

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE

OBJECTIVES FOR NEW OR AMENDED FORMULA & RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

The ECS grant provides significant funding from the State of Connecticut to its 169 towns and cities to help fulfill the requirement under the state Constitution that “there shall always be free public elementary and secondary schools in the state”(Art. Eighth, § 1) and under state law “that each child shall have... equal opportunity to receive a suitable program of educational experiences” (CGS § 10-4a).

The Formula Committee has focused on the education aid grant formula as set forth in section 10-262h of the general statutes as charged by the Legislature. We have identified objectives which we believe will give clarity and purpose to the ECS grant process, and to its funding. We have specific and general recommendations that if adopted will provide guidance and stability to a complex and sometimes controversial exercise of determining the annual allocations.

We believe that the recommendations if adopted will lead to a fairer and more predictable allocation, and a more understandable and reliable process. There are, however, numerous variables that ultimately determine the district by district allocations, and changes that have been made over the years that have created some inconsistencies that may require in depth analysis. In addition, the ultimate ECS grant amount also is an important factor in determining the specific allocations and this total amount is not presently funded. The amount to be funded in the near future is also not known since economic conditions exist that will conceivably alter that amount. It therefore makes sense for the recommendations to be compared to the Current Law Target Amount to demonstrate the outcome of the recommendations when compared to the current formula. There are of course minor adjustments and variations that can be applied that will alter the district allocations.

What is critically important is that once the ECS grant is determined it be fully funded from year to year with an appropriate phase-in period if required. The uncertainty and unpredictability of the present funding creates undue hardships on districts making it very difficult for them to adequately forecast their annual budgets.

The recommendations if adopted will provide a path that will lead to a fairer and more understandable ECS grant process. There are variations of the recommendations that can be prepared and perhaps additional analysis and work needs to be done. There can be no doubt that if the recommendations or variations of them are adopted, and a strong commitment by government is made to annually commit the funds to ECS, there will be a significant improvement to the ECS process that will greatly benefit the educational system, students of Connecticut.

I GENERAL OBJECTIVES

1 Comply with State Constitutional requirements for the equalization of educational opportunities.

Court cases have consistently determined that students must receive an equal educational opportunity. The ECS formula must therefore continue to strive to direct state money inversely to districts' capacity to pay for education.

2 Help close the achievement gap.

The achievement gap in Connecticut must be eliminated. This will require an effort by the State to ensure that all school districts have the resources necessary to help achieve this objective but particularly those districts with the greatest needs and the lowest achievement.

II SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

OBJECTIVE 1

Eliminate the uncertainty of annual ECS grant

RECOMMENDATION

Establish Target Grant and Criteria to Maintain Grant Over a Period of Years

ECS grants are an integral part of educational funding, and the state should adopt a four-year funding goal for the new updated ECS formula starting in FY 14 and commit to reaching at least 90% of the goal within four years and 100% within two years thereafter. Funding the new formula target goal will be contingent on the state's financial capability, *but there should be criteria specifying the extraordinary circumstances under which the ECS goal would not be fully funded.*

At the end of the period that the formula is fully funded, the state should adopt a new four-year funding goal, after reevaluating the formula and its policy rationale, and making necessary or desirable adjustments.

As much as possible, grants should be predictable by the districts to allow for more accurate budgeting. Current data should be incorporated into the formula and frozen for a four-year period to assure within a range the formula amounts that will be granted.

As part of this commitment by the state, local districts must be committed to spending the funds that are required for educational purposes. Future ECS grants could be adjusted if these funds are not utilized for education.

OBJECTIVE 2

Establish a process to weight property values and income in determining town wealth that is more equitable, stable and free of distortions.

RECOMMENDATION

Use Median Household Income (MHI) with Property Values to Determine Town Wealth on a more equitable basis.

It would appear that using median household income alone, as opposed to per capita income and median household, as the single income measure will provide a more precise measure of district income. Combined with one single measure of property values as opposed to using two measures of property values, this data should result in a fairer and more stable measurement of wealth. Three year rolling averages of data should be utilized whenever possible.

