

ANALYSIS OF REVISED EXECUTIVE ORDER RESOURCE ALLOCATION PLAN: STATE EDUCATION FUNDING

August 22, 2017

The purpose of this document is to detail the current Connecticut state budget situation and the changes in school funding in Governor Dannel Malloy's Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan,¹ which was issued on August 18, 2017. As a result of the Connecticut General Assembly not passing a budget before the start of fiscal year 2018, the governor has been operating the state by executive order since July 1.²

Just like the governor's original Resource Allocation Plan issued on June 30,³ the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan covers all of FY 2018 and funds state government operations while the General Assembly continues budget discussions and negotiations. The Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan will remain in effect until a budget is passed by the General Assembly and signed by the governor, or until an updated Resource Allocation Plan is issued by the governor.

This document provides estimates of the impact of the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan for FY 2018 on individual municipalities due to changes in major state education grant programs contained in the Plan.

Q: How is the Connecticut budget process supposed to work?

A: The budget process is a collaboration between the legislative and executive branches of government. The governor submits a budget to the legislature in February of odd-numbered years. The legislature then reviews the governor's proposed budget and the General Assembly's Appropriations and Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committees hold public hearings on spending and revenues, respectively. Next, the Appropriations Committee develops a modified budget, which is then passed out of the committee (usually in April). During the same time period, the Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committee meets separately to determine any revenue changes and passes a revenue package out of the committee (also usually in late April). The Appropriations' budget must then be passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Before this happens, any number of changes may be made to the budget through bipartisan negotiations. After being passed by both chambers, the legislature's final budget must then be signed into law by the governor, before June 30 — the end of the fiscal year.⁴

Q: Why is it so difficult for the legislature to pass a budget?

A: The budget must be passed with a simple majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. However, the House Democrats currently hold a very narrow majority (79-72), and the Senate is tied with 18 Democratic senators and 18

Republican senators. The lieutenant governor, a Democrat, casts any tie-breaking votes. This is a much narrower margin for the majority party than in prior years, making it more difficult to negotiate a budget that a majority of members in both chambers can support. Furthermore, in order to close the \$3.5 billion deficit⁵ over the next biennium, and bring the budget into balance, policymakers must make difficult decisions about how to close the deficit. These decisions may include spending cuts to state services, increasing taxes and fees, and/or reductions in state aid to municipalities. All of these decisions are typically highly contested, political decisions. If the Connecticut General Assembly is able to pass a budget through both chambers, the budget must be approved by the governor who has the power to veto the budget in full if he does not agree with it, as well as veto specific items in the budget through what are referred to as “line-item” vetoes.⁶

Q: What was different about the budget process this year?

A: There is an approximately \$3.5 billion deficit remaining in the upcoming biennial budget, due primarily to declining income tax revenues and increasing fixed costs.⁷ The deficit has decreased from \$5.1 billion in July,⁸ due to approximately \$1.6 billion in projected savings included in a labor concessions deal,⁹ which was passed by the General Assembly on July 31.¹⁰ Currently, approximately half of the budget is encumbered by fixed costs related to state employee pensions and benefits, teacher pensions, bonding debt, and Medicaid.¹¹ Connecticut’s current budget is approximately \$18 billion, with just over \$9 billion devoted to the aforementioned fixed costs. For the remaining \$9.1 billion, there is a \$1.6 billion deficit in fiscal year 2018 and a \$1.9 billion deficit in fiscal year 2019, including projected savings from labor concessions.^{12, 13} This means that policymakers need to make very difficult decisions about cuts to spending and/or changes in revenues to close the deficit. In part because policymakers have very different ideological positions related to spending cuts and tax or fee increases,¹⁴ they were not able to come to an agreement on a new biennial budget before the end of the fiscal year on June 30.¹⁵ Additionally, this year was the first year in recent memory that the Appropriations Committee was unable to pass a budget, and the first year since 2009 that the legislature has failed to enact a budget before the end of the fiscal year.¹⁶

Q: What is an Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan?

A: The State of Connecticut operates on a two-year, or biennial, budget cycle. The budget biennium begins in even-numbered years and ends in odd-numbered years.¹⁷ If a budget bill does not become law by the end of an odd-numbered fiscal year, the governor must manage the state government and allocate taxpayer revenues through executive order. The governor is granted this authority through the Connecticut Constitution.¹⁸ However, the governor does not have the authority to raise additional revenues, which means he cannot change tax rates or create additional taxes or fees. In addition, the governor does not have the authority to appropriate funds outside of what is allowed in state statute. It is important to note that this Revised Resource Allocation Plan is only in effect until a budget is passed. The legislature could pass a budget at any time, which, when signed by the governor, will supersede the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan.

Q: How does the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan affect state education funding?

