

Background

Providing a safe and healthy learning environment is pivotal to ensuring students can achieve in the classroom and beyond. Research has repeatedly shown a safe learning environment can help improve student learning outcomes. Students' overall health and ability to perform academically can be negatively impacted by environmental exposure to mold, poorly ventilated air, uncomfortable temperatures, and inadequate lighting or noise in school buildings.¹ Research has also shown that socioeconomically disadvantaged students are less likely to attend school in a building that is in "good" or "excellent" condition.²

The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted how vital a safe physical learning environment is for students. Districts used over \$6.7 billion (15.4%) of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund to improve physical health and safety in schools during fiscal year 2022.³ It is estimated Connecticut districts spent more than \$200 million to improve school safety, with some of the funds allocated for heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); outdoor classrooms; facility repairs; and upgrades aimed at reducing the spread of COVID-19.⁴

This historical infusion of federal aid enabled districts to improve student safety, underscoring the significance of investing in physical learning environments. While historic, this investment must continue well beyond the sunset of ESSER aid to ensure continued access to healthy, safe, and effective learning spaces.

Investing in capital improvements for school districts results in more than just improved facilities for students. Research has shown school facility investments result in both improved student outcomes and increased home values.^{5,6} Additionally, the impact of these investments is most significant in communities with higher levels of student need and student diversity.⁷

During the 2025 legislative session, Connecticut made progress toward creating safer, healthier learning environments for students and educators. The General Assembly enhanced and expanded existing laws and introduced the District Repair and Improvement Project (DRIP) program.^A This program offers reimbursement grants to school districts for minor capital repairs and improvements to public school buildings, grounds, and infrastructure.^{8,B}

^A For more information on the 2025 legislative changes to school construction and capital improvements, please see:

School and State Finance Project. (2025). *2025 Legislative Session: Impacts to School Construction & Capital Projects*. Southington, CT: Author. Retrieved from <https://files.schoolstatefinance.org/hubfs/Reports/2025%20Legislative%20Session:%20Impacts%20to%20School%20Construction%20and%20Capital%20Projects.pdf>.

^B For more information on the DRIP program grant, please see:

School and State Finance Project. (2025). *FAQs: District Repair and Improvement Project (DRIP) Program*. Southington, CT: Author. Retrieved from [https://files.schoolstatefinance.org/hubfs/Reports/FAQs:%20District%20Repair%20and%20Improvement%20Project%20\(DRIP\)%20Program.pdf](https://files.schoolstatefinance.org/hubfs/Reports/FAQs:%20District%20Repair%20and%20Improvement%20Project%20(DRIP)%20Program.pdf).

For major infrastructure and new construction projects, eligible public school operators are still able to receive reimbursement through the state's school construction grant program. However, this program continues to not equitably support all public school operators or provide reimbursements to all public school types.

To provide better support to school districts, Connecticut should:

1. Expand the school construction grant program's eligibility to serve all public school types; and
2. Revamp school construction grant reimbursement rates to be more equitable for students with additional learning needs.

This document provides an overview of how the State of Connecticut currently supports school construction and expands on how the State's school construction grant reimbursement processes can be improved to better serve all students and public schools.

School Construction Grant Program Eligibility

Recommendation: Expand the eligibility of the current school construction grant program to all types of public school districts to benefit all Connecticut students.

Connecticut's school construction grant program reimburses most public school operators, with exceptions for charter school operators, under specific legislative guidelines. Charter school operators are the only public school type ineligible for reimbursement through this program. Instead, they primarily receive funds through the Charter School Facilities grant.

To ensure equity for all students, regardless of where they attend public school, the school construction grant program should be expanded to include support for charter schools. Similar to how support is calculated for Regional Educational Services Centers (RESCs) and regional school districts, charter schools should qualify for the same reimbursement rates as the communities in which they are located.

Do all public school districts receive funding through the school construction grant program?

