

ANNE MILGRAM  
Attorney General of New Jersey  
Attorney for Defendants  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
PO BOX 112  
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0112

By: Michelle Lyn Miller  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
(609) 984-8464

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
DOCKET NO. 62,700

RAYMOND ARTHUR ABBOTT, et al., )  
Plaintiffs, ) Civil Action  
v. ) SUPPLEMENTAL CERTIFICATION OF  
FRED G. BURKE, et al., ) KATHERINE ATTWOOD  
Defendants. )

I, Katherine Attwood, of full age, hereby certify that:

1. I am the Assistant Commissioner of the Division of Finance, Department of Education ("Department"). I offer this certification by way of supplement to my March 17, 2008 certification in this matter.

Budget Update Since March 2008

2. Since the State's application to the Court in March 2008, all of the Abbott district 2008-2009 budgets, with the exception of Camden, were submitted and approved by the DOE under

the provisions of the School Funding Reform Act of 2008 (SFRA), L. 2007, c.260.

3. To date, Camden has not submitted an approvable, balanced budget to the Department of Education. See Exhibit A, a true copy of letter dated May 27, 2008, from Katherine Attwood, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Finance and Rochelle Hendricks, Assistant Commissioner, Division of District and School Improvement, to Dr. Bessie LeFra Young, Superintendent, and Ms. Sarah Davis, Camden Board of Education President.

4. Camden has not accepted the suggestions of the Department and the State-appointed fiscal monitor (State Monitor) for appropriate reallocations and efficiencies that would yield a balanced budget. Moreover, Camden has missed several promised deadlines for the submission of a balanced budget to the Department.

5. As a result of Camden's inaction in adopting a balanced budget, a discretionary spending freeze has been directed by the Department. On May 27, 2008, the State Monitor was authorized to veto any discretionary spending approved by the board until such time as the budget is submitted and approved. Camden has challenged the action of the State Monitor to veto discretionary spending, and a controversy is currently pending before the Commissioner of Education pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:3.

6. All of the submitted 2008-2009 budgets reflect an increase in State aid over 2007-2008. Exhibit L, School State Aid Comparison of 2007-2008 with 2008-2009, of my initial certification set forth projected amounts of State aid to all of the Abbott districts. However, the 2008-2009 aid did not include SDA transition aid and charter school aid that the districts were noticed of after the filing of my certification. Attached hereto at Exhibit B is an updated School State Aid Comparison of 2007-2008 with 2008-2009 chart. Based on that chart, the increases in aid to the Abbott districts range from a 2.3% increase in Pemberton to over 26% increase in Hoboken.

7. Stated differently, the Abbott districts have increases in State aid per pupil ranging from \$298 per resident pupil in Millville to \$2,940 per resident pupil in Union City. Fifteen Abbott districts have an increase in State aid of \$1,000 per resident pupil or more over 2007-2008. See Exhibit B.

8. Twelve districts will benefit from SDA Transition Aid. See Exhibit B. Consistent with notifications recently issued, this aid is provided to Abbott districts that will be bringing new facilities on-line in 2008-2009. More than \$13 million in SDA Transition Aid will be awarded. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true copy of an award letter to Newark dated May 30, 2008.

9. Numerous non-Abbott districts will also enjoy substantial state aid increases over 2008-2009. There are 52 non-Abbott districts with concentrations of at-risk pupils at 40% or more. Of course, all non-Abbott, high-poverty districts will receive at least a 2% increase in aid. More critically, a significant number of these districts receive increases of 10%, 20% or higher. Thirty non-Abbott, high-poverty districts will receive aid increases of 20% or higher. Five will receive aid increases between 10% and 20% and one other will receive aid increases between 5% and 10%.