A: Because the governor cannot raise revenues or appropriate funds outside of what is allowed in statute, and because the budget is currently out of balance, the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan contains very deep cuts to state education funding. The Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan is projected to decrease the amount of Education Cost Sharing (ECS) funding by approximately \$557 million compared to the FY 2017 appropriated amount with rescissions.^{19,20} The ECS grant only includes local and regional boards of education, while charter schools, magnet schools, Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs), and the Connecticut Technical High School System remaining separate line items.²¹ Under the Revised Resource Allocation Plan, special education funding remains partially incorporated in the ECS grant and the Special Education Excess Cost grant is increased to \$143 million, which is an increase of \$7 million over the FY 2017 appropriated amount.²² It is important to note that these cuts are amplified by cuts made in the Revised Resource Allocation Plan to municipal aid, such as the elimination of the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) grant program, which reimburses towns for tax-exempt property from hospitals, universities, state-owned properties, churches, etc.²³ Additionally, the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan eliminates all Priority School District grant funding,²⁴ which is designed to “assist designated school districts in improving student achievement and enhancing educational opportunities.”²⁵

Under the Revised Resource Allocation Plan, the governor has chosen to allocate ECS grants to towns without a formula. Essentially, the revised plan determines reductions to the ECS grants based on FY 2017 ECS grant levels with rescissions.^{26,27} Under the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan, the 30 lowest-performing districts in the state (known as the Alliance Districts²⁸) each receive a grant equal to their FY 2017 ECS grant after rescissions. For all other towns, ECS funding is determined by the percentage of town revenue represented by state aid. The 85 towns for whom the percentage of town revenue represented by state aid is less than the state average (22.24 percent) will receive no ECS grant. The remaining 54 “non-Alliance” towns, whose reliance on state aid was higher than the statewide average, will receive between 10 percent and 60 percent of their FY 2017 ECS grant.²⁹

Projected FY 2018 Funding Estimates

Table 1 below contains the proposed FY 2018 appropriations for the Connecticut Technical High School System, State Magnet, and Charter School grants, as laid out in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan. Proposed decreases in state education funding in FY 2018 under the Revised Resource Allocation Plan are highlighted in red, while state education funding that is proposed to remain the same is highlighted in yellow.

Table 1: Choice Program FY 2018 Revised Resource Allocation Plan Appropriations

Grant	FY 2017 Appropriation ³⁰	Governor's Revised Resource Allocation Plan FY 2018 Funding ³¹
Charter Schools	\$110,835,808	\$109,208,000
Magnet Schools	\$313,058,158	\$313,058,158
Connecticut Technical High School System	\$163,367,535	\$156,732,607

Table 2 below details the projected change in ECS funding contained in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan for each town compared to FY 2017. The FY 2017 ECS amounts, for comparative purposes, account for the \$20 million in mid-year rescissions issued by the governor on December 29, 2016.³² Towns projected under the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan to receive a decrease in ECS funding in FY 2018 are highlighted in red, while towns projected to receive no change in ECS funding are highlighted in yellow. The estimated October ECS payment column assumes the ECS grant is disbursed as specified in statute.³³ In order to put these changes into context, the column on the far right shows the projected reduction, in terms of percent, in a district's FY 2016 total expenditures (the most recent year available),³⁴ if the ECS funding changes contained in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan were applied to the district's total expenditures.

It is important to note the projected reductions in this column only take into consideration reductions in ECS funding and do not necessarily mean a district would see a reduction in its overall funding. For example, should the General Assembly not pass a budget before the proposed cuts in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan are implemented, some towns may decide to replace some or all the reduced or eliminated ECS funds with additional funding from local property taxes or use their budget reserves to make a one-time payment.

Table 2: Estimated Town-by-Town Net Change in ECS Funding for FY 2018

Town	FY 2017 ECS Funding ^{35,36}	Projected Change in ECS Funding for FY 2018 ³⁷	Projected October ECS Payment ³⁸	Projected Reduction in District's Total Expenditures ^{39,a}
Andover	\$2,331,185	-\$1,864,948	\$116,559	*
Ansonia	\$16,473,543	\$0	\$4,118,386	0%
Ashford	\$3,859,564	-\$2,701,695	\$289,467	*
Avon	\$731,456	-\$731,456	\$0	-1%
Barkhamsted	\$1,633,686	-\$1,633,686	\$0	*
Beacon Falls	\$4,067,920	-\$4,067,920	\$0	*
Berlin	\$6,215,712	-\$6,215,712	\$0	-13%
Bethany	\$2,000,209	-\$2,000,209	\$0	*
Bethel	\$8,087,732	-\$8,087,732	\$0	-17%
Bethlehem	\$1,278,838	-\$1,278,838	\$0	*
Bloomfield	\$6,160,837	\$0	\$1,540,209	0%
Bolton	\$2,983,350	-\$2,685,015	\$74,584	-18%
Bozrah	\$1,223,830	-\$979,064	\$61,192	-17%
Branford	\$2,211,848	-\$2,211,848	\$0	-4%
Bridgeport	\$181,105,390	\$0	\$45,276,348	0%
Bridgewater	\$23,014	-\$23,014	\$0	*
Bristol	\$44,853,676	\$0	\$11,213,419	0%
Brookfield	\$1,417,583	-\$1,417,583	\$0	-3%
Brooklyn	\$6,975,373	-\$2,790,149	\$1,046,306	-15%
Burlington	\$4,359,350	-\$4,359,350	\$0	*
Canaan	\$177,216	-\$177,216	\$0	*
Canterbury	\$4,665,608	-\$1,866,243	\$699,841	-16%
Canton	\$3,403,900	-\$3,403,900	\$0	-13%
Chaplin	\$1,856,992	-\$928,496	\$232,124	*
Cheshire	\$9,436,665	-\$8,492,998	\$235,917	-12%
Chester	\$659,216	-\$659,216	\$0	*
Clinton	\$6,326,998	-\$6,326,998	\$0	-20%
Colchester	\$13,503,310	-\$9,452,317	\$1,012,748	-23%
Colebrook	\$491,388	-\$491,388	\$0	*
Columbia	\$2,523,462	-\$1,766,423	\$189,260	-14%
Cornwall	\$6,976	-\$6,976	\$0	*
Coventry	\$8,756,165	-\$7,004,932	\$437,808	-25%
Cromwell	\$4,646,922	-\$4,646,922	\$0	-15%
Danbury	\$31,290,480	\$0	\$7,822,620	0%
Darien	\$406,683	-\$406,683	\$0	0%
Deep River	\$1,675,092	-\$1,675,092	\$0	*
Derby	\$7,902,388	\$0	\$1,975,597	0%
Durham	\$3,895,303	-\$3,895,303	\$0	*
East Granby	\$1,439,845	-\$1,439,845	\$0	-8%
East Haddam	\$3,686,134	-\$3,317,521	\$92,153	-16%
East Hampton	\$7,538,993	-\$6,031,194	\$376,950	-20%
East Hartford	\$49,075,156	\$0	\$12,268,789	0%
East Haven	\$19,595,415	\$0	\$4,898,854	0%
East Lyme	\$6,918,462	-\$6,918,462	\$0	-15%
East Windsor	\$5,669,122	\$0	\$1,417,281	0%
Eastford	\$1,091,881	-\$764,317	\$81,891	-20%
Easton	\$177,907	-\$177,907	\$0	*
Ellington	\$9,684,435	-\$7,747,548	\$484,222	-21%
Enfield	\$28,585,010	-\$20,009,507	\$2,143,876	-25%

