

**From:** Grenier, Leah  
**Sent:** Monday, March 12, 2012 3:15 PM  
**To:** Barnes, Ben  
**CC:** Noonan, John G.;Potamianos, Paul;MESSNER, GREGORY  
**Subject:** Proposed ECS hold harmless for Cafero meeting  
**Attachments:** ECS Shell with updated husky and other data.xlsx

Ben,

On the legislative side:

Going with the 67% poverty weighting, the following from SB 24 would have to be changed:

Section 1. Section 10-262f of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*):

(25)"Total need students" means the sum of (A) the number of resident students of the town for the school year, (B) (i) for any school year commencing prior to July 1, 1998, one-quarter the number of children under the temporary family assistance program for the prior fiscal year, and (ii) for the school years commencing July 1, 1998, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, one-quarter the number of children under the temporary family assistance program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997, (C) for school years commencing July 1, 1995, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, one-quarter of the mastery count for the school year, (D) for school years commencing July 1, 1995, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, ten per cent of the number of eligible children, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, for whom the board of education is not required to provide a program pursuant to section 10-17f, (E) for the school [year] years commencing July 1, 2007, [and each school year thereafter,] to July 1, 2011, inclusive, fifteen per cent of the number of eligible students, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, for whom the board of education is not required to provide a program pursuant to section 10-17f, [and] (F) for the school year commencing July 1, 2012, and each school year thereafter, fifteen per cent of the number of eligible students, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, (G) for the school [year] years commencing July 1, 2007, [and each school year thereafter] to July 1, 2011, inclusive, thirty-three per cent of the number of children below the level of poverty, and (H) for the school year commencing July 1, 2012, and each school year thereafter, [thirty-three]sixty-seven per cent of the number of children in poverty.

I've passed the following language by Brian and he believes it would work to hold Norwalk harmless from the PSD cut. Changing the poverty weighting to 67% also changes the phase in percents stated in this section. Section 2 of SB 24 (ed reform bill) would look like:

Sec. 2. Subdivision (6) of subsection (a) of section 10-262h of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*):

(U) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (i) the town's base aid, and (ii) one and forty[-one] one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the fully funded grant as described in said subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, except that for conditional funding districts, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (I) the town's base aid, and (II) two and forty-seven one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the fully funded grant as described in said subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, provided that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, no town shall receive a grant that, when summed with the grant received pursuant to section 10-266p, is less than the [amount of the grant received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012] sum of the grants received pursuant to subsection (d) of this section and section 10-266p for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012;

The PSD distribution language in section 10 of HB 5014 (the budget bill) would have to be changed for the \$650,000 cut:

Sec. 10. Subsection (b) of section 36 of public act 11-6 is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*):

**PLAINTIFFS'**  
**TRIAL EXHIBIT**  
No. X07 HHD-CV14-5037566-S

288

(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, the distribution of priority school district grants, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-266p of the general statutes, shall be as follows: (1) For priority school districts in the amount of [~~\$39,792,940~~]\$39,142,940, (2) for school readiness in the amount of [~~\$69,813,190~~]\$73,813,190, (3) for extended school building hours in the amount of \$2,994,752, and (4) for school accountability in the amount of \$3,499,699.

On the budget side:

\$650,000 would have to be taken out of the PSD recommended appropriation and Brian says that \$100,000 would have to be added to ECS to cover this hold harmless provision.