10. Moreover, of 16 districts involved in Bacon v. New Jersey Department of Education, Buena Regional, Clayton, Commercial, Egg Harbor City, Fairfield Twp, Hammonton, Lakewood Twp, Lakehurst, Lawrence (Cumberland County), Little Egg Harbor, Maurice River, Ocean (Ocean County), Quinton, Upper Deerfield, Wallington and Woodbine, eight will receive increases in State aid of approximately 20% and three other Bacon districts' state aid will increase by approximately 10%. Salem City, originally one of the Bacon districts, is not included in this analysis as it was designated an Abbott district during the course of the litigation.

11. Additionally, prior to the presentation of their budgets, Millville and Phillipsburg sought waivers of the statutory tax levy cap from the Department as permitted by N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-39. Millville's request was approved without adjustment.

Phillipsburg's request was approved at approximately 90% of the request. The Department approved the cap waiver for Millville to support an increase in the required PERS payment, and for Phillipsburg, to replace the loss of non-recurring revenue. The tax levy in Gloucester City was also increased more than 4% due to an automatic adjustment for enrollment increases.

12. The SFRA requires Abbott districts eligible for Educational Adequacy Aid ("EAA") in the first three years of SFRA implementation -- Bridgeton, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Orange, Passaic, Perth Amboy and Plainfield -- to raise their local school tax levies by four or six percent in 2008-2009. N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-58.

13. Based on the Department's expectation that the FY 2009 Appropriations Act will modify N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-58 to provide that an eligible district does not need to raise its local tax levy beyond what is necessary to reach adequacy, Jersey City was advised that it was only required to raise its levy by 3%. Nevertheless the district opted to increase the levy by 4%.

14. Twenty-five of the 31 Abbott districts raised their local levies. See Exhibit D, Final Tax Levy 2008-2009 Budgets.

15. Twenty-seven of the 31 Abbott districts had their budgets approved by the voters or Board of School Estimate. See Exhibit D, Final Tax Levy 2008-2009 Budgets.

16. In Neptune, Phillipsburg, Salem City, and Vineland, where the budgets were defeated, the budgets have been reviewed. No levy reductions were certified in Phillipsburg and Vineland. In Neptune and Salem City, the municipalities reduced the levy by \$25,000 and \$69,000, respectively, which in both cases is significantly less than 1% of the general fund budget. Neither of these two districts submitted an application to the Commissioner to restore the municipal levy reduction. See Exhibit D, Final Tax Levy 2008-2009 Budgets.

17. When 2008-2009 state aid is combined with local levy, it is clear that the fiscal resources available to the Abbott districts are substantial and exceed State aid and local levy of the I and J average. The Abbott average per pupil revenue is \$17,325, compared to the I and J average of \$14,046. Attached hereto as Exhibit E, Summary Of Revenues Per Pupil Comparison, is a chart that updates the data of Exhibit F of my initial certification. The data was updated to reflect actual local school tax levy information as well as to include SDA Transition Aid and Charter School Aid.

#### **Response to Plaintiffs' Certifications**

18. I have reviewed the Certification of Melvin L. Wyns and attached exhibits thereto. Upon review of the exhibits I note significant discrepancies in his calculations submitted in support of his conclusions.

19. For example, in ¶¶34 to 37 of Wyns' Certification, Mr. Wyns relies on his calculations set forth in Exhibit C attached to his Certification, Comparison of Abbott/CEIFA and SFRA T&E Budgets, to support his conclusion that SFRA provides less than the level of expenditures the State determined to provide T&E to students in Abbott districts in 2007-2008 under Abbott/CEIFA. His calculations, however, are not entirely accurate.

20. First, Mr. Wyns overstates the amount for "K-12 Supplemental Funding" in 2007-08 as \$690,622,489. The actual EOA supplemental funding for 2007-08 is \$676,412,861. Therefore, the "Total K-12 T&E Budget" for 2007-08 which he calculates as \$4,613,334,305 is incorrect.

