



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

OFFICE OF THE
PROBATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

PAUL J. KNIERIM
Probate Court Administrator

THOMAS E. GAFFEY
Chief Counsel

HELEN B. BENNET
Attorney

186 NEWINGTON ROAD
WEST HARTFORD, CT 06110

TEL (860) 231-2442
FAX (860) 231-1055

Probate Court Budget Committee

Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, March 4, 2015
5:00 p.m.

Library at the Office of the Probate Court Administrator
186 Newington Road, West Hartford

- I. Convene Meeting
- II. Public Comment and Correspondence
- III. Remarks by the Chair
- IV. Compensation Study Implementation Policies
- V. FY16 Court Office Budgets
- VI. Staffing Level Adjustments
- VII. Financial Impact of January 2015 COLA
- VIII. July 2015 Merit Pay Adjustments
- IX. Other Business
- X. Schedule Next Meeting
- XI. Adjournment

KURT M. AHLBERG
Judge

DEIRDRE L. BASSETT
Chief Clerk

SHARON K. ZIMMERMAN
Clerk

LORRAINE MAGLIONE
Assistant Clerk

JENNIE-LYNN MAINVILLE
Court Assistant

STRATFORD PROBATE COURT
468 Birdseye Street, 2nd Floor
Stratford, CT 06615
ph. (203) 385-4023
fax (203) 375-6253

RECEIVED
PROBATE COURT ADM
2015 MAR -2 P 1:44

February 27, 2015

Hon. Paul J. Knierim
Probate Court Administrator
186 Newington Road
West Hartford, CT 06110

Hon. Fred J. Anthony
Shelton Probate Court
P.O. Box 27
Shelton, CT 06484

Hon. Joseph D. Marino
Middletown Probate Court
94 Court Street
Middletown, CT 06457

Re: Compensation / Merit increase

Dear Judges,

Although a written job description is a good starting point for any employer when hiring a new employee, it can only become apparent that you have hired the right person when they actually begin to perform the tasks at hand. Sometimes you find that a person is not up to the task they were hired for, and other times you find that a new hire exceeds your every expectation.

Last June, our Court hired Jennie-Lynn Mainville as a 'Court Assistant', which was the only position allowed in accordance with our benchmark staffing level. During this past year, it has become abundantly clear that she provides this Court with much more than her title or job description defines, and I am therefore requesting that the Budget Committee consider approving a substantial merit increase for Jennie-Lynn to fairly compensate her for her exceptional work ethic and skill level that she has demonstrated this past year.

Her general experience far exceeds the one-year clerical experience as required under the job description for a Court Assistant's minimum qualifications. She has previously worked for a private-practice attorney, giving her legal knowledge and familiarity with court procedures, and also received an Associate's Degree in Paralegal Studies from Gateway in May, 2014. She has grasped general Probate procedures in a very short amount of time and has demonstrated that she is a self-starter. Her exceptional ability to communicate to the public is beyond our expectations of a typical new-hire.

Her starting pay-rate, which is just a few dollars above minimum-wage, cannot fairly compensate Jennie-Lynn for the work she is performing for this office or as a positive representative of the Probate system as a whole. If the current benchmark staffing levels for our Court do not permit us to provide her with a salary and title promotion, I feel the very least we can do is compensate her with fair wages so we do not risk losing her to a higher-paying job elsewhere.

Sincerely,

Kurt M. Ahlberg, Judge

Compensation Study Proposed Implementation Policies

DRAFT 2/25/2015

Introduction

To implement the compensation study, the budget committee will need to adopt policies to determine how changes to the pay ranges will affect the rates of pay of individual employees. In developing those policies, careful consideration of the findings of the internal pay equity study, which was completed in 2013, is warranted. The budget committee used the pay equity study to increase the rates of pay of employees who were underpaid in relation to length of service in the Probate Courts. At the same time, the committee decided against reducing the pay of employees whose pay rates were higher than the rate as calculated in the equity study. In light of this key decision, the compensation study implementation policies will need to address the treatment of employees previously determined to be above the equity study rate in a way that avoids perpetuating legacy pay disparities among employees.

Equity Study Background

In 2013, the compensation consultant performed a calculation for each eligible employee to determine an equity study rate based on the employee's years of service. Service was calculated as of January 5, 2011, the date on which the uniform compensation system became effective. Pay adjustments were calculated using a hybrid approach that considered both experience in the employee's current position and prior experience in other positions within the Probate Court system. Employees were credited with 100% of their service in the current position and 40% of their service in prior positions.

