

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED  
ENTERPRISE OPERATING PRODUCTS, LLC PROJECT ON THE  
FINANCES OF THE BARBERS HILL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL  
DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY  
VALUE LIMITATION**

**November 5, 2010**

**Final Report**

**PREPARED BY**



# **Estimated Impact of the Proposed Enterprise Operating Products, LLC Project on the Finances of the Barbers Hill Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation**

## **Introduction**

Enterprise Operating Products, LLC (Enterprise) has requested that the Barbers Hill Independent School District (BHISD) consider granting a property value limitation under Chapter 313 of the Tax Code for a new natural gas liquids (NGL) fractionation manufacturing project. An application was submitted to BHISD on August 30, 2010. Enterprise proposes to invest \$235 million to construct the new NGL fractionator project in BHISD.

The Enterprise project is consistent with the state's goal to "encourage large scale capital investments in this state." When enacted as House Bill 1200 in 2001, the original language in Chapter 313 of the Tax Code made companies engaged in manufacturing, research and development, and renewable electric energy production eligible to apply to school districts for property value limitations. Subsequent legislative changes expanded eligibility to clean coal projects, nuclear power generation and data centers, among others.

## **School Finance Mechanics**

Under the provisions of Chapter 313, BHISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$30 million. Based on the application, the qualifying time period would begin with the 2011-12 school year. The full value of the investment is expected to reach \$218 million in 2013-14, with depreciation expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement.

The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years, unless the District and the Company agree to an extension of the start of the qualifying time period. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the qualifying time period will be the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. Beginning in 2013-14, the project would go on the local tax roll at \$30 million and remain at that level of taxable value for eight years for maintenance and operations taxes. The full taxable value of the project could be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period, with BHISD currently levying a \$0.2698 I&S tax rate.

Under the current school finance system, the property values established by the Comptroller's Office that are used to calculate state aid and recapture lag by one year, a practical consequence of the fact that the Comptroller's Office needs this time to conduct their property value study and now the planned audits of appraisal district operations in alternating years. A taxpayer receiving a value limitation pays M&O taxes on the reduced value for the project in years 3-10 and receives a tax bill for I&S taxes based on the full project value throughout the qualifying and value limitation period (and thereafter). The school funding formulas use the Comptroller's property

values that reflect a reduction due to the property value limitation in years 4-11 as a result of the one-year lag in property values.

For the school finance system that operated prior to the approval of House Bill 1 (HB 1) in the 2006 special session, the third year was typically problematical for a school district that approved a Chapter 313 value limitation. Based on the data provided in the application, Enterprise indicates that no taxable value would be in place in the second year under the agreement. In year three (2013-14) of the agreement, the project is expected to go on the tax roll at \$30 million or, if applicable, a higher value limitation amount approved by the BHISD Board of Trustees. This difference would result in a revenue loss to the school district in the third year of the agreement that would not be reimbursed by the state, but require some type of compensation from the applicant in the revenue protection provisions of the agreement. In years 4-10, smaller revenue losses would be anticipated when the state property values are aligned at the minimum value established by the Board on both the local tax roll and the corresponding state property value study, assuming a similar deduction is made in the state property values.

HB 1 established a “target” revenue system per student that has the effect of largely neutralizing the third-year revenue losses associated with Chapter 313 property value limitations, at least up to a district’s compressed M&O tax rate. The additional six cents of tax effort that a district may levy are subject to an enriched level of equalization (or no recapture in the case of Chapter 41 school district) and operate more like the pre-HB 1 system. A value limitation must be analyzed for any potential revenue loss associated with this component of the M&O tax levy. For tax effort in excess of the compressed plus six cents rate, equalization and recapture occur at the level of \$319,500 per weighted student in average daily attendance (WADA).

Under HB 3646—the school finance system changes approved by the Legislature in 2009—the starting point is the target revenue provisions from HB 1, that are then expanded through the addition of a series of school funding provisions that had operated previously outside the basic allotment and the traditional formula structure, as well as an additional \$120 per WADA guarantee.