21. Further, the second column of Exhibit C titled "SFRA (2008-09)" is also not accurate. Mr. Wyns excludes the following four aid categories from that column:

- a. Adjustment Aid, which totals \$599,417,413;
- b. Education Adequacy Aid, which totals \$8,168,000;
- c. Charter Aid, which totals \$19,179,247; and
- d. SDA Transition Aid, which totals \$13,239,657.

22. In addition, in the second column of Exhibit C, Mr. Wyns uses a projected levy increase amount of \$660,357,690. Following the April election and municipal certification of defeated budgets, the actual total tax levy for Abbott districts was slightly lower, i.e., \$658,649,903.

23. The total difference between the amount listed as the 2008-09 "Total K-12 T&E Budget" by Mr. Wyns and the actual amount allocated to Abbott districts' K-12 budgets in 2008-2009 is \$638,141,530. The accurate amount reflects an actual increase of over \$205 million in funding to Abbott districts for K-12 programs. It also represents an average state share of 86% in 2008-2009, which is the same as the average state share in 2007-2008. See Exhibit F, Comparison of Abbott/CEIFA and SFRA K-12 Budgets.

24. The ELC's comparison of the CEIFA T&E amount with the SFRA base amount to support its claim that the SFRA is constitutionally deficient as applied to the Abbott districts is misleading. The SFRA adequacy model provides for significantly more resources for high poverty districts to meet the needs of their students. If the additional resources such as DEPA/at-risk, Bilingual/LEP and SFRA security aid are included in the comparison, the picture is quite different.

25. Inflated to 2008-2009, CEIFA would generate a bilingual per pupil amount of \$1,444 and a DEPA per pupil amount at 20-40% concentration of \$404; and at 40% and above of \$572. Thus, for example, the adequacy model for an "at-risk" student in a district with a 60% concentration under the SFRA would generate \$15,625 while the same student under CEIFA (inflated to 2008-2009) in a school with a high concentration of at-risk students would generate only \$10,356. Attached hereto as Exhibit G, CEIFA and



SFRA Per Pupil Comparison for 2008-09, is a chart that compares the resources for an at-risk elementary student under CEIFA and SFRA.

26. Mr. Wyns also compares the level of expenditures the SFRA determines as "essential to provide T&E to students in Abbott districts" with the 2007-2008 expenditures in those districts. Wyns Certification, ¶37. In doing so, he erroneously concludes that the SFRA finds \$447 million "in current-year, DOE approved expenditures as excessive and not necessary to provide T&E for Abbott students." Ibid. The proper measure of the level of resources that the SFRA determines is essential to provide T&E to students in Abbott districts, however, is reflected in each Abbott district's Adequacy Budget plus special education and security categoricals (ADBUD CAT). The actual difference between the 2007-2008 Abbott district expenditures and their ADBUD CAT is \$30 million out of \$4.617 billion in expenditures -- the amount of Abbott district expenditures over adequacy. See Exhibit H, K-12 2007-2008 Budget Comparison To Adequacy Budget Plus Categoricals.

27. I have also reviewed the Certification of Dr. Margaret Goertz and attached exhibits thereto. With particular regard to Exhibit C, Table 1 of the Goertz Certification, it appears that rounding as well as the lack of actual levy data results in a presentation of Abbott tax rates relative to the State average that is not entirely accurate. Attached hereto as Exhibit I, Abbott Tax Rates Relative to the State Average, is a chart that

sets forth the Abbott total equalized tax rates relative to the State average. Using this information, only 13 Abbott districts are over 120% of the State average rather than the 15 reflected in Dr. Goertz' Exhibit C, Table 1.

#### **Additional Data and Chart**

28. Exhibit B attached hereto includes the resident enrollment of the Abbott districts. That data may be utilized to determine the model district derived from the PJP process each Abbott district would be reflected by the Abbott district's size, i.e., very large, large, moderate and small. Based on the most updated enrollment data, one district would be a small district (less than 1,300 students), 8 moderate (1,300-3,999 students), 11 large (4,000-7,999 students) and 11 very large (8,000+ students).