An employee whose pay was less than the equity study rate received an increase to match the target. If an employee's pay was found to be higher than the equity study rate, the employee's pay was not reduced. A total of 138 employees received equity pay increases and 108 employees were found to be already above the equity study rate.

The following categories of employees were excluded from the equity study:

1. Employees hired on or after January 5, 2011, when the uniform compensation system was already in place
2. Employees whose rates of pay were at or above maximum for the position
3. Temporary employees
4. Rehired retirees

At the time the equity study was conducted, the Probate Court system employed 341 individuals, of which 95 were in one of the excluded categories.

Compensation Study Pay Range Adjustments

In 2014, the budget committee embarked on a compensation study to evaluate the competitiveness of the compensation plan. The compensation consultant, Owen-Pottier, Inc. recommended revised pay ranges for each of the 11 staff positions. The percentage increases to the pay ranges vary by position, as follows:

| Position | Compensation Study Percentage |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Chief Clerk III | 9% |
| Chief Clerk II | 6% |
| Chief Clerk I | 9% |
| Staff Attorney | 12% |
| Deputy Clerk | 13% |
| Clerk | 8% |
| Assistant Clerk | 15% |
| Court Assistant | 5% |
| Security Officer | 5% |
| Lead PCO | 27% |
| PCO | 25% |

The proposed implementation policies outlined below seek to translate the changes in pay ranges into adjustments in the rates of pay for individual employees, taking into consideration the equity study findings.

Proposed Policies

GROUP 1 – Employees hired PRIOR to January 5, 2011 who were below their target rates and received equity adjustments in 2013 (116 employees):

Increase the hourly rate of each Group 1 employee by the compensation study percentage for the employee's position.

GROUP 2 – Employees hired PRIOR to January 5, 2011 who DID NOT receive an equity adjustment in 2013 because their hourly rates at the time were higher than the equity study rates (90 employees):

First calculate an updated equity study rate by adding all COLA and merit raises to the 2013 equity study rate. Then calculate the compensation study hourly rate for each employee by applying the compensation study percentage for the employee's position to the updated equity study rate. The employee will receive the greater of the compensation study hourly rate or the employee's current rate.

GROUP 3 – Employees hired PRIOR to January 5, 2011 who were grandfathered because their hourly rates were higher than the maximum (17 employees):
Calculate adjustments for Group 3 in the same manner as Group 2. PCA will need to collect employment histories for Group 3 because this group was excluded from the equity study in 2013.

GROUP 4 – Employees hired SINCE January 5, 2011 who were hired at the minimum for their positions (71 employees):

Increase the hourly rate of each Group 4 employee by the compensation study percentage for the employee's position.

The adjustment will apply to employees who were hired before July 1, 2015. Employees hired on or after July will receive an increase to the new minimum for the position.

GROUP 5 – Employees hired SINCE January 5, 2011 who were hired ABOVE the minimum for their positions (8 employees):

On September 28, 2011, the budget committee adopted a policy requiring new hires from outside the system to start at the minimum for the position. Several employees were hired above minimum before the policy became effective. Calculate the compensation study rate for these employees by applying the compensation study percentage to an adjusted hourly rate equal to the sum of the minimum for the position plus all merit and COLA increases.

GROUP 6 – Rehired retirees (16 employees):

Make a one-time adjustment to standardize rates for rehired retirees at the following updated market rates, provided that the rate does not exceed the employee's pre-retirement rate of pay:

- \$25.79 Clerk
- \$22.74 Assistant Clerk
- \$18.83 Court Assistant

Temporary and floating clerk positions held by rehired retirees would be treated as Assistant Clerk positions.

PROMOTIONS

If an employee in Group 2, 3 or 5 was promoted on or after January 5, 2011, calculate the adjustment as if the employee was hired at minimum in the original position and add the promotion increase, along with the COLA and merit increases, before applying the compensation study factor.

Proposed Compensation Study Implementation Schedule

Implementation is contingent upon budgetary approval.