Attached is the comparison of the ECS distribution in the Governor's budget compared with the distribution based on updated statistics and the new Husky A data.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

*Leah Grenier*

Principal Budget Specialist  
Office of Policy & Management  
450 Capitol Ave., MS 53BUD  
Hartford, CT 06106-1379  
Phone: (860) 418-6421  
Fax: (860) 418-6490



Reduce, Reuse, Recycle



---

**From:** Grenier, Leah  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 6, 2012 4:05 PM  
**To:** Barnes, Ben  
**CC:** Noonan, John G.;Potamianos, Paul;MESSNER, GREGORY  
**Subject:** Norwalk and ECS  
**Attachments:** ECS Shell with updated husky and other data.xlsx, Changes to SB 24 for ECS.docx

Ben,

The first attachment is the latest ECS shell from Brian, which reflects updates to all the data, including resident students, Husky A, ENGL, English language learners and population. If you look at the "ECS Pov @ 33%" tab, you can see that due mainly to the updated Husky A numbers, Norwalk is made whole, plus a little. I wanted to ask, if your intent was to restore the \$650,000 from the PSD cut plus whatever additional funding they get in ECS or if your intent was to hold them harmless so that the total they get would be more than zero. Does that make any sense?

According to the papers, Cafero was upset that Norwalk would be losing \$72,000 (\$577,476 in additional ECS funding minus the \$650,000 PSD cut), so I would assume he'd be happy or at least satisfied if the additional ECS funding was equal to or more than the PSD cut, which in the "ECS Pov @ 33%" tab it is \$74,524 more (\$724,551 in additional ECS funding minus the \$650,000 PSD cut).

Brian said that OFA has made inquiries as to what it might take to get the big cities up to levels that were included in the Governor's budget and says that it would appear that increasing the poverty weighting from 33% to 67% would somewhat do the trick. I've also included a tab "ECS Pov @ 67%" to show this scenario and while it does provide a run that is closer to the one in the Governor's budget, it would not solve the Norwalk issue.

I believe the only changes needed for the ECS statute would be to change the phase in percent depending on what is finally agreed to and the poverty weight. If we go with the 33% poverty weight, the phase in would be 3.47% for Conditional Districts and 1.6% for all other districts. If we go with the 67% poverty weight, the phase in would be 2.47% for Conditional Districts and 1.4% for all other districts. See the second attachment.

I wanted to touch base with you to see if you think the ECS run at 33% poverty weighting would satisfy Cafero before I spent too much time trying to find other ways to hold Norwalk harmless like you requested. I think this ECS run would really be the best, most equitable option and wouldn't require weird, one district fixes that we're trying to avoid.

Lastly, Brian is asking if his shell that he sent yesterday (that I've made some slight tweaks to in the attachment) is okay to be shared with OFA since they have been asking for the shell with updated numbers.

Thank you!

*Leah Grenier*

Principal Budget Specialist  
Office of Policy & Management  
450 Capitol Ave., MS 53BUD  
Hartford, CT 06106-1379  
Phone: (860) 418-6421  
Fax: (860) 418-6490



Reduce, Reuse, Recycle

**PLAINTIFFS'  
TRIAL EXHIBIT**

No. X07 HH0-CV14-5037566-S

316

Changes to SB 24 for ECS

Sec. 1

10-262f (25) "Total need students" means the sum of (A) the number of resident students of the town for the school year, (B) (i) for any school year commencing prior to July 1, 1998, one-quarter the number of children under the temporary family assistance program for the prior fiscal year, and (ii) for the school years commencing July 1, 1998, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, one-quarter the number of children under the temporary family assistance program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997, (C) for school years commencing July 1, 1995, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, one-quarter of the mastery count for the school year, (D) for school years commencing July 1, 1995, to July 1, 2006, inclusive, ten per cent of the number of eligible children, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, for whom the board of education is not required to provide a program pursuant to section 10-17f, (E) for the school [year] years commencing July 1, 2007, [and each school year thereafter,] to July 1, 2011, inclusive, fifteen per cent of the number of eligible students, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, for whom the board of education is not required to provide a program pursuant to section 10-17f, [and] (F) for the school year commencing July 1, 2012, and each school year thereafter, fifteen per cent of the number of eligible students, as defined in subdivision (1) of section 10-17e, (G) for the school [year] years commencing July 1, 2007, [and each school year thereafter] to July 1, 2011, inclusive, thirty-three per cent of the number of children below the level of poverty, and (H) for the school year commencing July 1, 2012, and each school year thereafter, thirty-three per cent of the number of children in poverty. Might change if decision is to use 67% (or some other percentage).