^a Towns participating in regional school districts are represented with an asterisk in this column as it is not certain what amount of the town's FY 2018 ECS funding will be directed to the regional school district.

Town	FY 2017 ECS Funding ^{35,36}	Projected Change in ECS Funding for FY 2018 ³⁷	Projected October ECS Payment ³⁸	Projected Reduction in District's Total Expenditures ^{39, a}
Essex	\$105,052	-\$105,052	\$0	*
Fairfield	\$1,087,165	-\$1,087,165	\$0	-1%
Farmington	\$1,095,080	-\$1,095,080	\$0	-2%
Franklin	\$923,278	-\$738,622	\$46,164	-18%
Glastonbury	\$6,654,380	-\$6,654,380	\$0	-6%
Goshen	\$82,025	-\$82,025	\$0	*
Granby	\$5,510,220	-\$5,510,220	\$0	-18%
Greenwich	\$136,859	-\$136,859	\$0	0%
Griswold	\$10,775,767	-\$4,310,307	\$1,616,365	-16%
Groton	\$25,040,045	-\$17,528,031	\$1,878,004	-22%
Guilford	\$2,740,394	-\$2,740,394	\$0	-5%
Haddam	\$1,971,482	-\$1,971,482	\$0	*
Hamden	\$26,945,481	\$0	\$6,736,370	0%
Hampton	\$1,312,383	-\$918,668	\$98,429	*
Hartford	\$200,518,244	\$0	\$50,129,561	0%
Hartland	\$1,327,652	-\$929,356	\$99,574	-17%
Harwinton	\$2,708,774	-\$2,708,774	\$0	*
Hebron	\$6,875,123	-\$6,187,611	\$171,878	*
Kent	\$25,634	-\$25,634	\$0	*
Killingly	\$15,574,402	\$0	\$3,893,601	0%
Killingworth	\$2,173,420	-\$2,173,420	\$0	*
Lebanon	\$5,410,404	-\$3,787,283	\$405,780	-19%
Ledyard	\$11,977,384	-\$5,988,692	\$1,497,173	-16%
Lisbon	\$3,518,715	-\$1,759,357	\$439,840	-17%
Litchfield	\$1,446,598	-\$1,446,598	\$0	-8%
Lyme	\$63,069	-\$63,069	\$0	*
Madison	\$446,496	-\$446,496	\$0	-1%
Manchester	\$34,440,424	\$0	\$8,610,106	0%
Mansfield	\$9,947,410	-\$3,978,964	\$1,492,112	*
Marlborough	\$3,154,015	-\$3,154,015	\$0	*
Meriden	\$60,258,395	\$0	\$15,064,599	0%
Middlebury	\$855,086	-\$855,086	\$0	*
Middlefield	\$2,099,315	-\$2,099,315	\$0	*
Middletown	\$19,515,825	\$0	\$4,878,956	0%
Milford	\$10,849,101	-\$10,849,101	\$0	-9%
Monroe	\$6,394,518	-\$6,394,518	\$0	-12%
Montville	\$12,589,621	-\$6,294,810	\$1,573,703	-16%
Morris	\$102,178	-\$102,178	\$0	*
Naugatuck	\$30,280,380	\$0	\$7,570,095	0%
New Britain	\$86,195,269	\$0	\$21,548,817	0%
New Canaan	\$339,590	-\$339,590	\$0	0%
New Fairfield	\$4,338,569	-\$4,338,569	\$0	-11%
New Hartford	\$3,113,169	-\$3,113,169	\$0	*
New Haven	\$154,301,977	\$0	\$38,575,494	0%
New London	\$25,806,077	\$0	\$6,451,519	0%
New Milford	\$11,832,806	-\$10,649,525	\$295,820	-17%
Newington	\$12,983,806	-\$11,685,425	\$324,595	-16%
Newtown	\$4,893,944	-\$4,893,944	\$0	-6%
Norfolk	\$25,815	-\$25,815	\$0	*
North Branford	\$8,076,776	-\$7,269,098	\$201,920	-23%
North Canaan	\$2,044,243	-\$1,635,394	\$102,212	*
North Haven	\$3,842,088	-\$3,842,088	\$0	-7%
North Stonington	\$2,834,470	-\$2,267,576	\$141,724	-17%
Norwalk	\$11,243,340	\$0	\$2,810,835	0%