June – State budget and Probate Court system budget finalized

June 10 – Budget committee meeting

July 9 – Pay date with merit increases (pay period beginning 6/20/15, ending 7/3/15)

September 11 – Distribute report showing hourly rate changes for each employee (by employee number rather than name)

September 25 – Due date for comment or questions

September 30 – Special budget committee meeting (tentative)

October 29 – Payroll date with changes processed (pay period beginning 10/10/15)

DRAFT

STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: March 4, 2015

Probate District:

Trumbull

District No.:

46

| Positions | Benchmark | Proposal |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Chief Clerk III | | |
| Chief Clerk II | | |
| Chief Clerk I | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Deputy Clerk | | |
| Clerk | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Assistant Clerk | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Court Assistant | | |
| Court Staff Attorney | | |
| Temporary Staff | | |
| Probate Court Officer | | |
| Security Officer | | |
| TOTAL | 2.8 | 3.6 |

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: March 4, 2015

Probate District:

Stratford

District No.:

47

| Positions | Benchmark | Proposal |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Chief Clerk III | | |
| Chief Clerk II | | |
| Chief Clerk I | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Deputy Clerk | | |
| Clerk | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Assistant Clerk | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Court Assistant | 0.9 | |
| Court Staff Attorney | | |
| Temporary Staff | | |
| Probate Court Officer | | |
| Security Officer | | |
| TOTAL | 3.8 | 3.8 |

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

**Office Expense Budget
 FY 2016 Budget Proposal
 July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016**

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

District: **All Probate Districts**

District Nos.: **1 through 54**

No. of Employees (Judge and Court Staff) **344** **

| Description | FY 2015 As Adjusted | FY 2016 Proposed | Budget Committee Assumptions |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Educ/Seminars/Mtgs | 32,680 | 32,800 | \$600 per district |
| Dues | 95,125 | 8,600 | Other = \$25 per person average (Excludes Probate Assembly, bar & NCPJ dues) |
| Subscriptions | 50,720 | 51,020 | Court proposal, subject to \$1,500 maximum |
| Coffee/Tea/Holiday/Special Occ | 27,920 | 27,520 | \$80 per person |
| Other Expenses | 50,840 | 54,040 | \$500 per district |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 257,285 | 173,980 | |

** Represents number of individuals (not FTE)

**Office Expense Budget
 FY 2016 Budget Proposal
 July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016**

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

RCPC: ALL RCPCs

District No.: 55-60

No. of Employees (AJ and Court Staff) 50 **

| Description | FY 2015 As Adjusted | FY 2016 Proposed | Budget Committee Assumptions |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Rent and Taxes | 276,716 | 279,818 | Court proposal |
| Repairs, Maint and Utilities | 77,380 | 83,580 | Court proposal |
| Office Supplies | 38,300 | 39,800 | Court proposal |
| Office Furniture and Equip | 34,500 | 32,000 | Court proposal |
| Postage Equip and Fees | 42,565 | 42,365 | Court proposal |
| Legal Notices and Ads | 18,750 | 18,700 | Court proposal |
| Liability Insurance | 8,150 | 10,500 | Court proposal |
| Educ/Seminars/Mtgs | 6,400 | 6,800 | \$600 per RCPC, plus \$200 per PCO |
| Dues | 1,250 | 1,250 | Other = \$25 per person (Excludes Probate Assembly, bar & NCPJ dues) |
| Subscriptions | 3,275 | 2,925 | Court proposal, subject to \$1,500 maximum |
| Coffee/Tea/Holiday/Special Occasion | 4,000 | 4,000 | \$80 per person |
| Other Expenses | 3,500 | 3,500 | \$500 per district |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 514,786 | 525,238 | |