29. In my initial certification, various charts were appended that establish the types and amounts of State aid for the Abbott districts from fiscal year 1999 to 2008. Exhibit J, Annual Increase in State Education Aid 1998 to 2009, identifies the increases in State aid over the previous fiscal year. It also sets forth the percentage portion of that increase that went to the Abbott districts. Without exception, the Abbott districts received the largest share of state aid increase in the years presented.

I hereby certify that the statements made by me are true.  
I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements are willfully  
false, I am subject to punishment.

Katherine Attwood  
Katherine Attwood

Dated: June 9, 2008



Exhibit A

State of New Jersey  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
PO Box 500  
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

JON S. CORZINE  
Governor

LUCILLE E. DAVY  
Commissioner

May 27, 2008

Dr. Bessie LeFra Young  
Superintendent

Ms. Sarah Davis  
Board President  
Camden School District  
201 North Front Street  
Camden, NJ 08102-1935

Dear Dr. Young and Ms. Davis:

This is to advise that the Department of Education continues to have serious concern with the Camden School District's failure to submit a balanced budget for 2008-2009. It is our understanding that the district has missed a number of agreed upon submission dates, with the latest extended deadline set for June 11, 2008.

The lack of an approvable 2008-09 budget is a serious matter and one that needs to be remedied immediately. It is critical that the district submit a balanced budget consistent with the revenues available. Department staff have met with the district's administration on numerous occasions and presented several options for the district's consideration for more efficient operations. These discussions have focused on those efficiencies in the administration and noninstructional areas that will not impact the district's ability to provide a thorough and efficient education.

Of particular concern is how much the district exceeds the statutorily established administrative cost limit when actual enrollments are used in the calculation, as well as its continued approval of travel and funding of discretionary programs beyond Pre-K through 12 when it cannot balance its Pre-K through 12 budget. Notwithstanding any separate action being pursued by the board of education to seek additional funds from the state, there is no mechanism for the district to request additional funds in its 2008-09 budget submission. It is the administration's statutory responsibility to present a balanced budget to the board of education, and the board of education's statutory responsibility to approve a balanced budget consistent with the School Funding Reform Act.


[www.nj.gov/education](http://www.nj.gov/education)


New Jersey Is An Equal Opportunity Employer \* Printed on Recycled and Recyclable Paper

Dr. Bessie LeFra Young  
Ms. Sarah Davis  
May 27, 2008  
Page 2

While we recognize that essential staff needs to be rehired and necessary instructional materials and supplies ordered for summer and fall academic programs, expenditures for discretionary activities cannot continue until the 2008-09 budget is submitted to the department and approved. Therefore, after careful consideration and numerous efforts to work with the district to resolve this matter, the State monitor will act to freeze all current year spending regardless of the funding source and review all personnel appointments, purchase orders and other commitments to verify only essential appointments and expenditures are approved for 2008-09. This approach is consistent with the department's prior policies and practices regarding districts that had not submitted a balanced budget at this time. Discretionary expenditures, including all conferences and workshops, will not be approved regardless of the funding source. Grant monies used for discretionary expenditures, unless specifically awarded for said purpose, will not be approved. Further, the State monitor will disapprove any purchase order and overturn any board action in which he determines that the appointment is not critical or the expenditure to be discretionary in nature. Payment of any invoice that was not properly approved by the district and/or State monitor will be the responsibility of the issuer. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:11-12, under no circumstances will the board be permitted to approve or ratify a travel event after the event has occurred.

As soon as a balanced budget is presented and approved, the district will be able to resume travel and other discretionary activities consistent with the approved budget. We anticipate that a balanced budget will be presented for approval by June 11, 2008 which will allow the district to continue to plan for the upcoming school year.