Under the provisions of HB 3646, school districts do have the potential to earn revenue above the \$120 per WADA level, up to a maximum of \$350 per WADA above current law. Initial estimates indicate that about 700 school districts are funded at the minimum \$120 per WADA level, while approximately 300 school districts are expected to generate higher revenue amounts per WADA. This is significant because changes in property values and related tax collections under a Chapter 313 agreement once again have the potential to affect a school district’s base revenue, although probably not to the degree experienced prior to the HB 1 target revenue system.

One key element in any analysis of the school finance implications is the provision for revenue protection in the agreement between the school district and the applicant. In the case of the Enterprise project, the agreement calls for a calculation of the revenue impact of the value limitation in years 3-10 of the agreement, under whatever school finance and property tax laws are in effect in each of those years. This meets the statutory requirement under Section 313.027(f) (1) of the Tax Code to provide school district revenue protection language in the agreement.

### **Underlying Assumptions**

There are several approaches that can be used to analyze the future revenue stream of a school district under a value limitation. Whatever method is used, a reasonable analysis requires the use of a multi-year forecasting model that covers the years in which the agreement is in effect. The

Chapter 313 application now requires 15 years of data and analysis on the project being considered for a property value limitation.

The approach used here is to use the District's enrollment projections but static property values in order to isolate the effects of the value limitation under the school finance system. While the new target revenue system appears to limit the impact of property value changes for a majority of school districts, changes in underlying property value growth have the potential to influence the revenue stream of a number of school districts.

Student enrollment counts begin at 4,342 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in 2011-12 and increase to 7,028 ADA over the next decade in analyzing the effects of the Enterprise project on the finances of BHISD, assuming a 3.5 percent annual growth in enrollment. The District's local tax base totaled \$2.8 billion for the 2010 tax year. While the district's tax base has experienced modest decline in recent years, the underlying \$2.8 billion taxable value for 2010-11 is maintained for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. BHISD is a property-wealthy district, with wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$574,503 expected for the 2011-12 school year. The assumptions for 2011-12 and the forecast period are summarized in Table 1.

### **School Finance Impact**

A baseline model was prepared for BHISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2025-26 school year. Beyond the 2010-11 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88<sup>th</sup> percentile or Austin yield that influence future state funding. In the analyses for other districts and applicants on earlier projects, these changes appeared to have little impact on the revenue associated with the implementation of the property value limitation, since the baseline and other models incorporate the same underlying assumptions.

Under the proposed agreement, a second model is established to make a calculation of the "Baseline Revenue" by adding the value of the proposed Enterprise facility to the model, but without assuming that a value limitation is approved. The results of the model are shown in Table 2.

A third model is developed which adds the Enterprise value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2013-14 school year. The results of this model are identified as "Value Limitation Revenue Model" under the revenue protection provisions of the proposed agreement (see Table 3). An M&O tax rate of \$1.06 is used throughout this analysis.

A summary of the differences between these models is shown in Table 4. The model results show approximately \$38.6 million a year in net General Fund revenue at the beginning of the of limitation period, with annual increases reflective of the District's projected increases in student enrollment.

Under these assumptions, BHISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2013-14 school year (-\$122,658). The revenue reduction results from the mechanics of six cents not subject to recapture, which reflect the one-year lag in value associated with the property value study. It appears that smaller differences persist between the two models over the course of the agreement, in part due to deductions made in state property value study that do not sufficiently offset the reduction in M&O taxes resulting from the impact of the value limitation agreement.

One change that has been incorporated into these models is a more precise estimate of the deduction from the property value study conducted by the Comptroller's Office. At the school district level, a taxpayer benefiting from a property value limitation has two property values assigned by the local appraisal district for their property covered by the limitation: (1) a reduced value for M&O taxes, and (2) the full taxable value for I&S taxes. This situation exists for the eight years that the value limitation is in effect.