Town	FY 2017 ECS Funding ^{35,36}	Projected Change in ECS Funding for FY 2018 ³⁷	Projected October ECS Payment ³⁸	Projected Reduction in District's Total Expenditures ^{39, a}
Norwich	\$36,209,664	\$0	\$9,052,416	0%
Old Lyme	\$247,462	-\$247,462	\$0	*
Old Saybrook	\$122,907	-\$122,907	\$0	0%
Orange	\$1,509,226	-\$1,509,226	\$0	*
Oxford	\$4,528,763	-\$4,528,763	\$0	-15%
Plainfield	\$15,364,444	-\$6,145,778	\$2,304,667	-17%
Plainville	\$10,272,197	-\$8,217,758	\$513,610	-21%
Plymouth	\$9,761,632	-\$9,761,632	\$0	-39%
Pomfret	\$3,073,015	-\$1,536,507	\$384,127	-14%
Portland	\$4,363,751	-\$4,363,751	\$0	-21%
Preston	\$3,012,017	-\$1,506,008	\$376,502	-13%
Prospect	\$5,297,609	-\$5,297,609	\$0	*
Putnam	\$8,340,282	\$0	\$2,085,071	0%
Redding	\$180,135	-\$180,135	\$0	*
Ridgefield	\$571,648	-\$571,648	\$0	-1%
Rocky Hill	\$4,250,230	-\$4,250,230	\$0	-10%
Roxbury	\$33,612	-\$33,612	\$0	*
Salem	\$3,049,314	-\$2,134,520	\$228,699	-19%
Salisbury	\$10,871	-\$10,871	\$0	*
Scotland	\$1,423,001	-\$996,101	\$106,725	*
Seymour	\$10,040,987	-\$8,032,790	\$502,049	-23%
Sharon	\$9,960	-\$9,960	\$0	*
Shelton	\$5,893,771	-\$5,893,771	\$0	-8%
Sherman	\$46,611	-\$46,611	\$0	-1%
Simsbury	\$6,087,799	-\$6,087,799	\$0	-9%
Somers	\$5,929,453	-\$2,964,726	\$741,182	-13%
South Windsor	\$12,826,469	-\$12,826,469	\$0	-17%
Southbury	\$3,458,266	-\$3,458,266	\$0	*
Southington	\$20,268,059	-\$20,268,059	\$0	-21%
Sprague	\$2,612,273	-\$1,044,909	\$391,841	-16%
Stafford	\$9,790,490	-\$7,832,392	\$489,525	-27%
Stamford	\$10,803,759	\$0	\$2,700,940	0%
Sterling	\$3,196,216	-\$1,598,108	\$399,527	-19%
Stonington	\$1,649,159	-\$1,649,159	\$0	-4%
Stratford	\$21,461,782	-\$21,461,782	\$0	-20%
Suffield	\$6,221,145	-\$4,354,801	\$466,586	-12%
Thomaston	\$5,624,815	-\$3,937,370	\$421,861	-25%
Thompson	\$7,534,704	-\$3,013,882	\$1,130,206	-16%
Tolland	\$10,699,177	-\$8,559,342	\$534,959	-21%
Torrington	\$24,482,865	-\$19,586,292	\$1,224,143	-26%
Trumbull	\$3,418,401	-\$3,418,401	\$0	-3%
Union	\$237,166	-\$237,166	\$0	-11%
Vernon	\$19,250,233	\$0	\$4,812,558	0%
Voluntown	\$2,502,621	-\$1,001,048	\$375,393	-13%
Wallingford	\$21,301,522	-\$19,171,370	\$532,538	-18%
Warren	\$33,205	-\$33,205	\$0	*
Washington	\$50,646	-\$50,646	\$0	*
Waterbury	\$133,606,066	\$0	\$33,401,517	0%
Waterford	\$321,279	-\$321,279	\$0	-1%
Watertown	\$11,753,175	-\$9,402,540	\$587,659	-22%
West Hartford	\$20,961,352	-\$20,961,352	\$0	-13%
West Haven	\$45,140,487	\$0	\$11,285,122	0%
Westbrook	\$70,393	-\$70,393	\$0	0%
Weston	\$263,431	-\$263,431	\$0	-1%