Currently, property values are the dominant measure of wealth. Although median household income and per-capita income were also used, the computation itself heavily weighted property values. It is recommended that median household income be given a more equal weighting to property values in order to more accurately reflect the wealth of a district.

The weighting of median household income and property values needs to be weighted in a way that appropriately recognizes the districts that are poorer in median income but may have above average property values. This will require the testing of various weighting formulas in order to determine the weighting that best achieves the required results.

OBJECTIVE **3**

Update data used in determining wealth.

RECOMMENDATION

Use American Community Survey Income Data

At present the income data used to determine wealth is at least ten years old and since the US Census no longer records income data, a new and current source of this information is required.

American Community Survey data is current and reliable and has been adopted by the US Census Bureau. It is also possible that in the future the Department of Revenue Services can ask residents to provide school district information on their personal income tax returns. If this is done a comparative analysis can be prepared to determine which data gathering process provides the most reliable information. *What is important is that current data be utilized as opposed to census bureau data that is ten or more years old.*

OBJECTIVE **4**

Determine a new measure of Student Need

RECOMMENDATION

Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility should be used to determine ECS student need weighting.

Various weighting methods were tested including Title 1, District Performance Index, and Husky A eligibility along with Free and Reduced Lunch eligibility. There was a high correlation of the various methods but it does appear that Free & Reduced Price lunch provided funding to districts in need in higher amounts and also correlated highly to the other measures particularly the District Performance Index.

OBJECTIVE 5

Consider increasing allocations to Alliance Districts

RECOMMENDATION

At the present time the Alliance Districts received approximately 62.5% of the 2012/13 entitlement and in the current law target amount would receive approximately 60%. Consideration should be given to increasing this allocation to approximately 64%. This should be done even in times of economic constraint to ensure that the overall balance of the ECS formula is weighted to the neediest districts.

OBJECTIVE 6

Provide a system that allocates lower funding levels to districts

RECOMMENDATION

Reduce Minimum Aid to Wealthier Towns

A revision of the ECS should require some reduction of minimum aid funding for wealthier towns. Communities in need should receive sufficient and adequate funding and minimum aid to communities that are not in need should be reduced from 9% to 2%. Perhaps this reduction can be phased in over a four to six-year period to the lower minimum aid levels.

OBJECTIVE 7

Reserve a part of the ECS grant for lower performing districts

RECOMMENDATION

Create Incentives to Establish Best Practices and Success

A determined amount would be contingent on the State Department of Education approving district plans to improve performance. This is to ensure that the lowest performing districts are implementing generally accepted, critical, research-based best practices to improve student

achievement. A small percentage of the grants should be contingent on the districts' specific plans and their performance in meeting their educational goals. Districts whose performance improves but whose wealth level remains the same should continue to receive this special funding. Expansion of this program should be considered depending on future success.

Consideration should also be given to merging other school and district categorical grants into the reserve portion of the ECS Alliance District grant programs provided that it does not supplant ECS funding. This will increase efficiency and by adding these grants into the reserve portion of the ECS Alliance District grant programs it should be understood that this is not meant as a reduction of those grants nor a replacement for ECS funding.

OBJECTIVE 8

Establish the ECS foundation amount.

RECOMMENDATION

Base Foundation on Present Estimates and Consider Comprehensive Study for Future Estimates

The foundation is a key component in the formula and it must be adjusted to more accurately reflect current needs and costs. Criteria should be adapted to periodically increase the foundation amount so that it reflects the costs of educating public school children in Connecticut.

Consideration should be given to a comprehensive cost study regarding the demographic, economic, and education cost factors that should be considered in determining an appropriate foundation level for the cost of education. This study should also review the allocation of educational costs and staff ratios in order to appropriately analyze efficiencies and effectiveness.

The larger the share of overall funding for public education that comes from state sources, the more equal the educational opportunities are across Connecticut's 169 towns. Thus, the state must make a long-term commitment to increasing its proportional share of total educational funding in the state. This commitment must be faithfully carried out in the biennial state budget through annual increases in total state funding for education (including funding for ECS grants) that, in the aggregate, exceeds annual increases in education spending from locally generated revenues.