Under current law, the school construction grant program typically only allocates funds to certain types of public school districts. There have been several instances where charter schools, which are not currently eligible to apply for the school construction grant program, have been awarded aid through the program.⁹ This only happens when the legislature permits it by adopting special “notwithstanding” language and modifying specific projects, making these projects eligible for reimbursement.¹⁰

How do districts that are not eligible for the school construction grant program receive facilities funding from the State for their schools?

Currently, charter schools are the only public school type ineligible for support through the school construction grant program. The legislature has occasionally allowed charter schools to receive facilities funding through the school construction grant, but they primarily receive aid through the Charter School Facilities Grant.

Under the Charter School Facilities Grant, the General Assembly authorizes bonds to support capital improvements at charter schools, which are administered by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE).

Unlike funds provided under the school construction grant program, a charter school must wait for action by the State Bond Commission, chaired by the governor, to approve the release of funds.^{11.C}

However, Section 147 of Public Act 25-174 now requires the CSDE to prioritize charter school capital improvement grant applications for schools with Accountability Index scores at or above the state average.¹²

How can eligibility for the school construction grant program be improved?

The school construction grant program should be expanded to include charter schools, ensuring all students have access to safe, modern, and suitable school facilities. The standard reimbursement rate for charter schools should be based on the rate provided to the host community in which they are located.^D This ensures all school construction projects move forward equitably once they receive legislative approval.

School Construction Grant Reimbursement Rates

Recommendation: Connecticut should increase its investment for all districts serving higher-needs students by revising the current reimbursement calculation for the school construction grant program.

Students in Connecticut would benefit from a school construction grant program that is more equitable and accurately accounts for district needs. Currently, the school construction grant program's reimbursement rates are divided into three main categories: standard, bonus, and reduced. Within these categories, eligible schools may receive reimbursement rates between 10% and 85%. Schools can also receive bonuses ranging from 5% to 10% without exceeding 95%.

^C For more detailed information, please see:

Callahan, J. (2024). *Charter Schools and the School Construction Program* (2024-R-0046). Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2024/rpt/pdf/2024-R-0046.pdf>.

^D To see how this change would potentially impact charter schools, please see Appendix A.

The school construction grant program provides eligible school districts with additional support. While the State has established a 15 percentage-point bonus to reimbursements for school construction projects that expand or create in-district special education programs or services, reimbursements still do not fully represent district need or capacity to fund construction projects.¹³ The State should add bonus rates that accurately capture student and district need to improve the relationship between support and municipal need.

How is the state funding percentage currently determined?¹⁴

To calculate standard reimbursement rates for local public school districts, the State ranks municipalities based on the average Adjusted Equalized Grand List per Capita (AEGLC) for two, three, and four years prior. Reimbursement rates are then assigned on a continuous scale, with the lowest wealth community receiving the highest rate and each municipality after receiving a slightly lower rate than the municipality prior. There are two ranges of standard reimbursements for any projects approved on or after July 1, 2024, which are outlined in Table 1.¹⁵

Table 1: Reimbursement Rates for Projects Approved on or After July 1, 2024^E

Project Type	Reimbursement Rate Range
New construction or building replacement ^F	10% - 80%
Renovations, extensions, code violations, roof replacements	20% - 80%

Districts may receive bonus reimbursement rates on top of their standard rate for certain eligible projects. These rates range between five and 15 additional percentage points on top of the standard reimbursement rate.¹⁶ For qualified school-related areas where learning may not typically take place — such as outdoor athletic facilities, auditorium seating, and spectator seating in a gymnasium — the reduced reimbursement rate is 50% of the district's regular reimbursement rate for construction, extensions, or major alterations.^G

^E Reimbursement rates for RESCs, regional school districts, and endowed academies are calculated by taking a weighted average of the rankings of participating communities. Districts receive the reimbursement rate provided to the local public school district with the next closest ranking. Regional school districts receive up to an additional 10 percentage points on their rate, and endowed academies receive up to an additional five percentage points, with their standard rate not to exceed 85%.