  
Katherine Attwood  
Assistant Commissioner  
Division of Finance

Sincerely,  
  
Rochelle Hendricks  
Assistant Commissioner  
Division of District and School Improvement

LED/KPA/Camden spending freeze.doc  
c: Lucille E. Davy  
Willa Spicer  
William King  
James McBee  
Joan Saylor  
Nick Puleio  
Sharon Price-Cates  
Reuben Mills  
Camden Board of Education  
H. Mark Starwood

SCHOOL STATE AID COMPARISON OF 2007-08 WITH 2008-09

Table with columns: DISTRICT NAME, 2007-08 RES., 2007-08 STATE AID, STATE AID EQUALIZED, EDUCATION ADEQUACY CHOICE, TRANS. PORTATION CHOICE, SPECIAL EDUCATION, ADJUSTMENT, ADULT EDUCATION, PRESCHOOL, EXTRA-ORDINARY, CHARTER AID, TOTAL STATE AID, 2008-09 RES., 2008-09 STATE AID, 2008-09 RES. TOT., % DIFF, AID DIFF, % DIFF, PER PUPIL STATE AID PER PUPIL AID DIF.

\* Includes preschool aid.



Exhibit C

*State of New Jersey*

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PO Box 500

TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

May 30, 2008

JON S. CORZINE  
*Governor*

LUCILLE E. DAVY  
*Commissioner*

Ms. Marion Bolden, State District Superintendent  
Newark Public Schools  
2 Cedar Street  
Newark, NJ 07102-3015

Dear Ms. Bolden:

Your district is awarded 2008-2009 new school facility funding in the amount of \$2,336,760 for New Central High School. This award is based on square footage and projected 2008-2009 opening dates for new schools from the School Development Authority. This funding is transitional aid awarded at a rate of nine dollars per square foot to assist in moving to the School Funding Reform Act of 2008. Funding for this purpose was included in the Governor's budget.

The award is required to be recorded as other unrestricted state aid on budget line 360 and explained on supporting documentation item 8a in the district-wide budget software and accounted for on line 10-3198 in the district's accounting software. The budget containing this additional award is required to be resubmitted and retransmitted to the department.

If you have any questions regarding your new school facility funding approval, please call Joan Nesenkar Saylor, director, Office of Budget Review and Fiscal Monitors at 609-777-4484.

Sincerely,

*Katherine P. Attwood*

Katherine P. Attwood, Assistant Commissioner  
Division of Finance

c: John Hart  
Willa Spicer  
William King  
Kathryn Forsyth  
Donna Arons  
James McBee  
Joan Nesenkar Saylor  
Executive County Superintendent  
Budget Manager  
Lisa Williams  
School Business Administrator

[www.nj.gov/education](http://www.nj.gov/education)