Because the ECS grant is the largest single component of the state's support for elementary and secondary education, annual increases in the total ECS grant appropriation are required to enable the state to continue making progress toward the goal of equalizing educational opportunities for all students, regardless of where they live.

ECS TASK FORCE
BRIEF SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FORMULA & CURRENT LAW FORMULA
DECEMBER 2012

	<u>CURRENT LAW FORMULA</u>	<u>PROPOSED NEW FORMULA</u>
<u>Wealth Measure</u>		
Income measurement	Median Household Income & Per Capita Income used	Median Household Income only
Income measurement source	US Census Bureau (2000 census) Data at least 10 years old	American Community Survey* Current data
Property Value (ENGL)	2 Rating methods used	Only 1 rating method-Property value Divided by population
Weighting	Property values weighted higher than income	Property value and income weighted more equally
<u>Needs Measure</u>		
Source	Title 1 students	Free & Reduced Price Lunch
Weighting	1.33 for poverty, 1.15 for ELL (LEP)	1.30 for all FRPL students
<u>Other Measures</u>		
Foundation	\$9,687	\$11,754
Minimum Aid Ratio (other than Alliance Districts)	9%	2%
Minimum Aid Ratio- Alliance Districts	9%	10%
State Guaranteed Wealth Level Threshold Factor	1.75%	1.50%
<u>Summary of Results</u>		
Alliance Districts	\$1.623 billion	\$1.716 billion
Poorest Districts (deciles 9 & 10)	\$1.642 billion	\$1.703 billion
Lowest Performing DRGs	\$1.297 billion	\$1.371 billion
Urban Areas (over \$50 million ECF Funds)	\$1.184 billion	\$1.229 billion

** Possible future source: Department of Revenue Services could ask residents to provide school district information on their personal income tax returns.*

ECS GENERAL & SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS ACCOMPANYING FINANCIAL MODEL

Note: The model presented is for comparative purposes only to demonstrate the changes that the ECS Task Force recommendations have when compared to the current law target amount. The new formula would increase the allocations to the alliance districts, the poorer districts, the lower performing districts and the urban centers. A phase in period of funding and changes distributed equally over a four year period has been assumed. Minor adjustments can be made that will alter the amounts that districts receive. In addition, the number of years as well as the rate that the funding and changes are phased in could also be altered.

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

- ▶ The targeted amount of the current law of approximately \$2.7 billion has been used for the new formula as well as to compare results.
- ▶ A phase in period has been assumed of the funding amounts of the new formula entitlement as well as for any impact that the new formula has on current district allocations.
- ▶ Districts in need and those under performing will receive a larger proportion of the funding than they do under current law.

SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS

I Phase-In

- ▶ Simulation is based on the new formula funding level being phased in equally over a 4 year period. Differences in funding between new formula and the current law target entitlement would also be phased in over a 4 year period.
- ▶ Data would be frozen over phase-in period.

Note: It is possible that budgetary considerations may require the ECS grant to not be phased in at the 25% rate in the early years. As economic conditions improve the phase-in would be accelerated over the later years to reach the target level. If this were to occur the alliance districts could receive a disproportionately larger share of the additional funding than they otherwise would receive.

II Foundation

- ▶ For the recommended formula, a foundation of approximately \$12,000 is used.

III Need Weighted Students

- ▶ Free & Reduced Price Lunch eligibility has been used to determine need students.

IV Town Wealth

- ▶ Median Household Income (MHI) replaces the average of MHI and Per Capita Income (PCI). Current data is utilized for MHI.
- ▶ Property Tax Base and MHI are weighted in the determination of Town Wealth. In the model, the weighting is approximately 50% for property values and 50% for median household income.
- ▶ State Guaranteed Wealth Level is set at 1.5 times the median town wealth.

V Target Aid

- ▶ The Minimum Aid Ratio be reduced from 9% to 2%.
- ▶ Alliance Districts will receive a minimum aid ratio of 10%.
- ▶ No hold harmless has been assumed.