^F For projects applied for prior to July 1, 2024, new construction reimbursement rates range between 10% and 70%.

^G For more detailed information, please visit:

Sullivan, M. (2023). *School Construction Reimbursement Grants (2023-R-0250)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0250.pdf>.

Is the current reimbursement rate calculation equitable and accurately representing district need?

The current method of calculating reimbursement rates does not fully represent districts' needs or provide equitable support. Currently, reimbursement rates are based entirely on municipal wealth and are provided on a continuous scale based on wealth ranking. This method does not consider the impact of student need on the ability to fund projects. Districts with higher levels of student need experience higher costs associated with providing increased levels of student support. This results in reduced resources available for school construction projects.

How can the school construction grant program reimbursement rates be improved?

To be more in line with peer states, and provide more equitable support, Connecticut should adopt reimbursement bonus rates that would provide additional state support to districts with higher rates of student poverty, students with disabilities, and multilingual learners. Currently, Massachusetts offers a similar bonus for students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.¹⁷

Under this proposal, districts would receive bonus points based on the percentage of students identified in each need category and the quartile the district ranks in for each category compared to the state as a whole. Table 2 below outlines proposed reimbursement rates by quartile, with Quartile 1 representing districts with the lowest percentages of student need and Quartile 4 representing those with the highest percentages.^H

Table 2: Proposed Bonus Rates

Student Need Category	Quartile 1	Quartile 2	Quartile 3	Quartile 4
Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points
Multilingual Learners	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points
Students with Disabilities	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points

^H For how these changes would impact district reimbursement rates, please see Appendix B.

Appendices

Appendix A: Proposed Charter School Rates

The table below displays proposed reimbursement rates for charter schools based on the most recent rates provided to host districts for renovation projects. Proposed rates are subject to change on a yearly basis due to similar fluctuations in host district rates.

Charter School	Proposed Rate
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	78.6%
Achievement First Hartford Academy	79.6%
Amistad Academy	77.9%
Booker T. Washington Academy	77.9%
Brass City Charter School	78.9%
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	78.6%
Common Ground High School	77.9%
Elm City College Preparatory School	77.9%
Elm City Montessori School	77.9%
Explorations	72.9%
Great Oaks Charter School	78.6%
Highville Charter School	77.9%
Integrated Day Charter School	77.5%
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	78.2%
Jumoke Academy	79.6%
New Beginnings Family Academy	78.6%
Odyssey Community School	67.9%
Park City Prep Charter School	78.6%
Side By Side Charter School	60.0%
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	60.0%
The Bridge Academy	78.6%

Appendix B: School Construction Grant Program Reimbursement Rates

The table below displays: 1) the current law reimbursements to districts under the school construction grant program for projects that qualify for the renovation project rates; 2) the increase districts could receive with a more equitable reimbursement rate; and 3) the percentage change from the old rates to the new ones.