Exhibit D

Final Tax Levy 2008-2009 Budgets							
District	Prior Year Tax Levy	Proposed Tax Levy	Percent Increase	Defeated Budget	Municipal Reduction	Final Tax Levy	Reduction as % of Budget
Asbury Park	5,667,895	5,894,611	4.00%			5,894,611	
Bridgeton City****	3,233,408	3,362,744	4.00%			3,362,744	
Burlington City	8,269,555	8,600,337	4.00%			8,600,337	
Camden City	7,449,009	7,449,009	0.00%			7,449,009	
City of Orange Twp****	8,931,421	9,288,678	4.00%			9,288,678	
East Orange	18,070,000	18,670,000	3.32%			18,670,000	
Elizabeth****	38,651,718	40,970,810	6.00%			40,970,810	
Garfield City	21,216,081	22,064,724	4.00%			22,064,724	
Gloucester City *	2,858,502	2,976,018	4.11%			2,976,018	
Harrison Town	8,204,341	8,504,341	3.66%			8,504,341	
Hoboken	34,408,157	35,784,483	4.00%			35,784,483	
Irvington Twp	17,459,529	17,459,529	0.00%			17,459,529	
Jersey City*****	82,809,873	86,122,268	4.00%			86,122,268	
Kearnsburg	4,077,969	4,241,088	4.00%			4,241,088	
Long Branch	30,356,657	31,570,923	4.00%			31,570,923	
Millville City **	8,803,739	9,792,246	11.23%			9,792,246	
Neptune Twp	30,211,863	31,420,338	4.00%	X	25,000	31,395,338	0.04%
New Brunswick	27,326,591	27,326,591	0.00%			27,326,591	
Newark	96,358,910	100,213,266	4.00%			100,213,266	
Passaic City****	13,869,390	14,701,553	6.00%			14,701,553	
Paterson	36,016,971	37,457,650	4.00%			37,457,650	
Pemberton Twp	10,953,343	10,953,343	0.00%			10,953,343	
Perth Amboy****	17,281,742	18,318,647	6.00%			18,318,647	
Phillipsburg Town ***	6,512,706	7,008,722	7.62%	X	0	7,008,722	
Plainfield****	17,683,906	18,391,262	4.00%			18,391,262	
Pleasantville	6,220,639	6,469,465	4.00%			6,469,465	
Salem City	2,366,655	2,461,321	4.00%	X	69,000	2,392,321	0.31%
Trenton	21,115,662	21,115,662	0.00%			21,115,662	
Union City	15,418,637	15,418,637	0.00%			15,418,637	
Vineland City	20,330,766	21,143,997	4.00%	X	0	21,143,997	
West New York	13,112,154	13,636,640	4.00%			13,636,640	

\* Gloucester City levy increased more than 4% from an automatic adjustment to the cap for enrollment increases.  
 \*\* Millville levy increased more than 4% from Commissioner approval of a waiver to exceed the cap for an increase.  
 in required PERS payment  
 \*\*\* Phillipsburg levy increased more than 4% from Commissioner approval of a waiver for non-recurring revenue.  
 \*\*\*\* EAA districts were required to increase their local levies by 4% or 6%.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Jersey City received EAA, but was only required to increase their levy by 3% to bring their spending to adequacy.  
 (However, the district chose to increase their levy by 4%).



Summary of Revenues Per Pupil Comparison			
Revenues Per Pupil*			
District	2008	2009**	Diff.
ASBURY PARK CITY	\$23,308	\$25,217	\$1,908
BRIDGETON CITY	\$14,102	\$14,361	\$259
BURLINGTON CITY	\$16,498	\$17,046	\$548
CAMDEN CITY	\$17,653	\$18,609	\$957
EAST ORANGE	\$18,740	\$19,959	\$1,219
ELIZABETH CITY	\$15,157	\$16,037	\$879
GARFIELD CITY	\$13,990	\$15,655	\$1,665
GLOUCESTER CITY	\$17,202	\$17,785	\$583
HARRISON TOWN	\$14,364	\$15,847	\$1,483
HOBOKEN CITY	\$19,427	\$21,244	\$1,817
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$16,987	\$17,959	\$972
JERSEY CITY	\$16,303	\$17,017	\$714
KEANSBURG BORO	\$17,222	\$18,184	\$963
LONG BRANCH CITY	\$16,805	\$17,594	\$789
MILLVILLE CITY	\$14,297	\$14,580	\$283
NEPTUNE TWP	\$15,141	\$16,042	\$901
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	\$16,309	\$17,480	\$1,171
NEWARK CITY	\$17,535	\$18,258	\$723
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$14,795	\$15,724	\$929
PASSAIC CITY	\$15,529	\$16,226	\$697
PATERSON CITY	\$16,501	\$17,406	\$905
PEMBERTON TWP	\$19,480	\$20,823	\$1,343
PERTH AMBOY CITY	\$14,131	\$15,416	\$1,285
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	\$16,421	\$16,989	\$568
PLAINFIELD CITY	\$15,504	\$16,383	\$879
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$16,783	\$17,346	\$563
SALEM CITY	\$16,407	\$16,835	\$428
TRENTON CITY	\$17,072	\$18,028	\$956
UNION CITY	\$14,706	\$17,038	\$2,332
VINELAND CITY	\$15,693	\$16,008	\$315
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$14,299	\$14,824	\$524
Abbott Average	2008	2009**	Diff.
Revenue Per Pupil*	\$16,407	\$17,325	\$918
Levy Per Pupil	\$2,284	\$2,394	\$110
I & J Average	2008	2009**	Diff.
Revenue Per Pupil*	\$13,703	\$14,046	\$344
Levy Per Pupil	\$12,588	\$12,852	\$264
* Revenue per pupil is the sum of the <i>actual</i> local levy and total aid (except transportation, preschool, & debt service), less transfers to preschool (L511); divided by resident enrollment reduced by 1/2 of the half-day Kindergarten student count. <i>Note that these include Charter and SDA aids.</i>			
** The enrollments for FY 2009 are projected based on ASSA submissions as of February 19th.			