** Represents number of individuals (not FTE)

Educ/Seminars/Mtg

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

| No. | District Name | FY16 Budget | Budget Committee Guidelines | Variance over (under) guideline |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Hartford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 2 | West Hartford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 3 | Tobacco Valley | 600 | 600 | - |
| 4 | Greater Windsor | 600 | 600 | - |
| 5 | East Hartford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 6 | Glastonbury-Hebron | 600 | 600 | - |
| 7 | Newington | 600 | 600 | - |
| 8 | Berlin | 600 | 600 | - |
| 9 | Simsbury Regional | 600 | 600 | - |
| 10 | Farmington-Burlington | 600 | 600 | - |
| 11 | North Central Connecticut | 600 | 600 | - |
| 12 | Ellington | 600 | 600 | - |
| 13 | Greater Manchester | 600 | 600 | - |
| 14 | Region # 14 | 600 | 600 | - |
| 15 | Middletown | 600 | 600 | - |
| 16 | Meriden | 600 | 600 | - |
| 17 | Wallingford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 18 | Cheshire-Southington | 600 | 600 | - |
| 19 | Region # 19 | 600 | 600 | - |
| 20 | Waterbury | 600 | 600 | - |
| 21 | Naugatuck | 600 | 600 | - |
| 22 | Region # 22 | 600 | 600 | - |
| 23 | Torrington Area | 600 | 600 | - |
| 24 | Litchfield Hills | 600 | 600 | - |
| 25 | Tolland-Mansfield | 600 | 600 | - |
| 26 | Northeast | 600 | 600 | - |
| 27 | Plainfield-Killingly Regional | 600 | 600 | - |
| 28 | Windham-Colchester | 600 | 600 | - |
| 29 | Norwich | 600 | 600 | - |
| 30 | Southeastern CT Regional | 600 | 600 | - |
| 31 | New London | 600 | 600 | - |
| 32 | Niantic Regional | 600 | 600 | - |
| 33 | Saybrook | 600 | 600 | - |
| 34 | Madison-Guilford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 35 | Branford-North Branford | 1,000 | 600 | 400 |
| 36 | East Haven-North Haven | 600 | 600 | - |
| 37 | Hamden-Bethany | 600 | 600 | - |
| 38 | New Haven | 600 | 600 | - |
| 39 | West Haven | 600 | 600 | - |
| 40 | Millford-Orange | 600 | 600 | - |
| 41 | Derby | 600 | 600 | - |
| 42 | Shelton | 600 | 600 | - |
| 43 | Danbury | 600 | 600 | - |
| 44 | Housatonic | 600 | 600 | - |
| 45 | Northern Fairfield County | 600 | 600 | - |
| 46 | Trumbull | 600 | 600 | - |
| 47 | Stratford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 48 | Bridgeport | 600 | 600 | - |
| 49 | Fairfield | 600 | 600 | - |
| 50 | Westport | 600 | 600 | - |
| 51 | Norwalk-Wilton | 600 | 600 | - |
| 52 | Darien-New Canaan | 600 | 600 | - |
| 53 | Stamford | 600 | 600 | - |
| 54 | Greenwich | 600 | 600 | - |
| SUBTOTAL | | 32,800 | 32,400 | 400 |
| 55 | New Haven Regional Children's | 1,400 | 1,400 | - |
| 56 | Central CT Regional Children's | 1,000 | 1,000 | - |
| 57 | New London Regional Children's | 1,000 | 1,000 | - |
| 58 | Waterbury Regional Children's | 1,000 | 1,000 | - |
| 59 | Northeast Regional Children's | 1,000 | 1,000 | - |
| 60 | Hartford Regional Children's | 1,400 | 1,400 | - |
| SUBTOTAL | | 6,800 | 6,800 | - |
| TOTAL | | 39,600 | 39,200 | 400 |

Dues

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

| No. | District Name | # of Court Staff | FY16 Budget | Budget Committee Guidelines | Variance over (under) guideline |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Hartford | 11 | 275 | 275 | 0 |
| 2 | West Hartford | 9 | 225 | 225 | 0 |
| 3 | Tobacco Valley | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 4 | Greater Windsor | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 5 | East Hartford | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 6 | Glastonbury-Hebron | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 7 | Newington | 8 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| 8 | Berlin | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 9 | Simsbury Regional | 8 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| 10 | Farmington-Burlington | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 11 | North Central Connecticut | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 12 | Ellington | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 13 | Greater Manchester | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 14 | Region # 14 | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 15 | Middletown | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 16 | Meriden | 3 | 75 | 75 | 0 |
| 17 | Wallingford | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 18 | Cheshire-Southington | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 19 | Region # 19 | 10 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 20 | Waterbury | 10 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 21 | Naugatuck | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 22 | Region # 22 | 9 | 225 | 225 | 0 |
| 23 | Torrington Area | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 24 | Litchfield Hills | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 25 | Tolland-Mansfield | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 26 | Northeast | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 27 | Plainfield-Killingly Regional | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 28 | Windham-Colchester | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 29 | Norwich | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 30 | Southeastern CT Regional | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 31 | New London | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 32 | Niantic Regional | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 33 | Saybrook | 8 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| 34 | Madison-Gulford | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 35 | Branford-North Branford | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 36 | East Haven-North Haven | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 37 | Hamden-Bethany | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 38 | New Haven | 14 | 350 | 350 | 0 |
| 39 | West Haven | 8 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| 40 | Milford-Orange | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 41 | Derby | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 42 | Shelton | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 43 | Danbury | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 44 | Housatonic | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 45 | Northern Fairfield County | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 46 | Trumbull | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 47 | Stratford | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 48 | Bridgeport | 14 | 350 | 350 | 0 |
| 49 | Fairfield | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 50 | Westport | 4 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 51 | Norwalk-Wilton | 9 | 225 | 225 | 0 |
| 52 | Darien-New Canaan | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 53 | Stamford | 10 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 54 | Greenwich | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL | | 344 | 8,600 | 8,600 | - |
| 55 | New Haven Regional Children's | 13 | 325 | 325 | 0 |
| 56 | Central CT Regional Children's | 5 | 125 | 125 | 0 |
| 57 | New London Regional Children's | 6 | 150 | 150 | 0 |
| 58 | Waterbury Regional Children's | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 59 | Northeast Regional Children's | 7 | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| 60 | Hartford Regional Children's | 12 | 300 | 300 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL | | 50 | 1,250 | 1,250 | - |
| TOTAL | | 394 | 9,850 | 9,850 | - |