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
Achievement First Hartford Academy	0.0%	87.6%	8.0%
Amistad Academy	0.0%	86.9%	9.0%
Andover School District	60.4%	64.4%	4.0%
Ansonia School District	77.1%	88.1%	11.0%
ACES	65.0%	75.0%	10.0%
Ashford School District	67.5%	72.5%	5.0%
Avon School District	27.9%	31.9%	4.0%
Barkhamsted School District	51.4%	58.4%	7.0%
Berlin School District	40.4%	47.4%	7.0%
Bethany School District	37.1%	44.1%	7.0%
Bethel School District	47.9%	55.9%	8.0%
Bloomfield School District	49.6%	60.6%	11.0%
Bolton School District	52.5%	56.5%	4.0%
Booker T. Washington Academy	0.0%	85.9%	8.0%
Bozrah School District	60.7%	67.7%	7.0%
Branford School District	34.6%	42.6%	8.0%
Brass City Charter School	0.0%	88.9%	10.0%
Bridgeport School District	78.6%	90.6%	12.0%
Bristol School District	72.1%	83.1%	11.0%
Brookfield School District	33.9%	40.9%	7.0%
Brooklyn School District	68.9%	77.9%	9.0%
Canaan School District	30.0%	36.0%	6.0%
Canterbury School District	65.7%	70.7%	5.0%
Canton School District	41.8%	46.8%	5.0%
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
CREC	59.3%	71.3%	12.0%
Chaplin School District	64.3%	71.3%	7.0%
Cheshire School District	50.0%	54.0%	4.0%
Chester School District	48.9%	52.9%	4.0%
Clinton School District	42.9%	51.9%	9.0%
Colchester School District	61.1%	68.1%	7.0%
Colebrook School District	42.5%	50.5%	8.0%
Columbia School District	48.6%	52.6%	4.0%
Common Ground High School	0.0%	88.9%	11.0%
C.E.S.	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Cornwall School District	23.6%	28.6%	5.0%
Coventry School District	59.6%	64.6%	5.0%
Cromwell School District	44.6%	50.6%	6.0%
Danbury School District	63.9%	71.9%	8.0%
Darien School District	20.7%	27.7%	7.0%
Deep River School District	42.1%	50.1%	8.0%
Derby School District	75.0%	86.0%	11.0%
East Granby School District	46.4%	50.4%	4.0%
East Haddam School District	52.1%	56.1%	4.0%
East Hampton School District	57.1%	63.1%	6.0%
East Hartford School District	76.4%	88.4%	12.0%
East Haven School District	71.4%	82.4%	11.0%
East Lyme School District	40.7%	48.7%	8.0%
East Windsor School District	63.2%	74.2%	11.0%
EASTCONN	65.7%	74.7%	9.0%
Eastford School District	58.6%	63.6%	5.0%
Easton School District	26.8%	31.8%	5.0%
EdAdvance	52.1%	61.1%	9.0%
Ellington School District	53.6%	60.6%	7.0%
Elm City College Preparatory School	0.0%	86.9%	9.0%
Elm City Montessori School	0.0%	83.9%	6.0%
Enfield School District	71.8%	81.8%	10.0%
Essex School District	28.9%	37.9%	9.0%
Explorations	0.0%	81.9%	9.0%
Fairfield School District	26.1%	33.1%	7.0%
Farmington School District	30.7%	35.7%	5.0%
Franklin School District	43.2%	47.2%	4.0%
Glastonbury School District	32.9%	37.9%	5.0%
Granby School District	45.7%	49.7%	4.0%
Great Oaks Charter School	0.0%	88.6%	10.0%
Greenwich School District	20.0%	26.0%	6.0%
Griswold School District	73.2%	83.2%	10.0%
Groton School District	57.5%	67.5%	10.0%
Guilford School District	30.4%	35.4%	5.0%
Hamden School District	69.6%	80.6%	11.0%
Hampton School District	62.9%	70.9%	8.0%
Hartford School District	79.6%	91.6%	12.0%
Hartland School District	51.8%	57.8%	6.0%
Hebron School District	55.4%	58.4%	3.0%
Highville Charter School	0.0%	83.9%	6.0%
Integrated Day Charter School	0.0%	84.5%	7.0%
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	0.0%	89.2%	11.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Jumoke Academy	0.0%	86.6%	7.0%
Kent School District	28.2%	34.2%	6.0%
Killingly School District	70.4%	79.4%	9.0%
LEARN	50.7%	61.7%	11.0%
Lebanon School District	57.9%	63.9%	6.0%
Ledyard School District	61.8%	68.8%	7.0%
Lisbon School District	56.4%	65.4%	9.0%
Madison School District	29.3%	34.3%	5.0%
Manchester School District	67.9%	78.9%	11.0%
Mansfield School District	76.1%	82.1%	6.0%
Marlborough School District	46.1%	50.1%	4.0%
Meriden School District	75.7%	87.7%	12.0%
Middletown School District	66.1%	75.1%	9.0%
Milford School District	36.8%	43.8%	7.0%
Monroe School District	37.9%	42.9%	5.0%
Montville School District	72.5%	82.5%	10.0%
Naugatuck School District	74.6%	86.6%	12.0%
New Beginnings Family Academy	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
New Britain School District	79.3%	91.3%	12.0%
New Canaan School District	20.4%	23.4%	3.0%
New Fairfield School District	35.4%	42.4%	7.0%
New Hartford School District	50.4%	57.4%	7.0%