Exhibit F

Comparison Of Abbott/CEIFA and SFRA K-12 Budgets

Abbott/CEIFA (2007-08)		SFRA (2008-09)	
CCSA	\$1,573,279,215	Equalization Aid	\$3,207,736,844
SCCSA	\$187,855,397	Adjustment Aid**	\$599,417,413
Stabilization Aid	\$11,124,962	Education Adequacy Aid**	\$8,168,000
Parity Remedy Aid	\$1,039,798,422	SDA Transition Aid**	\$13,239,657
K-12 Regular Education Aids	\$2,812,057,996		
Local Tax Levy	\$635,247,779	Local Tax Levy***	\$658,694,903
Total K-12 Regular Education	\$3,447,305,775		
Categorical Aids:		Categorical Aids:	
DEPA	\$122,123,370		
ECPA	\$48,685,638		
K-12 Supplemental Funding*	\$676,412,861		
Total K-12 Supplemental Programs	\$847,221,869		
Bilingual Aid	\$38,653,466	Security Aid	\$97,704,763
		Charter Aid**	\$19,179,247
		Special Education Categorical Aid	\$147,988,814
Special Education Categorical Aid	\$209,533,490	Extraordinary Aid	\$11,916,486
Extraordinary Aid	\$9,383,743		
Special Education Aid	\$218,917,233		
		Transportation Aid	\$40,218,941
Transportation Aid	\$47,414,238		
Consolidated Aid	\$34,094,447	Choice Aid	\$114,954
Choice Aid	\$400,402		
Less Line 511	\$35,167,550		
Total Categorical Aid	\$304,312,236		
		<b>Total K-12 Aid</b>	<b>\$4,145,685,119</b>
<b>Total K-12 Aid</b>	<b>\$3,963,592,101</b>	<b>Total K-12 Budget</b>	<b>\$4,804,380,022</b>
<b>Total K-12 Budget</b>	<b>\$4,598,839,880</b>		
		Increase in K-12 Budget FY08 to FY09	\$205,540,142
		K-12 Aid as a Pct of Budget FY09	86%
Preschool Budget	\$511,406,029	Preschool Budget	\$529,833,454

* This represents the actual EOA supplemental funding	
** These aid categories were excluded from Wyns' cert.	
*** This reflects levies from final approved budgets	

# Exhibit G

<b>CEIFA and SFRA Per Pupil Comparison for 2008-09</b>		
Estimate for an elementary at-risk student in a school/district with an at-risk concentration of 60%:		
	<u>SFRA Per Pupil</u>	<u>CEIFA Per Pupil</u>
Base Amount/T&E	\$9,649	\$9,784
At-risk/DEPA*	\$5,500	\$572
Security	\$476	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$15,625</b>	<b>\$10,356</b>
*In CEIFA school districts generated DEPA for each child in a school with a moderate/high concentration of at-risk students; SFRA provides at-risk aid for each at risk student.		