Town	FY 2017 ECS Funding ^{35,36}	Projected Change in ECS Funding for FY 2018 ³⁷	Projected October ECS Payment ³⁸	Projected Reduction in District's Total Expenditures ^{39, a}
Westport	\$465,334	-\$465,334	\$0	0%
Wethersfield	\$9,348,852	-\$9,348,852	\$0	-15%
Willington	\$3,637,161	-\$2,546,013	\$272,787	*
Wilton	\$462,941	-\$462,941	\$0	-1%
Winchester	\$8,024,957	\$0	\$2,006,239	0%
Windham	\$26,582,071	\$0	\$6,645,518	0%
Windsor	\$12,130,392	\$0	\$3,032,598	0%
Windsor Locks	\$5,167,806	\$0	\$1,291,952	0%
Wolcott	\$13,423,576	-\$6,711,788	\$1,677,947	-19%
Woodbridge	\$656,185	-\$656,185	\$0	*
Woodbury	\$1,276,811	-\$1,276,811	\$0	*
Woodstock	\$5,356,542	-\$3,749,579	\$401,741	-21%

Table 3 below details the projected change in total state education funding contained in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan for each town compared to FY 2017. These town education grant comparisons below were estimated using the impact of the order on state education grants to municipalities that exceeded \$10 million in total grant allocation in FY 2017. Although the *Sheff* Settlement and Adult Education grants both exceed \$10 million in statewide allocation, they were not included due to irregularity in appropriation (*Sheff* Settlement), and relationship to public K-12 education (Adult Education). The list of selected grants is below:⁴⁰

1. Education Cost Sharing (FY 2017 with rescissions)
2. Special Education Excess Cost
3. State Magnet School
4. Commissioner's Network
5. Vocational Agriculture
6. Open Choice
7. Priority School Districts

The inclusion of grants smaller than \$10 million may impact the calculation of total proposed state aid to municipalities and the determination of whether or not a town is proposed to receive more state funding in total than it currently receives.

The FY 2018 projected net change estimates in Table 3 were created by applying the percentage change in the total appropriation of a grant in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan from the sum of grant payments in FY 2017 to each actual town grant in FY 2017. Towns projected to receive an increase in state education funding in FY 2018 under the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan are highlighted in green, while towns projected to receive a decrease in state education funding are highlighted in red. In order to put these changes into context, the column on the far right shows the projected change, in terms of percent, in a district's FY 2016 total expenditures (the most recent year available),⁴¹ if the changes to all state education aid^b (not just the ECS grant) contained in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan were applied to the district's total expenditures.

^b With the exception of the omitted grants as detailed in the preceding two paragraphs.

It is important to note the projected reductions in this column only take into consideration reductions in state education aid and do not necessarily mean a district would see a reduction in its overall funding. For example, should the General Assembly not pass a budget before the proposed cuts in the Revised Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan are implemented, some towns may decide to replace some or all the reduced or eliminated state education funds with additional funding from local property taxes or use their budget reserves to make a one-time payment.

Table 3: Estimated Town-by-Town Net Change in Total State Education Funding for FY 2018

Town	FY 2017 Total State Education Funding ^{42,43}	Projected Change in Total State Education Funding for FY 2018 ⁴⁴	Projected Reduction in Total District Expenditures ^{45,c}
Andover	\$2,408,281	-\$1,863,860	*
Ansonia	\$17,858,541	\$20,624	0%
Ashford	\$4,024,685	-\$2,705,951	*
Avon	\$3,116,504	-\$632,173	-1%
Barkhamsted	\$1,814,743	-\$1,638,992	*
Beacon Falls	\$4,312,894	-\$4,064,464	*
Berlin	\$7,406,082	-\$6,163,028	-13%
Bethany	\$2,286,127	-\$1,994,728	*
Bethel	\$8,906,696	-\$8,076,543	-17%
Bethlehem	\$1,631,008	-\$1,294,514	*
Bloomfield	\$11,855,330	-\$10,534	0%
Bolton	\$3,681,252	-\$2,643,843	-18%
Bozrah	\$1,223,830	-\$979,064	-17%
Branford	\$2,966,358	-\$2,192,722	-4%
Bridgeport	\$204,414,619	-\$5,557,455	-2%
Bridgewater	\$23,149	-\$23,012	*
Bristol	\$49,189,087	\$61,159	0%
Brookfield	\$2,071,212	-\$1,408,678	-3%
Brooklyn	\$7,397,332	-\$2,784,421	-15%
Burlington	\$4,702,178	-\$4,354,394	*
Canaan	\$286,426	-\$181,882	*
Canterbury	\$4,665,608	-\$1,866,243	-16%
Canton	\$4,782,638	-\$3,329,256	-13%
Chaplin	\$1,857,013	-\$928,496	*
Cheshire	\$10,188,710	-\$8,476,648	-12%
Chester	\$710,278	-\$658,496	*
Clinton	\$6,628,785	-\$6,322,741	-20%
Colchester	\$14,273,964	-\$9,441,455	-23%
Colebrook	\$566,729	-\$493,038	*
Columbia	\$2,809,178	-\$1,762,392	-14%
Cornwall	\$76,749	-\$9,957	*
Coventry	\$9,488,109	-\$6,994,607	-25%
Cromwell	\$6,053,258	-\$4,597,508	-15%
Danbury	\$36,067,854	-\$2,090,395	-1%
Darien	\$3,268,129	-\$366,317	0%
Deep River	\$1,842,198	-\$1,672,735	*
Derby	\$9,273,817	-\$1,024,639	-4%

^c Towns participating in regional school districts are represented with an asterisk in this column as it is not certain what amount of the town's FY 2018 state education funding will be directed to the regional school district.

