



# NEWS RELEASE

Respond to:  
 P.O. Box 185  
 Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0185

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

CONTACT: JEFF BRINDLE  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FOR RELEASE:  
 May 28, 2015

A flurry of independent spending in the 20<sup>th</sup> legislative district has enlivened this year’s state Assembly primary elections, according to the latest reports filed by candidates and committees.

Two groups- the National Association of Realtors Fund and the NJ Coalition of Real Estate- have spent \$124,724 in the Union County district where six Democrats are vying for two seats. It is the first known independent spending in the legislative primary elections thus far.

**Table 1**  
**Campaign Finance Activity in 20<sup>th</sup> Legislative**  
**District Up Until 11 Days Before June 2 Primary Election**

Committee	Party	Incumbent/ Challenger	Cumulative Raised	Cumulative Spent	Cash
Assemblyman Jamel Holley	D	I	\$118,865	\$99,200	\$19,665
Assemblywoman Annette Quijano	D	I	\$232,356	\$191,411	\$40,945
Quijano and Holley	D	I/I	\$136,200	\$124,148	\$12,052
Roger Stryeski *	R	C	NA	NA	NA
Jorge Batista	D	C	NA	NA	NA
Vivian Bell	D	C	NA	NA	NA
Stephen Kozlovich	R	C	NA	NA	NA
Monteiro and Farina	D	C/C	NA	NA	NA
<b>Candidate Totals</b>			\$487,421	\$414,759	\$72,662
National Association of Realtors Fund			NA	\$116,765	NA
NJ Coalition of Real Estate			NA	\$7,989	NA
<b>Independent Group Totals</b>			NA	\$124,754	NA
<b>Grand Totals</b>			\$487,421	\$539,513	\$72,662

\*Does not expect to spend more than \$4,500 NA means not available

The combined spending of \$539,513 in the 20<sup>th</sup> District is second only to the \$584,009 spent so far in the 7<sup>th</sup> Legislative District. The 20<sup>th</sup> district is facing competition after the resignation of long-time incumbent Assemblyman Joseph Cryan, who became Union County Sheriff last November. In January, former Roselle Mayor Jamel Holley was appointed by the party to replace Cryan. Only the 31<sup>st</sup> Legislative District in Hudson County, with seven Democrats on the slate, has more candidates seeking just two slots. Thirty five of the 40 legislative districts have no contested primaries.

Jeff Brindle, ELEC’s Executive Director, said it is not surprising to see independent spending in a district that is emerging as one of the most competitive statewide in the primary.

“Since independent special interest spending became more common in legislative elections in 2009, we have found that these groups tend to focus their money on key districts,” said Brindle.

While the 11-day pre-election reports have disclosed the first involvement of independent groups in this year’s legislative elections, it is unlikely that independent spending will approach the estimated \$10.5 million spent in the 2013 election, Brindle said.

“Competition over legislative seats was more intense two years ago because the governor was running for reelection and state Senate seats also were up for grabs,” said Brindle. “Assembly candidates this year are running alone, and most incumbents are facing little or no primary competition.”

Fundraising for the primary elections has reached \$12.5 million while spending has climbed to \$7 million. Candidates combined have \$5.5 million in cash reserves- \$274,749, or 5.3 percent, more than the total reported 29 days before the election.

**Table 2**  
**Campaign Finance Activity Related to 2015 Primary by State**  
**Assembly Candidates Up Until 11 Days Before June 2 Primary Election**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Raised</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Cash-on-Hand</b>
Candidates	\$12,476,029	\$6,915,141	\$5,494,492
Independent Committees	NA	\$ 124,724	NA
Totals	\$12,476,029	\$7,039,865	\$5,494,492

Assembly candidates this year have nearly \$800,000, or 17 percent, more cash-on-hand than the \$4.7 million they had amassed at this point in 2013.

Democrats, who currently hold a 48 to 32 margin, have held control of the lower house since 2001. They continue to have an easier time raising money.

**Table 3**  
**Party Breakdown of Assembly Campaign Finance Activity**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Raised</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Cash-on-Hand</b>
Democrats	\$ 8,526,245	\$4,892,368	\$3,566,519
Republicans	\$ 3,949,784	\$2,022,773	\$1,927,973
Both Parties	\$12,476,029	\$6,915,141	\$5,494,492

Incumbents also continue to hold a heavy advantage over challengers in most districts.

**Table 4**  
**Breakdown of Assembly Campaign Finance**  
**Activity Incumbents Versus Challengers**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Raised</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Cash-on-Hand</b>
Incumbents	\$11,757,711	\$6,528,858	\$5,186,071
Challengers	\$ 718,318	\$ 386,283	\$ 308,421
Totals	\$12,476,029	\$6,915,141	\$5,494,492

The numbers in this report should be considered preliminary. The analysis is based on legislative fundraising reports received by May 26, 2015. Reports filed by legislative candidates are available online on ELEC’s website at [www.elec.state.nj.us](http://www.elec.state.nj.us). A downloadable summary of data from those reports is available in both spreadsheet and PDF formats at [www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/statistics.htm](http://www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/statistics.htm).