Under the property value study conducted by the Comptroller's Office, however, only a single deduction amount is calculated for a property value limitation and the same value is assigned for the M&O and I&S calculations under the school funding formulas. The result of this interpretation is that a "composite" value for a school district with a Chapter 313 agreement is calculated, by averaging the impact of the value reduction across the M&O and I&S tax levies. The result of the composite deduction calculation is that the amount deducted for the value limitation from the state value study is always less than the tax benefit that has been provided for the taxpayer receiving the value limitation in school districts that only levy M&O taxes.

The consequence of the lower deduction in the value study relative to the Chapter 313 reduction in the CAD values is that a school district risks not being fully compensated under the school finance funding formulas for having granted the property value limitation. In the case of BHISD, the calculated lower reduction in the state property value relative to the M&O benefit to be received by the taxpayer does not appear to be substantial. In large part this results because the underlying tax base is substantially larger than the proposed project.

### **Impact on the Taxpayer**

Table 5 summarizes the impact of the proposed property value limitation in terms of the potential tax savings under the property value limitation agreement. The focus of this table is on the M&O tax rate only. As noted previously, the property is fully taxable in the first two years under the agreement. A \$1.06 per \$100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed in 2010-11 and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total \$14.2 million over the life of the agreement. The key BHISD revenue losses are associated with the additional six-cent levy not subject to recapture and expected to total approximately -\$182,343 over the course of the agreement. In total, the potential net tax benefits are estimated to total \$14.0 million over the life of the agreement.

### **Facilities Funding Impact**

The Enterprise project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with BHISD currently levying a \$0.2698 I&S rate. The value of the Enterprise project is expected to depreciate over the life of the agreement and beyond, but full access to the additional value will add to the District's projected wealth per ADA that is currently well above what is provided for through the state's facilities program. The additional value is expected to help reduce the District's current I&S tax rate to \$0.2565 per \$100 in 2013-14—\$0.0133 cents of tax effort—with the rate reduction diminishing as the project value depreciates.

The Enterprise project is not expected to affect BHISD in terms of enrollment. While the construction phase is expected to employ as many as 500 workers, recent experience for similar projects suggests that a number of these workers are not likely to relocate their families while working on the project. The project is expected to result in the creation of eight full-time

positions once the project is in operation. Even if there are some additional students, BHISD is in the midst of a period of steady enrollment growth and should be able to accommodate additional students based on current enrollment trends.

### Conclusion

The proposed Enterprise NGL fractionator project enhances the tax base of BHISD. It reflects continued capital investment in industrial gas manufacturing, one of the goals of Chapter 313 of the Tax Code, also known as the Texas Economic Development Act.

Under the assumptions outlined above, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$14.0 million over the course of the agreement. This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District. The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of BHISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