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
(Hold Harmless)

	December 24, 2012			
	Foundation	\$9,687	\$11,754	
	SGWL/Threshold Factor	1.75	1.50	
	Minimum Aid Ratio - Non-Alliance	9%	2%	
	Minimum Aid Ratio - Alliance	9%	10%	
	Loss from Prior Year	No	No	
	Total Distributed through Formula	\$50,000,000	\$2,696,928,459	
			Subcommittee	
Town	Town	Entitlement	Recommendation	
Code	Name	2012-13	Hold Harmless	
1	Andover	2,367,466	2,634,536	
2	Ansonia	15,571,383	21,169,830	
3	Ashford	3,931,796	3,931,796	
4	Avon	1,232,688	2,730,133	
5	Barkhamsted	1,654,360	2,279,518	
6	Beacon Falls	4,109,097	4,626,697	
7	Berlin	6,280,132	8,976,411	
8	Bethany	2,042,361	2,042,361	
9	Bethel	8,228,760	9,881,662	
10	Bethlehem	1,318,800	1,438,061	
11	Bloomfield	5,614,895	10,996,059	
12	Bolton	3,038,788	3,038,788	
13	Bozrah	1,242,936	1,609,317	
14	Branford	1,824,612	10,977,275	
15	Bridgeport	168,599,571	211,445,056	
16	Bridgewater	137,292	137,292	
17	Bristol	43,047,496	57,136,815	
18	Brookfield	1,545,179	2,071,077	
19	Brooklyn	7,058,407	7,851,143	
20	Burlington	4,354,540	4,354,540	
21	Canaan	209,258	331,561	
22	Canterbury	4,754,383	4,754,383	
23	Canton	3,421,074	5,523,389	
24	Chaplin	1,893,247	1,893,247	
25	Cheshire	9,376,495	11,520,700	
26	Chester	665,733	1,531,399	
27	Clinton	6,502,667	7,110,104	
28	Colchester	13,723,859	13,723,859	
29	Colebrook	506,256	813,167	
30	Columbia	2,563,631	2,827,716	
31	Cornwall	85,322	85,322	
32	Coventry	8,918,028	8,918,028	
33	Cromwell	4,423,837	8,087,448	
34	Danbury	24,554,515	62,215,222	

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
(Hold Harmless)

35	Darien	1,616,006	1,616,006	
36	Deep River	1,711,882	2,843,299	
37	Derby	7,146,221	12,256,662	
38	Durham	3,986,743	3,986,743	
39	Eastford	1,116,844	1,116,844	
40	East Granby	1,349,822	3,198,016	
41	East Haddam	3,765,035	4,670,569	
42	East Hampton	7,665,929	7,780,357	
43	East Hartford	43,425,561	66,094,135	
44	East Haven	19,253,992	24,339,374	
45	East Lyme	7,132,157	8,826,900	
46	Easton	593,868	593,868	
47	East Windsor	5,650,470	7,118,446	
48	Ellington	9,649,604	12,323,598	
49	Enfield	28,810,492	35,758,955	
50	Essex	389,697	620,994	
51	Fairfield	3,590,008	3,590,008	
52	Farmington	1,611,013	6,898,348	
53	Franklin	948,235	1,088,129	
54	Glastonbury	6,415,031	12,721,412	
55	Goshen	218,188	218,188	
56	Granby	5,477,633	6,874,752	
57	Greenwich	3,418,642	3,418,642	
58	Griswold	10,878,817	12,567,524	
59	Groton	25,625,179	28,357,001	
60	Guilford	3,058,981	4,370,216	
61	Haddam	1,776,625	4,455,551	
62	Hamden	23,913,747	42,692,580	
63	Hampton	1,339,928	1,339,928	
64	Hartford	192,783,001	237,178,255	
65	Hartland	1,358,660	1,358,660	
66	Harwinton	2,760,313	3,384,939	
67	Hebron	6,969,354	6,969,354	
68	Kent	167,342	167,342	
69	Killingly	15,625,767	17,910,640	
70	Killingworth	2,237,730	2,378,330	
71	Lebanon	5,523,871	5,523,871	
72	Ledyard	12,141,501	12,141,501	
73	Lisbon	3,927,193	3,927,193	
74	Litchfield	1,508,386	3,027,087	
75	Lyme	145,556	145,556	
76	Madison	1,576,061	1,576,061	
77	Manchester	31,962,679	47,590,676	
78	Mansfield	10,156,014	11,302,392	
79	Marlborough	3,171,682	3,284,484	
80	Meriden	55,561,122	73,546,725	
81	Middlebury	714,234	2,156,470	
82	Middlefield	2,132,776	2,716,311	