Town	FY 2017 Total State Education Funding ^{42, 43}	Projected Change in Total State Education Funding for FY 2018 ⁴⁴	Projected Reduction in Total District Expenditures ^{45, c}
Durham	\$4,125,089	-\$3,892,089	*
East Granby	\$2,105,397	-\$1,399,129	-8%
East Haddam	\$3,956,591	-\$3,313,706	-16%
East Hampton	\$8,012,127	-\$6,024,520	-20%
East Hartford	\$54,989,120	-\$933,928	-1%
East Haven	\$20,342,329	\$13,272	0%
East Lyme	\$7,668,337	-\$6,908,500	-15%
East Windsor	\$6,271,124	\$36,338	0%
Eastford	\$1,096,204	-\$764,256	-20%
Easton	\$1,121,819	-\$159,747	*
Ellington	\$10,455,926	-\$7,717,116	-21%
Enfield	\$30,630,419	-\$19,936,136	-25%
Essex	\$301,518	-\$102,280	*
Fairfield	\$4,798,250	-\$1,021,984	-1%
Farmington	\$2,519,222	-\$1,025,274	-2%
Franklin	\$924,410	-\$738,606	-18%
Glastonbury	\$8,134,527	-\$6,650,916	-6%
Goshen	\$370,982	-\$101,110	*
Granby	\$6,457,560	-\$5,456,082	-18%
Greenwich	\$1,021,858	-\$124,374	0%
Griswold	\$11,309,715	-\$4,302,775	-16%
Groton	\$26,144,507	-\$17,514,356	-22%
Guilford	\$4,238,876	-\$2,719,540	-5%
Haddam	\$2,319,904	-\$1,966,567	*
Hamden	\$28,624,296	\$23,955	0%
Hampton	\$1,312,397	-\$918,668	*
Hartford	\$277,236,022	-\$5,367,524	-1%
Hartland	\$1,327,652	-\$929,356	-17%
Harwinton	\$2,891,588	-\$2,706,131	*
Hebron	\$7,164,117	-\$6,183,534	*
Kent	\$128,777	-\$30,040	*
Killingly	\$16,989,596	-\$18,049	0%
Killingworth	\$2,423,009	-\$2,169,899	*
Lebanon	\$6,156,641	-\$3,799,465	-19%
Ledyard	\$13,636,471	-\$6,020,616	-16%
Lisbon	\$3,823,496	-\$1,755,184	-17%
Litchfield	\$1,675,386	-\$1,443,371	-8%
Lyme	\$97,000	-\$62,617	*
Madison	\$1,189,673	-\$436,012	-1%
Manchester	\$35,250,848	\$10,897	0%
Mansfield	\$10,452,589	-\$3,989,784	*
Marlborough	\$3,321,621	-\$3,151,651	*
Meriden	\$63,331,250	-\$1,197,986	-1%
Middlebury	\$1,437,567	-\$847,002	*
Middlefield	\$2,221,766	-\$2,097,602	*
Middletown	\$22,202,355	\$7,529	0%
Milford	\$12,435,310	-\$10,818,905	-9%
Monroe	\$7,369,909	-\$6,381,123	-12%
Montville	\$12,986,284	-\$6,290,083	-16%
Morris	\$348,829	-\$118,469	*
Naugatuck	\$30,882,449	\$6,212	0%
New Britain	\$91,932,917	-\$2,014,512	-1%
New Canaan	\$1,337,590	-\$325,525	0%
New Fairfield	\$4,566,292	-\$4,335,623	-11%

Town	FY 2017 Total State Education Funding ^{42, 43}	Projected Change in Total State Education Funding for FY 2018 ⁴⁴	Projected Reduction in Total District Expenditures ^{45, c}
New Hartford	\$3,457,000	-\$3,122,185	*
New Haven	\$205,142,834	-\$5,094,898	-1%
New London	\$35,864,639	-\$1,031,058	-2%
New Milford	\$12,631,069	-\$10,638,474	-17%
Newington	\$13,874,421	-\$11,652,479	-16%
Newtown	\$6,455,377	-\$4,872,547	-6%
Norfolk	\$88,293	-\$27,646	*
North Branford	\$8,308,561	-\$7,260,752	-23%
North Canaan	\$2,244,462	-\$1,643,947	*
North Haven	\$5,409,220	-\$3,811,771	-7%
North Stonington	\$2,834,470	-\$2,267,576	-17%
Norwalk	\$21,991,719	-\$4,199,621	-2%
Norwich	\$39,596,605	-\$990,293	-1%
Old Lyme	\$375,021	-\$245,762	*
Old Saybrook	\$608,443	-\$116,058	0%
Orange	\$2,411,223	-\$1,492,659	*
Oxford	\$5,111,725	-\$4,520,637	-15%
Plainfield	\$16,081,864	-\$6,136,218	-17%
Plainville	\$12,635,778	-\$8,086,363	-21%
Plymouth	\$10,713,264	-\$9,749,905	-39%
Pomfret	\$3,571,325	-\$1,529,477	-14%
Portland	\$4,957,370	-\$4,335,676	-21%
Preston	\$3,339,565	-\$1,501,476	-13%
Prospect	\$5,671,419	-\$5,292,336	*
Putnam	\$9,532,318	-\$690,666	-3%
Redding	\$1,087,443	-\$167,092	*
Ridgefield	\$2,192,082	-\$548,789	-1%
Rocky Hill	\$4,805,206	-\$4,234,602	-10%
Roxbury	\$33,812	-\$33,609	*
Salem	\$3,239,117	-\$2,131,842	-19%
Salisbury	\$156,485	-\$17,092	*
Scotland	\$1,481,369	-\$995,278	*
Seymour	\$10,799,444	-\$8,022,161	-23%
Sharon	\$146,473	-\$15,792	*
Shelton	\$7,455,805	-\$5,871,989	-8%
Sherman	\$86,044	-\$46,055	-1%
Simsbury	\$8,168,721	-\$5,999,826	-9%
Somers	\$6,199,789	-\$2,957,781	-13%
South Windsor	\$15,108,254	-\$12,747,137	-17%
Southbury	\$4,716,517	-\$3,440,803	*
Southington	\$22,850,236	-\$20,252,410	-21%
Sprague	\$2,698,287	-\$1,043,920	-16%
Stafford	\$10,117,082	-\$7,827,785	-27%
Stamford	\$24,941,911	-\$2,559,741	-1%
Sterling	\$3,365,208	-\$1,595,796	-19%
Stonington	\$2,389,734	-\$1,639,692	-4%
Stratford	\$23,693,429	-\$21,431,353	-20%
Suffield	\$7,762,633	-\$4,329,487	-12%
Thomaston	\$6,026,173	-\$3,932,826	-25%
Thompson	\$7,954,500	-\$3,008,054	-16%
Tolland	\$11,967,528	-\$8,541,493	-21%
Torrington	\$26,273,736	-\$19,561,028	-26%
Trumbull	\$5,200,749	-\$3,436,238	-3%
Union	\$237,166	-\$237,166	-11%