Sec. 2. Subdivision (6) of subsection (a) of section 10-262h of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*):

(6) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1996, and each fiscal year thereafter, a grant in an amount equal to the amount of its target aid as described in subdivision (32) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, except that such amount shall be capped in accordance with the following: (A) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1996, June 30, 1997, June 30, 1998, and June 30, 1999, for each town, the maximum percentage increase over its previous year's base revenue shall be the product of five per cent and the ratio of the wealth of the town ranked one hundred fifty-third when all towns are ranked in descending order to each town's wealth, provided no town shall receive an increase greater than five per cent. (B) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2000, June 30, 2001, June 30, 2002, June 30, 2003, and June 30, 2004, for each town, the maximum percentage increase over its previous year's base revenue shall be the product of six per cent and the ratio of the wealth of the town ranked one hundred fifty-third when all towns are ranked in descending order to each town's wealth, provided no town shall receive an increase greater than six per cent. (C) No such cap shall be used for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2005, or any fiscal year thereafter. (D) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1996, for each town, the maximum percentage reduction from its previous year's base revenue shall be equal to the product of three per cent and the ratio of each town's wealth to the wealth of the town ranked seventeenth when all towns are ranked in descending order, provided no town's grant shall be reduced by more than three per cent. (E) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1997, June 30, 1998, and June 30, 1999, for each town, the maximum percentage reduction from its previous year's base revenue shall be equal to the product of five per cent and the ratio of each town's wealth to the wealth of the town ranked seventeenth when all towns are ranked in descending order, provided no town's grant shall be reduced by more than five per cent. (F) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, and each fiscal year thereafter, no town's grant shall be less than the grant it received for the prior fiscal year. (G) For each fiscal year prior to the fiscal year



ending June 30, 2008, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2004, in addition to the amount determined pursuant to this subdivision, a town shall be eligible for a density supplement if the density of the town is greater than the average density of all towns in the state. The density supplement shall be determined by multiplying the density aid ratio of the town by the foundation level and the town's total need students for the prior fiscal year provided, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, and each fiscal year thereafter, no town's density supplement shall be less than the density supplement such town received for the prior fiscal year. (H) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997, the grant determined in accordance with this subdivision for a town ranked one to forty-two when all towns are ranked in descending order according to town wealth shall be further reduced by one and two-hundredths of a per cent and such grant for all other towns shall be further reduced by fifty-six-hundredths of a per cent. (I) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1998, and each fiscal year thereafter, no town whose school district is a priority school district shall receive a grant pursuant to this subdivision in an amount that is less than the amount received under such grant for the prior fiscal year. (J) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, and each fiscal year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003, no town whose school district is a priority school district shall receive a grant pursuant to this subdivision that provides an amount of aid per resident student that is less than the amount of aid per resident student provided under the grant received for the prior fiscal year. (K) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1998, and each fiscal year thereafter, no town whose school district is a priority school district shall receive a grant pursuant to this subdivision in an amount that is less than seventy per cent of the sum of (i) the product of a town's base aid ratio, the foundation level and the town's total need students for the fiscal year prior to the year in which the grant is to be paid, (ii) the product of a town's supplemental aid ratio, the foundation level and the sum of the portion of its total need students count described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subdivision (25) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, for the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the grant is to be paid, and the adjustments to its resident student count described in subdivision (22) of said section 10-262f, as amended by this act, relative to length of school year and summer school sessions, and (iii) the town's regional bonus. (L) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, and each fiscal year thereafter, no town whose school district is a transitional school district shall receive a grant pursuant to this subdivision in an amount that is less than forty per cent of the sum of (i) the product of a town's base aid ratio, the foundation level and the town's total need students for the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the grant is to be paid, (ii) the product of a town's supplemental aid ratio, the foundation level and the sum of the portion of its total need students count described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subdivision (25) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, for the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the grant is to be paid, and the adjustments to its resident student count described in subdivision (22) of said section 10-262f, as amended by this act, relative to length of school year and summer school sessions, and (iii) the town's regional bonus. (M) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2002, (i) each town whose target aid is capped pursuant to this subdivision shall receive a grant that includes a pro rata share of twenty-five million dollars based on the difference between its target aid and the amount of the grant determined with the cap, and (ii) all towns shall receive a grant that is at least 1.68 per cent greater than the grant they received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2001. (N) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003, (i) each town whose target aid is capped pursuant to this subdivision shall receive a pro rata share of fifty million dollars based on the difference between its target aid and the amount of the grant determined with the cap, and (ii) each town shall receive a grant that is at least 1.2 per cent more than its base revenue, as defined in subdivision (28) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act. (O) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003, each town shall receive a grant that is at least equal to the grant it received for the prior fiscal year. (P) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2004, (i) each town whose target aid is capped pursuant to this subdivision shall receive a grant that includes a pro rata share of fifty million dollars based on the difference between its target aid and the amount of the grant determined with the cap, (ii) each town's