Subscriptions

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

| No. | District Name | FY16 Budget |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | Hartford | 845 |
| 2 | West Hartford | - |
| 3 | Tobacco Valley | 700 |
| 4 | Greater Windsor | 1,500 |
| 5 | East Hartford | - |
| 6 | Glastonbury-Hebron | 350 |
| 7 | Newington | 350 |
| 8 | Berlin | 1,200 |
| 9 | Simsbury Regional | 1,500 |
| 10 | Farmington-Burlington | 1,500 |
| 11 | North Central Connecticut | 500 |
| 12 | Ellington | 375 |
| 13 | Greater Manchester | 1,500 |
| 14 | Region # 14 | 1,500 |
| 15 | Middletown | 1,250 |
| 16 | Meriden | 1,500 |
| 17 | Wallingford | 400 |
| 18 | Cheshire-Southington | 800 |
| 19 | Region # 19 | 1,500 |
| 20 | Waterbury | 1,500 |
| 21 | Naugatuck | 1,500 |
| 22 | Region # 22 | 1,500 |
| 23 | Torrington Area | 1,500 |
| 24 | Litchfield Hills | 750 |
| 25 | Tolland-Mansfield | - |
| 26 | Northeast | 500 |
| 27 | Plainfield-Killingly Regional | 250 |
| 28 | Windham-Colchester | - |
| 29 | Norwich | 300 |
| 30 | Southeastern CT Regional | 400 |
| 31 | New London | 500 |
| 32 | Niantic Regional | 150 |
| 33 | Saybrook | 1,000 |
| 34 | Madison-Gulford | 1,200 |
| 35 | Branford-North Branford | 1,500 |
| 36 | East Haven-North Haven | 1,500 |
| 37 | Hamden-Bethany | 400 |
| 38 | New Haven | 1,500 |
| 39 | West Haven | 500 |
| 40 | Milford-Orange | 1,500 |
| 41 | Derby | 1,300 |
| 42 | Shelton | - |
| 43 | Danbury | 1,500 |
| 44 | Housatonic | 700 |
| 45 | Northern Fairfield County | 1,500 |
| 46 | Trumbull | 1,300 |
| 47 | Stratford | 1,000 |
| 48 | Bridgeport | 1,000 |
| 49 | Fairfield | 1,500 |
| 50 | Westport | 1,500 |
| 51 | Norwalk-Wilton | 1,500 |
| 52 | Darien-New Canaan | 1,500 |
| 53 | Stamford | 1,500 |
| 54 | Greenwich | - |
| SUBTOTAL | | 51,020 |
| 55 | New Haven Regional Children's | 1,500 |
| 56 | Central CT Regional Children's | 325 |
| 57 | New London Regional Children's | - |
| 58 | Waterbury Regional Children's | 600 |
| 59 | Northeast Regional Children's | - |
| 60 | Hartford Regional Children's | 500 |
| SUBTOTAL | | 2,925 |
| TOTAL | | 53,945 |