K-12 2007-2008 Budget Comparison to Adequacy Budget Plus Categoricals*			
	BUDGET	ADBUD CAT	
District	07-08	08-09	DIFF
ASBURY PARK CITY	62,254	42,321	-19,932
BRIDGETON CITY	62,311	67,557	5,245
BURLINGTON CITY	24,917	21,317	-3,600
CAMDEN CITY	281,260	249,036	-32,224
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	69,016	79,056	10,040
EAST ORANGE	194,912	172,124	-22,788
ELIZABETH CITY	299,682	334,364	34,683
GARFIELD CITY	61,101	70,141	9,040
GLOUCESTER CITY	32,723	27,671	-5,053
HARRISON TOWN	25,392	29,928	4,536
HOBOKEN CITY	43,117	36,344	-6,773
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	129,022	123,992	-5,030
JERSEY CITY	493,123	503,634	10,511
KEANSBURG BORO	32,390	29,778	-2,612
LONG BRANCH CITY	70,264	66,879	-3,385
MILLVILLE CITY	75,565	72,659	-2,906
NEPTUNE TWP	62,562	60,995	-1,567
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	116,509	126,235	9,725
NEWARK CITY	789,603	759,471	-30,131
PASSAIC CITY	182,728	205,385	22,657
PATERSON CITY	418,797	418,435	-362
PEMBERTON TWP	92,594	63,798	-28,796
PERTH AMBOY CITY	124,953	147,684	22,731
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	43,662	37,237	-6,425
PLAINFIELD CITY	114,737	121,740	7,002
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	69,945	57,819	-12,125
SALEM CITY	18,642	17,243	-1,400
TRENTON CITY	238,726	221,107	-17,619
UNION CITY	144,213	181,967	37,754
VINELAND CITY	154,649	138,789	-15,861
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	87,913	102,253	14,340
	=====	=====	=====
	4,617,281	4,586,959	-30,322
Amounts shown in thousands.			
Categorical aids included are Security and Special Education Aids.			

**Abbott Tax Rates Relative to the State Average**

District	2007 Equalized Total Tax Rate	Relative to the State Avg	Over 120% of the State Avg	Over 130% of the State Avg
Asbury Park City	1.407	84.6%	0	0
Bridgeton City	2.887	173.5%	1	1
Burlington City	2.092	125.7%	1	0
Camden City	2.823	169.7%	1	1
East Orange City	2.691	161.7%	1	1
Elizabeth City	1.750	105.2%	0	0
Garfield City	1.574	94.6%	0	0
Gloucester City City	2.374	142.7%	1	1
Harrison Town	1.777	106.8%	0	0
Hoboken City	1.039	62.4%	0	0
Irvington Township	2.532	152.2%	1	1
Jersey City City	1.449	87.1%	0	0
Keansburg Borough	1.732	104.1%	0	0
Long Branch City	1.375	82.6%	0	0
Millville City	2.385	143.3%	1	1
Neptune Township	1.479	88.9%	0	0
New Brunswick City	1.662	99.9%	0	0
Newark City	1.586	95.3%	0	0
Orange City	2.652	159.4%	1	1
Passaic City	2.094	125.8%	1	0
Paterson City	1.935	116.3%	0	0
Pemberton Township	1.759	105.7%	0	0
Perth Amboy City	1.994	119.8%	0	0
Phillipsburg Town	1.994	119.8%	0	0
Plainfield City	2.067	124.2%	1	0
Pleasantville City	2.072	124.5%	1	0
Salem City	2.894	173.9%	1	1
Trenton City	2.603	156.4%	1	1
Union City City	1.972	118.5%	0	0
Vineland City	1.870	112.4%	0	0
West New York Town	1.751	105.2%	0	0
			13	9
State Average	1.664			
120% of State Avg	1.997			
Abbott average	1.750			

\* District is below 120% when both the district tax rate and the State average are rounded to the same number of places.

Exhibit J

Annual Increase in State Education Aid  
1998 to 2009