**Table 1 – Base District Information with Enterprise Operating Products, LLC Project Value and Limitation Values**

Year of Agreement	School Year	ADA	WADA	M&O Tax Rate	I&S Tax Rate	CAD Value with Project	CAD Value with Limitation	CPTD with Project	CPTD With Limitation	CPTD Value with Project per WADA	CPTD Value with Limitation per WADA
1	2011-12	4,342.35	5,067.72	\$1.0601	\$0.2698	\$2,793,937,580	\$2,793,937,580	\$2,911,424,135	\$2,911,424,135	\$574,503	\$574,503
2	2012-13	4,494.33	5,227.23	\$1.0601	\$0.2698	\$2,793,937,580	\$2,793,937,580	\$2,966,608,175	\$2,966,608,175	\$567,529	\$567,529
3	2013-14	4,651.63	5,389.65	\$1.0601	\$0.2576	\$3,012,317,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$2,979,946,365	\$2,979,946,365	\$552,902	\$552,902
4	2014-15	4,814.44	5,557.02	\$1.0601	\$0.2585	\$3,006,187,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,195,851,722	\$3,044,298,532	\$575,101	\$547,829
5	2015-16	4,982.95	5,729.52	\$1.0601	\$0.2595	\$2,999,517,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,188,746,708	\$3,042,225,227	\$556,547	\$530,974
6	2016-17	5,157.35	5,905.00	\$1.0601	\$0.2601	\$2,995,387,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,181,106,093	\$3,040,053,988	\$538,714	\$514,827
7	2017-18	5,337.86	6,094.00	\$1.0601	\$0.2615	\$2,988,907,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,175,957,791	\$3,038,286,117	\$521,162	\$498,570
8	2018-19	5,524.68	6,307.29	\$1.0601	\$0.2625	\$2,982,427,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,168,534,345	\$3,036,206,336	\$502,361	\$481,381
9	2019-20	5,718.05	6,528.04	\$1.0601	\$0.2635	\$2,975,947,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,161,063,243	\$3,034,029,182	\$484,228	\$464,769
10	2020-21	5,918.18	6,756.53	\$1.0601	\$0.2645	\$2,969,467,580	\$2,823,937,580	\$3,153,585,344	\$3,031,837,232	\$466,747	\$448,727
11	2021-22	6,125.31	6,993.00	\$1.0601	\$0.2655	\$2,962,987,580	\$2,962,987,580	\$3,263,079,400	\$3,146,609,256	\$466,621	\$449,965
12	2022-23	6,339.70	7,237.76	\$1.0601	\$0.2666	\$2,956,697,580	\$2,956,697,580	\$3,251,427,116	\$3,251,427,116	\$449,231	\$449,231
13	2023-24	6,561.59	7,491.08	\$1.0601	\$0.2680	\$2,947,398,580	\$2,947,398,580	\$3,240,116,727	\$3,240,116,727	\$432,530	\$432,530
14	2024-25	6,791.25	7,753.27	\$1.0601	\$0.2695	\$2,937,566,580	\$2,937,566,580	\$3,225,944,772	\$3,225,944,772	\$416,075	\$416,075
15	2025-26	7,028.94	8,024.63	\$1.0601	\$0.2701	\$2,928,246,240	\$2,928,246,240	\$3,211,382,921	\$3,211,382,921	\$400,191	\$400,191

\*Tier II Yield: \$47.65; AISD Yield: \$59.97; Equalized Wealth: \$476,500 per WADA

**Table 2– “Baseline Revenue Model”--Project Value Added with No Value Limitation**

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
1	2011-12	\$31,770,144	\$1,642,577	\$5,217,157	\$0	-\$1,992,710	\$1,907,702	\$83,598	-\$551	\$38,627,917
2	2012-13	\$31,518,291	\$1,694,949	\$6,185,840	\$0	-\$1,613,342	\$1,892,579	\$107,192	-\$535	\$39,784,973
3	2013-14	\$33,702,853	\$1,749,155	\$4,422,753	\$0	-\$919,538	\$2,023,755	\$171,149	-\$545	\$41,149,583
4	2014-15	\$33,641,501	\$2,130,872	\$6,896,938	\$0	-\$2,508,849	\$2,020,071	\$86,333	-\$598	\$42,266,270
5	2015-16	\$33,574,744	\$1,863,325	\$7,073,530	\$0	-\$1,109,072	\$2,016,063	\$156,189	-\$550	\$43,574,229
6	2016-17	\$33,533,410	\$2,272,230	\$7,311,291	\$0	-\$450,809	\$2,013,581	\$227,761	-\$528	\$44,906,936
7	2017-18	\$33,468,531	\$1,985,626	\$8,572,871	\$0	\$0	\$2,009,685	\$302,605	-\$477	\$46,338,840
8	2018-19	\$33,403,674	\$2,423,655	\$9,735,528	\$0	\$0	\$2,005,790	\$388,326	-\$448	\$47,956,525
9	2019-20	\$33,338,817	\$2,116,638	\$11,696,986	\$0	\$0	\$2,001,896	\$476,986	-\$389	\$49,630,933
10	2020-21	\$34,735,286	\$2,944,077	\$11,118,294	\$0	\$0	\$2,085,750	\$593,634	-\$374	\$51,476,666
11	2021-22	\$34,618,704	\$3,037,285	\$12,844,468	\$0	\$0	\$2,078,749	\$592,362	-\$357	\$53,171,213
12	2022-23	\$34,505,536	\$4,383,607	\$13,373,714	\$0	\$0	\$2,071,954	\$693,418	-\$322	\$55,027,907
13	2023-24	\$34,363,735	\$5,769,550	\$13,953,652	\$0	\$0	\$2,063,439	\$796,842	-\$252	\$56,946,966
14	2024-25	\$34,218,029	\$7,228,660	\$14,528,173	\$0	\$0	\$2,054,690	\$906,031	-\$214	\$58,935,370
15	2025-26	\$34,078,878	\$8,737,780	\$15,112,210	\$0	\$0	\$2,046,334	\$1,019,321	-\$156	\$60,994,367