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
(Hold Harmless)

83	Middletown	17,449,023	33,898,248	
84	Milford	11,048,292	29,838,432	
85	Monroe	6,592,969	6,592,969	
86	Montville	12,715,670	15,325,470	
87	Morris	657,975	657,975	
88	Naugatuck	29,846,550	34,488,809	
89	New Britain	76,583,631	111,227,872	
90	New Canaan	1,495,604	1,495,604	
91	New Fairfield	4,451,451	4,766,859	
92	New Hartford	3,167,099	4,363,089	
93	New Haven	146,351,428	179,397,731	
94	Newington	12,895,927	21,606,287	
95	New London	23,749,566	33,484,979	
96	New Milford	12,080,862	15,354,457	
97	Newtown	4,338,374	7,513,412	
98	Norfolk	381,414	381,414	
99	North Branford	8,225,632	9,287,995	
100	North Canaan	2,091,544	2,605,398	
101	North Haven	3,295,851	10,086,552	
102	North Stonington	2,906,538	2,906,538	
103	Norwalk	10,672,607	27,715,408	
104	Norwich	33,341,525	43,612,932	
105	Old Lyme	605,586	605,586	
106	Old Saybrook	652,677	652,677	
107	Orange	1,107,407	4,704,513	
108	Oxford	4,667,270	4,667,270	
109	Plainfield	15,560,284	16,737,477	
110	Plainville	10,346,140	13,715,878	
111	Plymouth	9,876,832	10,699,166	
112	Pomfret	3,130,001	3,550,011	
113	Portland	4,347,783	6,001,777	
114	Preston	3,077,693	3,077,693	
115	Prospect	5,377,654	6,147,989	
116	Putnam	8,251,714	9,477,119	
117	Redding	687,733	687,733	
118	Ridgefield	2,063,814	2,063,814	
119	Rocky Hill	3,481,162	10,361,643	
120	Roxbury	158,114	158,114	
121	Salem	3,114,216	3,114,216	
122	Salisbury	187,266	187,266	
123	Scotland	1,450,305	1,450,305	
124	Seymour	10,004,094	12,862,077	
125	Sharon	145,798	145,798	
126	Shelton	5,146,279	16,130,084	
127	Sherman	244,327	244,327	
128	Simsbury	5,513,204	7,898,343	
129	Somers	5,975,301	6,280,698	
130	Southbury	2,518,902	10,829,677	

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
(Hold Harmless)

131	Southington	20,191,195	28,928,386	
132	South Windsor	13,017,444	14,790,047	
133	Sprague	2,632,445	2,880,099	
134	Stafford	9,930,162	11,001,399	
135	Stamford	8,899,110	20,994,501	
136	Sterling	3,211,166	4,182,008	
137	Stonington	2,079,926	4,843,232	
138	Stratford	21,072,199	39,769,356	
139	Suffield	6,183,966	9,142,095	
140	Thomaston	5,712,479	6,900,293	
141	Thompson	7,674,408	7,863,858	
142	Tolland	10,866,063	10,866,063	
143	Torrington	24,402,168	34,838,772	
144	Trumbull	3,195,332	9,834,890	
145	Union	241,460	312,035	
146	Vernon	18,316,776	25,952,123	
147	Voluntown	2,550,166	2,550,166	
148	Wallingford	21,712,580	27,832,445	
149	Warren	99,777	99,777	
150	Washington	240,147	240,147	
151	Waterbury	118,012,691	178,947,830	
152	Waterford	1,485,842	3,786,534	
153	Watertown	11,886,760	14,479,686	
154	Westbrook	427,677	1,212,650	
155	West Hartford	16,996,060	50,533,063	
156	West Haven	42,781,151	58,831,331	
157	Weston	948,564	948,564	
158	Westport	1,988,255	1,988,255	
159	Wethersfield	8,313,255	19,526,992	
160	Willington	3,710,213	4,260,407	
161	Wilton	1,557,195	1,557,195	
162	Winchester	8,031,362	8,367,730	
163	Windham	24,933,574	32,432,485	
164	Windsor	11,854,648	16,818,179	
165	Windsor Locks	4,904,674	9,169,433	
166	Wolcott	13,685,912	13,685,912	
167	Woodbridge	721,370	721,370	
168	Woodbury	895,683	4,064,261	
169	Woodstock	5,453,688	6,028,405	
	State	\$1,939,607,087	\$2,696,928,459	