Coffee/Tea/Holiday/Special Occasion

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

| | | # of Court Staff | FY16 Budget | Budget Committee Guidelines | Variance over (under) guideline |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Hartford | 11 | 880 | 880 | 0 |
| 2 | West Hartford | 9 | 720 | 720 | 0 |
| 3 | Tobacco Valley | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 4 | Greater Windsor | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 5 | East Hartford | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 6 | Glastonbury-Hebron | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 7 | Newington | 8 | 640 | 640 | 0 |
| 8 | Berlin | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 9 | Simsbury Regional | 8 | 640 | 640 | 0 |
| 10 | Farmington-Burlington | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 11 | North Central Connecticut | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 12 | Ellington | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 13 | Greater Manchester | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 14 | Region # 14 | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 15 | Middletown | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 16 | Meriden | 3 | 240 | 240 | 0 |
| 17 | Wallingford | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 18 | Cheshire-Southington | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 19 | Region # 19 | 10 | 800 | 800 | 0 |
| 20 | Waterbury | 10 | 800 | 800 | 0 |
| 21 | Naugatuck | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 22 | Region # 22 | 9 | 720 | 720 | 0 |
| 23 | Torrington Area | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 24 | Litchfield Hills | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 25 | Tolland-Mansfield | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 26 | Northeast | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 27 | Plainfield-Killingly Regional | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 28 | Windham-Colchester | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 29 | Norwich | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 30 | Southeastern CT Regional | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 31 | New London | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 32 | Niantic Regional | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 33 | Saybrook | 8 | 640 | 640 | 0 |
| 34 | Madison-Guilford | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 35 | Branford-North Branford | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 36 | East Haven-North Haven | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 37 | Hamden-Bethany | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 38 | New Haven | 14 | 1,120 | 1,120 | 0 |
| 39 | West Haven | 8 | 640 | 640 | 0 |
| 40 | Milford-Orange | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 41 | Derby | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 42 | Shelton | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 43 | Danbury | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 44 | Housatonic | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 45 | Northern Fairfield County | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 46 | Trumbull | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 47 | Stratford | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 48 | Bridgeport | 14 | 1,120 | 1,120 | 0 |
| 49 | Fairfield | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 50 | Westport | 4 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 51 | Norwalk-Wilton | 9 | 720 | 720 | 0 |
| 52 | Darien-New Canaan | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 53 | Stamford | 10 | 800 | 800 | 0 |
| 54 | Greenwich | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL | | 344 | 27,520 | 27,520 | - |
| 55 | New Haven Regional Children's | 13 | 1,040 | 1,040 | 0 |
| 56 | Central CT Regional Children's | 5 | 400 | 400 | 0 |
| 57 | New London Regional Children's | 6 | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| 58 | Waterbury Regional Children's | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 59 | Northeast Regional Children's | 7 | 560 | 560 | 0 |
| 60 | Hartford Regional Children's | 12 | 960 | 960 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL | | 50 | 4,000 | 4,000 | - |
| TOTAL | | 394 | 31,520 | 31,520 | - |

Other Expenses

Budget Committee Meeting - March 4, 2015

| | FY16 Budget | Budget Committee Guidelines | Variance over (under) guideline |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 Hartford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 2 West Hartford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 3 Tobacco Valley | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 4 Greater Windsor | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 5 East Hartford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 6 Glastonbury-Hebron | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 7 Newington | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 8 Berlin | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 9 Simsbury Regional | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 10 Farmington-Burlington | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 11 North Central Connecticut | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 12 Ellington | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 13 Greater Manchester | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 14 Region # 14 | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 15 Middletown | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 16 Meriden | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 17 Wallingford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 18 Cheshire-Southington | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 19 Region # 19 | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 20 Waterbury | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 21 Naugatuck | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 22 Region # 22 | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 23 Torrington Area | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 24 Litchfield Hills | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 25 Tolland-Mansfield | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 26 Northeast | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 27 Plainfield-Killingly Regional | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 28 Windham-Colchester | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 29 Norwich | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 30 Southeastern CT Regional | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 31 New London | 4,500 | 500 | 4,000 |
| 32 Niantic Regional | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 33 Saybrook | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 34 Madison-Gulford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 35 Branford-North Branford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 36 East Haven-North Haven | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 37 Hamden-Bethany | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 38 New Haven | 23,540 | 500 | 23,040 |
| 39 West Haven | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 40 Millford-Orange | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 41 Derby | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 42 Shelton | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 43 Danbury | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 44 Housatonic | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 45 Northern Fairfield County | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 46 Trumbull | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 47 Stratford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 48 Bridgeport | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 49 Fairfield | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 50 Westport | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 51 Norwalk-Wilton | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 52 Darien-New Canaan | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 53 Stamford | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 54 Greenwich | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL | 54,040 | 27,000 | 27,040 |
| 55 New Haven Regional Children's | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 56 Central CT Regional Children's | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 57 New London Regional Children's | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 58 Waterbury Regional Children's | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 59 Northeast Regional Children's | 500 | 500 | 0 |
| 60 Hartford Regional Children's | 1,000 | 500 | 500 |
| SUBTOTAL | 3,500 | 3,000 | 500 |
| TOTAL | 57,540 | 30,000 | 27,540 |