this year. Just as it has been most of the past two decades.

While less money overall (\$32.5 million) has been spent in this district than in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, it has featured the most expensive race in three of the 10 legislative elections since 2001. It also has ranked six times among the top five costliest races.

Historically, it has been a Republican district. Democrats have held the Senate and two Assembly seats for only one two-year term back in 1974-75.

Since then, Democratic prospects have improved since Census data shows they now have more registered voters in the district than Republicans. As a result, the three seats have been split between the two parties every year since 2006.

Currently, the district is divided between Republican Senator-designate and former Assemblyman Vince Polistina and two Democratic Assembly members, including incumbent Vince Mazzeo, who is the Democratic Senate candidate this year.



At this writing, Atlantic County Republicans had picked Polistina to replace former Republican Senator Chris Brown, who stepped down to take a Murphy administration job in Atlantic City. Polistina has not yet been sworn in as the incumbent.

Political observers are predicting the 8<sup>th</sup> legislative district (Atlantic, Burlington and Camden Counties) race also could draw heavy spending.

That would be unusual since Republicans have controlled the district almost exclusively since 1974.

The trend changed when former Republican Senator Dawn Addiego switched parties in January 2019. She is now running for reelection as a Democrat for the first time against Republican Assembly member Jean Stanfield.

ELEC research indicates that the 8<sup>th</sup> legislative ranks 14<sup>th</sup> among legislative districts for spending since 2001 at just under \$10 million. During that period, it has never hosted the most expensive race statewide, and has been among the top five races only twice- in 2007 and 2019. The most expensive race was \$3.3 million in 2007.

Some districts stop being battlegrounds once one party or the other party consolidates its control.

For instance, not that long ago, the 14<sup>th</sup> legislative district (Mercer and Middlesex Counties) was a perennial battleground. At least for now, it is considered solidly Democratic. On the other hand, Republicans have recently reestablished control of the 1<sup>st</sup> legislative district (Atlantic, Cape May and Cumberland Counties), another frequent battleground in the past, after a several year hiatus.

Largely due to changing demographics, the 16<sup>th</sup> district (Hunterdon, Mercer, Somerset and Middlesex Counties) has been a relatively recent swing district. While it has never hosted the costliest district race in the state, it has been in the top five in the last three elections.

The advantage has been shifting to Democrats due to growing registration numbers in the traditionally GOP district.

This year, Democratic Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker is running for the state Senate post after long-time Republican incumbent Christopher "Kip" Bateman opted not to run for reelection. Zwicker's opponent is former Republican Congressman Michael Pappas.

## 2021 Reporting Dates

	INCLUSION DATES	REPORT DUE DATE
<b>FIRE COMMISSIONER – APRIL 20, 2021 – See Executive Order No. 211</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 3/19/2021	3/22/2021
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	3/20/2021 – 4/6/2021	4/9/2021
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	4/7/2021 – 5/7/2021	5/10/2021
48–Hour Notice Reports Start on 4/7/2021 through 4/20/2021		
<b>SCHOOLBOARD – APRIL 20, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 3/19/2021	3/22/2021
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	3/20/2021 – 4/6/2021	4/9/2021
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	4/7/2021 – 5/7/2021	5/10/2021
48–Hour Notice Reports State on 4/7/2021 through 4/20/2021		
<b>MAY MUNICIPAL – MAY 11, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign* – 4/9/2021	4/12/2021
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	4/10/2021 – 4/27/2021	4/30/2021
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	4/28/2021 – 5/28/2021	6/1/2021
48–Hour Notice Reports State on 4/28/2021 through 5/11/2021		
<b>RUNOFF (JUNE)** – JUNE 15, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	4/28/2021 – 6/1/2021	6/4/2021
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	6/2/2021 – 7/2/2021	7/6/2021
48–Hour Notice Reports Start on 6/2/2021 through 6/15/2021		
<b>PRIMARY (90 DAY START DATE – MARCH 10, 2021)*** – JUNE 8, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	Inception of campaign – 5/7/2021	5/10/2021
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	5/8/2021 – 5/25/2021	5/28/2021
20–Day Postelection Reporting Date	5/26/2021 – 6/25/2021	6/28/2021
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 5/26/2021 – 6/8/2021		
<b>GENERAL (90 DAY START DATE – AUGUST 4, 2021) – NOVEMBER 2, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	6/26/2021 – 10/1/2021	10/4/2021
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	10/2/2021 – 10/19/2021	10/22/2021
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	10/20/2021 – 11/19/2021	11/22/2021
48–Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 10/20/2021 – 11/2/2021		
<b>RUN–OFF (DECEMBER)** – December 7, 2021</b>		
29–day Preelection Reporting Date	No Report Required for this Period	
11–day Preelection Reporting Date	10/20/2021 – 11/23/2021	11/26/2021
20–day Postelection Reporting Date	11/24/2021 – 12/24/2021	12/27/2021
48 Hour Notice Reporting Starts on 11/24/2021 through 12/7/2021		

**PACS, PCFRS & CAMPAIGN QUARTERLY FILERS**

1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1/1/2021 – 3/31/2021	4/15/2021
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4/1/2021 – 6/30/2021	7/15/2021
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7/1/2021 – 9/30/2021	10/15/2021
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	10/1/2021 – 12/31/2021	1/18/2022

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

1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1/1/2021 – 3/31/2021	4/12/2021
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4/1/2021 – 6/30/2021	7/12/2021
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7/1/2021 – 9/30/2021	10/12/2021
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	10/1/2021 – 12/31/2021	1/10/2022

\*Inception Date of Campaign (first time filers) or January 1, 2021 (Quarterly filers).

\*\*A candidate committee or joint candidates committee that is filing in a 2021 Runoff election is not required to file a 20-day postelection report for the corresponding prior election (May Municipal or General).

\*\*\* Form PFD-1 is due April 15, 2021 for the Primary Election Candidates and June 21, 2021 for the Independent General Election Candidates.

Note: A fourth quarter 2020 filing is needed for the Primary 2021 candidates if they started their campaign prior to December 10, 2020.

A second quarter is needed by Independent/ Non-partisan General election candidates if they started their campaign prior to May 4, 2021.

**HOW TO CONTACT ELEC**

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

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

**DIRECTORS:**

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