grant including the cap supplement shall be reduced by three per cent, (iii) the towns of Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven shall each receive a grant that is equal to the grant such towns received for the prior fiscal year plus one million dollars, (iv) those towns described in clause (i) of this subparagraph shall receive a grant that includes a pro rata share of three million dollars based on the same pro rata basis as used in said clause (i), (v) towns whose school districts are priority school districts pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-266p, as amended by this act, or transitional school districts pursuant to section 10-263c or who are eligible for grants under section 10-276a or 10-263d for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2002, to June 30, 2004, inclusive, shall receive grants that are at least equal to the grants they received for the prior fiscal year, (vi) towns not receiving funds under clause (iii) of this subparagraph shall receive a pro rata share of any remaining funds based on their grant determined under this subparagraph. (Q) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2005, (i) no town shall receive a grant pursuant to this subparagraph in an amount that is less than sixty per cent of the amount determined pursuant to the previous subparagraphs of this subdivision, (ii) notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (B) of this subdivision, each town shall receive a grant that is equal to the amount the town received for the prior fiscal year increased by twenty-three and twenty-seven hundredths per cent of the difference between the grant amount calculated pursuant to this subdivision and the amount the town received for the prior fiscal year, (iii) no town whose school district is a priority school district pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-266p, as amended by this act, shall receive a grant pursuant to this subdivision that is less than three hundred seventy dollars per resident student, and (iv) each town shall receive a grant that is at least the greater of the amount of the grant it received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003, or the amount of the grant it received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2004, increased by seven-tenths per cent, except that the town of Winchester shall not receive less than its fixed entitlement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003. (R) Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2006, and June 30, 2007, each town shall receive a grant that is equal to the amount of the grant the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2005, increased by two per cent plus the amount specified in section 33 of public act 05-245, provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007, no town shall receive a grant in an amount that is less than sixty per cent of the amount of its target aid as described in subdivision (32) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act. (S) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (i) the town's base aid, and (ii) seventeen and thirty-one one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the town's fully funded grant as described in subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, except that such per cent shall be adjusted for all towns so that no town shall receive a grant that is less than the amount of the grant the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007, increased by four and four-tenths per cent. (T) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (i) the town's base aid, and (ii) twenty-two and two one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the fully funded grant as described in said subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, except that such per cent shall be adjusted for all towns so that no town shall receive a grant that is less than the amount of the grant the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008, increased by four and four-tenths per cent. (U) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (i) the town's base aid, and (ii) one and forty-one one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the fully funded grant as described in said subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, except that for conditional funding districts, a grant in an amount equal to the sum of (I) the town's base aid, and (II) two and forty-seven one-hundredths per cent of the difference between the fully funded grant as described in said subdivision (33) of section 10-262f, as amended by this act, and its base aid, provided that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, no town shall receive a grant that is less than the amount of the grant received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012; May change depending on poverty weight used.