ECS FORMULA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
(Hold Harmless)

1	Alliance Districts	\$1,236,690,450	\$1,716,507,185	
	DRGs			
	A	\$10,951,039	\$10,951,039	
	B	96,468,478	176,112,962	
	C	103,607,501	123,225,652	
	D	195,398,532	310,949,119	
	E	92,523,674	105,845,782	
	F	139,717,375	166,740,172	
	G	307,973,831	432,552,779	
	H	241,953,195	386,436,746	
	I	751,013,462	984,114,208	
	Wealth Deciles			
	1	\$15,431,661	\$15,431,661	
	2	25,333,439	44,080,370	
	3	64,638,167	113,733,075	
	4	63,050,079	108,805,243	
	5	78,270,461	102,355,687	
	6	131,409,716	191,831,253	
	7	119,237,182	172,741,992	
	8	159,932,776	243,994,466	
	9	255,336,982	347,613,549	
	10	1,026,966,624	1,356,341,163	
	Need Deciles			
	1	\$37,067,026	\$57,561,462	
	2	59,309,293	82,659,594	
	3	52,656,440	68,479,193	
	4	89,991,471	119,658,783	
	5	81,867,811	124,992,938	
	6	62,557,052	95,983,115	
	7	95,858,008	149,435,179	
	8	195,270,431	250,974,420	
	9	263,142,892	422,307,975	
	10	1,001,886,663	1,324,875,800	

ECS Formula Committee Recommendation
(No Hold Harmless)

	December 24, 2012		
	Foundation	\$9,687	\$11,825
	SGWL/Threshold Factor	1.75	1.50
	Minimum Aid Ratio - Non-Alliance	9%	2%
	Minimum Aid Ratio - Alliance	9%	10%
	Loss from Prior Year	Yes	Yes
	Total Distributed through Formula	\$50,000,000	\$2,691,181,605
			Subcommittee
Town	Town	Entitlement	Recommendation
Code	Name	2012-13	No Hold Harmless
1	Andover	2,367,466	2,650,370
2	Ansonia	15,571,383	21,297,706
3	Ashford	3,931,796	3,811,130
4	Avon	1,232,688	2,746,624
5	Barkhamsted	1,654,360	2,293,202
6	Beacon Falls	4,109,097	4,654,064
7	Berlin	6,280,132	9,030,633
8	Bethany	2,042,361	1,650,361
9	Bethel	8,228,760	9,941,352
10	Bethlehem	1,318,800	1,446,490
11	Bloomfield	5,614,895	11,062,481
12	Bolton	3,038,788	3,004,442
13	Bozrah	1,242,936	1,619,038
14	Branford	1,824,612	11,043,584
15	Bridgeport	168,599,571	212,722,289
16	Bridgewater	137,292	66,092
17	Bristol	43,047,496	57,481,950
18	Brookfield	1,545,179	2,083,588
19	Brooklyn	7,058,407	7,898,568
20	Burlington	4,354,540	4,024,741
21	Canaan	209,258	333,557
22	Canterbury	4,754,383	3,985,977
23	Canton	3,421,074	5,556,753
24	Chaplin	1,893,247	1,898,815
25	Cheshire	9,376,495	11,590,291
26	Chester	665,733	1,540,579
27	Clinton	6,502,667	7,153,053
28	Colchester	13,723,859	12,531,036
29	Colebrook	506,256	818,048
30	Columbia	2,563,631	2,844,797
31	Cornwall	85,322	39,719
32	Coventry	8,918,028	8,321,409
33	Cromwell	4,423,837	8,136,300
34	Danbury	24,554,515	62,591,033
35	Darien	1,616,006	1,161,634