New Haven School District	77.9%	87.9%	10.0%
New London School District	78.2%	90.2%	12.0%
New Milford School District	48.2%	57.2%	9.0%
Newington School District	59.3%	68.3%	9.0%
Newtown School District	35.0%	40.0%	5.0%
Norfolk School District	31.4%	38.4%	7.0%
North Branford School District	53.2%	59.2%	6.0%
North Canaan School District	63.6%	71.6%	8.0%
North Haven School District	37.5%	43.5%	6.0%
North Stonington School District	56.1%	60.1%	4.0%
Norwalk School District	60.0%	70.0%	10.0%
Norwich Free Academy	76.1%	85.1%	9.0%
Norwich School District	77.5%	89.5%	12.0%
Odyssey Community School	0.0%	75.9%	8.0%
Old Saybrook School District	27.1%	35.1%	8.0%
Orange School District	31.1%	36.1%	5.0%
Oxford School District	41.4%	46.4%	5.0%
Park City Prep Charter School	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
Plainfield School District	73.9%	83.9%	10.0%
Plainville School District	65.0%	74.0%	9.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Plymouth School District	68.6%	78.6%	10.0%
Pomfret School District	55.7%	61.7%	6.0%
Portland School District	51.1%	60.1%	9.0%
Preston School District	58.9%	64.9%	6.0%
Putnam School District	70.0%	81.0%	11.0%
Redding School District	26.4%	31.4%	5.0%
Regional School District 1	43.6%	50.6%	7.0%
Regional School District 4	48.6%	55.6%	7.0%
Regional School District 5	42.9%	46.9%	4.0%
Regional School District 7	57.5%	64.5%	7.0%
Regional School District 8	63.2%	67.2%	4.0%
Regional School District 9	36.8%	40.8%	4.0%
Regional School District 10	55.0%	61.0%	6.0%
Regional School District 11	75.4%	83.4%	8.0%
Regional School District 12	32.5%	36.5%	4.0%
Regional School District 13	53.2%	60.2%	7.0%
Regional School District 14	50.7%	58.7%	8.0%
Regional School District 15	48.9%	54.9%	6.0%
Regional School District 16	70.0%	76.0%	6.0%
Regional School District 17	50.4%	55.4%	5.0%
Regional School District 18	35.7%	39.7%	4.0%
Regional School District 19	81.8%	88.8%	7.0%
Regional School District 20	<i>District is new and data is not available to calculate a proposed rate.</i>		
Ridgefield School District	24.3%	30.3%	6.0%
Rocky Hill School District	45.4%	53.4%	8.0%
Salem School District	47.1%	53.1%	6.0%
Salisbury School District	22.5%	27.5%	5.0%
Scotland School District	69.3%	77.3%	8.0%
Seymour School District	66.8%	74.8%	8.0%
Sharon School District	23.2%	30.2%	7.0%
Shelton School District	38.6%	47.6%	9.0%
Sherman School District	25.4%	28.4%	3.0%
Side By Side Charter School	0.0%	69.0%	9.0%
Simsbury School District	36.1%	42.1%	6.0%
Somers School District	60.0%	64.0%	4.0%
South Windsor School District	44.3%	50.3%	6.0%
Southington School District	54.6%	61.6%	7.0%
Sprague School District	73.6%	83.6%	10.0%
Stafford School District	70.7%	78.7%	8.0%
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	0.0%	69.0%	9.0%
Stamford School District	60.0%	69.0%	9.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Sterling School District	74.3%	81.3%	7.0%
Stonington School District	32.1%	37.1%	5.0%
Stratford School District	62.1%	72.1%	10.0%
Suffield School District	50.7%	56.7%	6.0%
The Bridge Academy	0.0%	88.6%	10.0%
The Gilbert School	74.6%	82.6%	8.0%
The Woodstock Academy	66.1%	69.1%	3.0%
Thomaston School District	68.2%	75.2%	7.0%
Thompson School District	67.1%	76.1%	9.0%
Tolland School District	50.0%	55.0%	5.0%
Torrington School District	75.4%	86.4%	11.0%
Trumbull School District	34.3%	40.3%	6.0%
Union School District	43.9%	48.9%	5.0%
Vernon School District	71.1%	81.1%	10.0%
Voluntown School District	65.4%	71.4%	6.0%
Wallingford School District	54.3%	64.3%	10.0%
Waterbury School District	78.9%	90.9%	12.0%
Waterford School District	31.8%	39.8%	8.0%
Watertown School District	61.4%	69.4%	8.0%
West Hartford School District	38.2%	47.2%	9.0%
West Haven School District	76.8%	88.8%	12.0%
Westbrook School District	27.5%	36.5%	9.0%
Weston School District	22.1%	27.1%	5.0%
Westport School District	21.1%	24.1%	3.0%
Wethersfield School District	56.8%	64.8%	8.0%
Willington School District	64.6%	72.6%	8.0%
Wilton School District	22.9%	28.9%	6.0%
Winchester School District	72.9%	82.9%	10.0%
Windham School District	80.0%	92.0%	12.0%
Windsor Locks School District	53.9%	62.9%	9.0%
Windsor School District	52.9%	62.9%	10.0%
Wolcott School District	66.4%	74.4%	8.0%
Woodbridge School District	32.5%	37.5%	5.0%
Woodstock School District	55.0%	61.0%	6.0%