Town	FY 2017 Total State Education Funding ^{42, 43}	Projected Change in Total State Education Funding for FY 2018 ⁴⁴	Projected Reduction in Total District Expenditures ^{45, c}
Vernon	\$20,342,335	-\$1,010	0%
Voluntown	\$2,515,621	-\$1,001,005	-13%
Wallingford	\$24,075,839	-\$19,200,399	-18%
Warren	\$160,123	-\$41,588	*
Washington	\$50,923	-\$50,642	*
Waterbury	\$147,770,138	-\$2,321,392	-1%
Waterford	\$973,625	-\$313,043	-1%
Watertown	\$12,613,772	-\$9,390,400	-22%
West Hartford	\$25,768,095	-\$20,844,752	-13%
West Haven	\$47,358,809	\$29,024	0%
Westbrook	\$136,043	-\$69,467	0%
Weston	\$1,078,741	-\$248,061	0%
Westport	\$1,257,260	-\$443,768	0%
Wethersfield	\$11,682,710	-\$9,290,766	-15%
Willington	\$3,876,880	-\$2,549,941	*
Wilton	\$1,590,215	-\$447,081	-1%
Winchester	\$10,351,100	\$170,669	1%
Windham	\$31,137,515	-\$933,329	-1%
Windsor	\$13,645,488	\$21,211	0%
Windsor Locks	\$6,081,857	\$65,603	0%
Wolcott	\$14,161,209	-\$6,703,357	-19%
Woodbridge	\$1,163,856	-\$645,977	*
Woodbury	\$2,381,601	-\$1,325,987	*
Woodstock	\$5,649,136	-\$3,745,521	-21%