ECS Formula Committee Recommendation
(No Hold Harmless)

36	Deep River	1,711,882	2,860,391
37	Derby	7,146,221	12,330,698
38	Durham	3,986,743	3,286,312
39	Eastford	1,116,844	1,039,406
40	East Granby	1,349,822	3,217,334
41	East Haddam	3,765,035	4,698,781
42	East Hampton	7,665,929	7,827,354
43	East Hartford	43,425,561	66,493,376
44	East Haven	19,253,992	24,486,396
45	East Lyme	7,132,157	8,880,219
46	Easton	593,868	367,275
47	East Windsor	5,650,470	7,161,445
48	Ellington	9,649,604	12,398,039
49	Enfield	28,810,492	35,974,956
50	Essex	389,697	624,615
51	Fairfield	3,590,008	2,512,879
52	Farmington	1,611,013	6,940,017
53	Franklin	948,235	1,094,702
54	Glastonbury	6,415,031	12,798,255
55	Goshen	218,188	161,974
56	Granby	5,477,633	6,916,279
57	Greenwich	3,418,642	2,151,966
58	Griswold	10,878,817	12,643,438
59	Groton	25,625,179	28,528,292
60	Guilford	3,058,981	4,396,614
61	Haddam	1,776,625	4,481,653
62	Hamden	23,913,747	42,950,464
63	Hampton	1,339,928	977,234
64	Hartford	192,783,001	238,610,929
65	Hartland	1,358,660	1,202,714
66	Harwinton	2,760,313	3,404,841
67	Hebron	6,969,354	6,347,258
68	Kent	167,342	79,567
69	Killingly	15,625,767	18,018,829
70	Killingworth	2,237,730	2,392,095
71	Lebanon	5,523,871	5,541,623
72	Ledyard	12,141,501	11,909,944
73	Lisbon	3,927,193	2,865,221
74	Litchfield	1,508,386	3,045,372
75	Lyme	145,556	105,946
76	Madison	1,576,061	822,880
77	Manchester	31,962,679	47,878,147
78	Mansfield	10,156,014	11,370,550
79	Marlborough	3,171,682	3,304,175
80	Meriden	55,561,122	73,990,984
81	Middlebury	714,234	2,168,687
82	Middlefield	2,132,776	2,732,305
83	Middletown	17,449,023	34,103,011

ECS Formula Committee Recommendation
(No Hold Harmless)

84	Milford	11,048,292	30,018,671
85	Monroe	6,592,969	5,091,834
86	Montville	12,715,670	15,418,043
87	Morris	657,975	515,390
88	Naugatuck	29,846,550	34,697,138
89	New Britain	76,583,631	111,899,743
90	New Canaan	1,495,604	1,009,649
91	New Fairfield	4,451,451	4,795,653
92	New Hartford	3,167,099	4,389,294
93	New Haven	146,351,428	180,481,383
94	Newington	12,895,927	21,736,800
95	New London	23,749,566	33,687,245
96	New Milford	12,080,862	15,447,206
97	Newtown	4,338,374	7,558,797
98	Norfolk	381,414	122,359
99	North Branford	8,225,632	9,344,099
100	North Canaan	2,091,544	2,621,112
101	North Haven	3,295,851	10,147,480
102	North Stonington	2,906,538	2,449,415
103	Norwalk	10,672,607	27,882,823
104	Norwich	33,341,525	43,876,375
105	Old Lyme	605,586	397,141
106	Old Saybrook	652,677	367,370
107	Orange	1,107,407	4,732,599
108	Oxford	4,667,270	4,021,758
109	Plainfield	15,560,284	16,838,579
110	Plainville	10,346,140	13,798,729
111	Plymouth	9,876,832	10,763,795
112	Pomfret	3,130,001	3,571,455
113	Portland	4,347,783	6,038,031
114	Preston	3,077,693	2,840,122
115	Prospect	5,377,654	6,184,225
116	Putnam	8,251,714	9,534,366
117	Redding	687,733	415,760
118	Ridgefield	2,063,814	1,263,868
119	Rocky Hill	3,481,162	10,424,232
120	Roxbury	158,114	89,728
121	Salem	3,114,216	2,384,935
122	Salisbury	187,266	97,443
123	Scotland	1,450,305	1,172,611
124	Seymour	10,004,094	12,939,770
125	Sharon	145,798	62,483
126	Shelton	5,146,279	16,227,518
127	Sherman	244,327	140,055
128	Simsbury	5,513,204	7,946,053
129	Somers	5,975,301	6,318,637
130	Southbury	2,518,902	10,893,403
131	Southington	20,191,195	29,103,127