Endnotes

¹ Eitland, E., Klingensmith, L., MacNaughton, P., Cedeno Laurent, J., Spengler, J., Bernstein, A., & Allen, J.G. (2017). *Foundations for Student Success: How School Buildings Influence Student Health, Thinking and Performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Center for Health and the Global Environment. Retrieved from https://forhealth.org/Harvard.Schools_For_Health.Foundations_for_Student_Success.pdf.

² Blagg, K., Terrones, F., & Nelson, V. (2023). *Assessing the National Landscape of Capital Expenditures for Public School Districts*. Washington, DC.: Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2023-01/Assessing%20the%20National%20Landscape%20of%20Capital%20Expenditures%20for%20Public%20School%20Districts.pdf>.

³ U.S. Department of Education. (2024). *Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund: Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Performance Report*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://api.covid-relief-data.ed.gov/collection/api/v1/public/docs/ESSERFiscalYear2022AnnualPerformanceReport.pdf>.

⁴ School and State Finance Project. (n.d.). COVID-19 Relief Funding for Education. Retrieved from <https://schoolstatefinance.org/issues/esser-funding>.

⁵ Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2022). The Impact of School Facility Investments on Students and Homeowners: Evidence from Los Angeles. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 14(3), 254-289. Retrieved from <https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=14772>.

⁶ Biasi, B., Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2024). *What Works and For Whom? Effectiveness and Efficiency of School Capital Investments Across the U.S.* (Working Paper 32040). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w32040/w32040.pdf.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Conn. Acts 25-174 § 131 (i).

⁹ Callahan, J. (2024). *Charter Schools and the School Construction Program (2024-R-0046)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2024/rpt/pdf/2024-R-0046.pdf>.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Conn. Acts 25-174 §§ 147(a)(3)(A)-(B).

¹³ Conn. Acts 25-174 § 143.

¹⁴ Sullivan, M. (2023). *School Construction Reimbursement Grants (2023-R-0250)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0250.pdf>.

¹⁵ Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 173, § 10-285a(a)(3), as amended by Conn. Acts 23-205.

¹⁶ Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 173, §§ 10-285a(b)(2)(d)-(h).

¹⁷ Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 70B, § 10.