Endnotes

- ¹ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ² Ct. Exec. Order No. 2017-58 (June 30, 2017), <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/C28A235895764639AA819BFBAE575B1D.pdf>.
- ³ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2017). *Executive Order Resource Allocation Plan Fiscal Year 2018*. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/PressRoom/20170626--Executive-Order-Resource-Allocation-Plan.pdf?la=en>.
- ⁴ Wysock, R. (2017). *State of Connecticut Budgeting* [PowerPoint slides]. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Fiscal Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.cga.ct.gov/ofa/Documents/year/PRES/2017PRES-20170207_State%20of%20Connecticut%20Budget%20Process%20Presentation.pdf.
- ⁵ Stuart, C. (2017, August 1). Up Next? A \$3.5 Billion Budget Deficit. *CTNewsJunkie*. Retrieved from http://www.ctnewsjunkie.com/archives/entry/up_next_a_3.5_billion_budget_deficit/.
- ⁶ Pazniokas, M. (2017, June 8). Malloy tries to focus budget talks with a veto threat. *Connecticut Mirror*. Retrieved from <https://ctmirror.org/2017/06/08/malloy-tries-to-focus-budget-talks-with-a-veto-threat/>.
- ⁷ Stuart, C. (2017, August 1). Up Next? A \$3.5 Billion Budget Deficit. *CTNewsJunkie*. Retrieved from http://www.ctnewsjunkie.com/archives/entry/up_next_a_3.5_billion_budget_deficit/.
- ⁸ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management, & Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Fiscal Analysis. (2017). *State of Connecticut Consensus Revenue, May 1, 2017*. Retrieved from http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/budget/consensusrevenue/fy2017/final_consensus_may1_2017.pdf.
- ⁹ State of Connecticut, Office of the Governor. (2017). *Gov. Malloy: Actuarial Analysis Affirms Billions in Taxpayer Dollars Will be Save by Adopting Framework Reached With State Employee Unions* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://portal.ct.gov/en/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/Press-Releases/2017/06-2017/Gov-Malloy-Actuarial-Analysis-Affirms-Billions-in-Taxpayer-Dollars-Will-be-Saved>.
- ¹⁰ H.R. 202, July 2017, Gen. Assembly. (Ct. 2017); S.R. 51, July 2017, Gen. Assembly. (Ct. 2017)
- ¹¹ Roy, K. (2017, May 1). Update and FAQ on CT's Fiscal Crisis. *Connecticut School Finance Project*. Retrieved from <http://ctschoolfinance.org/news/2017/update-on-fiscal-crisis>.
- ¹² Stuart, C. (2017, August 1). Up Next? A \$3.5 Billion Budget Deficit. *CTNewsJunkie*. Retrieved from http://www.ctnewsjunkie.com/archives/entry/up_next_a_3.5_billion_budget_deficit/.
- ¹³ State of Connecticut, Office of the Governor. (2017). *Gov. Malloy: Actuarial Analysis Affirms Billions in Taxpayer Dollars Will be Save by Adopting Framework Reached With State Employee Unions* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://portal.ct.gov/en/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/Press-Releases/2017/06-2017/Gov-Malloy-Actuarial-Analysis-Affirms-Billions-in-Taxpayer-Dollars-Will-be-Saved>.
- ¹⁴ Constable, K. (2017, June 13). Budget talks testy as deadline inches closer. *Connecticut Mirror*. Retrieved from <https://ctmirror.org/2017/06/13/budget-talks-testy-as-deadline-nears/>.
- ¹⁵ State of Connecticut, Office of the Governor. (2017). *Gov. Malloy's Prepared Remarks from Today's News Conference Regarding the State Budget* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://portal.ct.gov/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/Press-Releases/2017/06-2017/Gov-Malloys-Prepared-Remarks-from-Todays-News-Conference-Regarding-the-State-Budget>.
- ¹⁶ Phaneuf, K. M. (2016, October 31). Budget deficits and state elections have a turbulent history. *Connecticut Mirror*. Retrieved from <https://ctmirror.org/2016/10/31/budget-deficits-and-state-elections-have-a-turbulent-history/>.
- ¹⁷ Wysock, R. (2017). *State of Connecticut Budgeting* [PowerPoint slides]. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Fiscal Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.cga.ct.gov/ofa/Documents/year/PRES/2017PRES-20170207_State%20of%20Connecticut%20Budget%20Process%20Presentation.pdf.
- ¹⁸ Ct. Exec. Order No. 2017-58 (June 30, 2017), <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/C28A235895764639AA819BFBAE575B1D.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ²⁰ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2016). *FY 17 Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Lapse Savings*. Retrieved from <http://tiny.cc/h6i4hy>.

-
- ²¹ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2016, August 9). Priority School District Program. Retrieved from <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2618&q=321612>.
- ²⁶ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ²⁷ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2016). *FY 17 Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Lapse Savings*. Retrieved from <http://tiny.cc/h6i4hy>.
- ²⁸ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017, August 7). Alliance Districts. Retrieved from <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2683&Q=334226>.
- ²⁹ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ³⁰ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2017). *Governor's FY 2018 - 2019 Biennial Budget*. Available from <http://www.ct.gov/opm/cwp/view.asp?a=2958&Q=590066&PM=1>.
- ³¹ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ³² State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2016). *FY 17 Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Lapse Savings*. Retrieved from <http://tiny.cc/h6i4hy>.
- ³³ Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 172, § 10-262i.
- ³⁴ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Connecticut End of Year School Reports (ED001s) for Local Public School Districts, 2009-16*. Available from <http://ctschoolfinance.org/data/ed001s-local-districts>.
- ³⁵ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Grant Payment Report*. Available from <https://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/dgm/grantreports1/paydetlMain.aspx>.
- ³⁶ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2016). *FY 17 Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Lapse Savings*. Retrieved from <http://tiny.cc/h6i4hy>.
- ³⁷ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.
- ³⁸ These estimations were calculated by multiplying the FY 2018 ECS grant by 25 percent in accordance with the statutory ECS payment schedule cited in Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 172, § 10-262i.
- ³⁹ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Connecticut End of Year School Reports (ED001s) for Local Public School Districts, 2009-16*. Available from <http://ctschoolfinance.org/data/ed001s-local-districts>.
- ⁴⁰ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Grant Payment Report*. Available from <https://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/dgm/grantreports1/paydetlMain.aspx>.
- ⁴¹ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Connecticut End of Year School Reports (ED001s) for Local Public School Districts, 2009-16*. Available from <http://ctschoolfinance.org/data/ed001s-local-districts>.
- ⁴² Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Grant Payment Report*. Available from <https://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/dgm/grantreports1/paydetlMain.aspx>.
- ⁴³ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2016). *FY 17 Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Lapse Savings*. Retrieved from <http://tiny.cc/h6i4hy>.
- ⁴⁴ Barnes, B. (2017). *Revisions to the Executive Order 58 Resource Allocation Plan and Municipal Aid - Town-by-Town Data*. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Available from <http://portal.ct.gov/-/media/Office-of-the-Governor/Press-Room/20170818-EO-Resource-Revisions.pdf?la=en>.

⁴⁵ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2017). *Connecticut End of Year School Reports (ED001s) for Local Public School Districts, 2009-16*. Available from <http://ctschoolfinance.org/data/ed001s-local-districts>.