ECS Formula Committee Recommendation
(No Hold Harmless)

132	South Windsor	13,017,444	14,879,386
133	Sprague	2,632,445	2,897,496
134	Stafford	9,930,162	11,067,853
135	Stamford	8,899,110	21,121,318
136	Sterling	3,211,166	4,207,270
137	Stonington	2,079,926	4,872,487
138	Stratford	21,072,199	40,009,583
139	Suffield	6,183,966	9,197,318
140	Thomaston	5,712,479	6,941,974
141	Thompson	7,674,408	7,911,360
142	Tolland	10,866,063	9,760,845
143	Torrington	24,402,168	35,049,215
144	Trumbull	3,195,332	9,894,297
145	Union	241,460	313,920
146	Vernon	18,316,776	26,108,886
147	Voluntown	2,550,166	2,241,092
148	Wallingford	21,712,580	28,000,566
149	Warren	99,777	59,801
150	Washington	240,147	126,225
151	Waterbury	118,012,691	180,028,764
152	Waterford	1,485,842	3,809,406
153	Watertown	11,886,760	14,567,151
154	Westbrook	427,677	1,219,975
155	West Hartford	16,996,060	50,838,308
156	West Haven	42,781,151	59,186,701
157	Weston	948,564	574,198
158	Westport	1,988,255	1,376,054
159	Wethersfield	8,313,255	19,644,945
160	Willington	3,710,213	4,286,094
161	Wilton	1,557,195	1,021,630
162	Winchester	8,031,362	8,418,276
163	Windham	24,933,574	32,628,394
164	Windsor	11,854,648	16,919,769
165	Windsor Locks	4,904,674	9,224,821
166	Wolcott	13,685,912	13,351,973
167	Woodbridge	721,370	385,937
168	Woodbury	895,683	4,088,048
169	Woodstock	5,453,688	6,064,819
	State	\$1,939,607,087	\$2,691,181,605

ECS Formula Committee Recommendation
(No Hold Harmless)

1	Alliance Districts	\$1,236,690,450	\$1,726,875,740
	DRGs		
	A	\$10,951,039	\$7,190,068
	B	96,468,478	172,144,347
	C	103,607,501	118,510,195
	D	195,398,532	310,957,537
	E	92,523,674	102,174,954
	F	139,717,375	166,209,130
	G	307,973,831	435,165,613
	H	241,953,195	388,771,014
	I	751,013,462	990,058,747
	Wealth Deciles		
	1	\$15,431,661	\$9,923,379
	2	25,333,439	41,058,394
	3	64,638,167	110,572,159
	4	63,050,079	108,321,807
	5	78,270,461	100,999,559
	6	131,409,716	191,548,735
	7	119,237,182	170,600,342
	8	159,932,776	243,915,656
	9	255,336,982	349,707,439
	10	1,026,966,624	1,364,534,135
	Need Deciles		
	1	\$37,067,026	\$53,319,190
	2	59,309,293	79,833,893
	3	52,656,440	65,469,401
	4	89,991,471	117,579,934
	5	81,867,811	121,582,244
	6	62,557,052	95,081,875
	7	95,858,008	149,778,039
	8	195,270,431	250,805,265
	9	263,142,892	424,853,057
	10	1,001,886,663	1,332,878,707
		\$1,939,607,087	\$2,691,181,605
		\$1,939,607,087	\$2,691,181,605
		\$1,939,607,087	\$2,691,181,605