**Table 3– “Value Limitation Revenue Model”--Project Value Added with Value Limit**

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
1	2011-12	\$31,770,144	\$1,642,577	\$5,217,157	\$0	-\$1,992,710	\$1,907,702	\$83,598	-\$551	\$38,627,917
2	2012-13	\$31,518,291	\$1,694,949	\$6,185,840	\$0	-\$1,613,342	\$1,892,579	\$107,192	-\$535	\$39,784,973
3	2013-14	\$31,818,959	\$1,749,155	\$6,235,038	\$0	-\$847,928	\$1,910,633	\$161,582	-\$514	\$41,026,925
4	2014-15	\$31,818,910	\$2,130,872	\$7,137,959	\$0	-\$927,278	\$1,910,630	\$180,757	-\$517	\$42,251,334
5	2015-16	\$31,818,856	\$1,863,325	\$7,720,346	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,627	\$247,094	-\$473	\$43,559,775
6	2016-17	\$31,818,824	\$2,272,230	\$8,575,068	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,625	\$314,718	-\$453	\$44,891,012
7	2017-18	\$31,818,749	\$1,985,626	\$10,222,653	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,620	\$387,227	-\$405	\$46,324,470
8	2018-19	\$31,818,695	\$11,711,824	\$16,149,853	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,617	\$1,208,489	\$0	\$62,799,478
9	2019-20	\$31,818,641	\$14,200,222	\$17,196,398	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,614	\$1,395,961	\$0	\$66,521,837
10	2020-21	\$33,279,914	\$14,222,143	\$15,713,205	\$0	\$0	\$1,998,359	\$1,462,570	\$0	\$66,676,190
11	2021-22	\$34,618,704	\$13,074,365	\$15,522,192	\$0	\$0	\$2,078,749	\$1,390,155	\$0	\$66,684,165
12	2022-23	\$34,505,536	\$12,026,134	\$16,683,592	\$0	\$0	\$2,071,954	\$1,274,203	-\$45	\$66,561,373
13	2023-24	\$34,363,735	\$12,139,244	\$16,712,283	\$0	\$0	\$2,063,439	\$1,280,593	-\$18	\$66,559,275
14	2024-25	\$34,218,029	\$12,280,970	\$16,716,262	\$0	\$0	\$2,054,690	\$1,289,784	-\$32	\$66,559,704
15	2025-26	\$34,078,878	\$12,426,596	\$16,709,788	\$0	\$0	\$2,046,334	\$1,299,635	-\$24	\$66,561,206

**Table 4 – Value Limit less Project Value with No Limit**

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
1	2011-12	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2012-13	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2013-14	-\$1,883,894	\$0	\$1,812,284	\$0	\$71,610	-\$113,122	-\$9,567	\$30	-\$122,658
4	2014-15	-\$1,822,591	\$0	\$241,021	\$0	\$1,581,571	-\$109,441	\$94,425	\$80	-\$14,936
5	2015-16	-\$1,755,888	\$0	\$646,816	\$0	\$1,109,072	-\$105,436	\$90,905	\$77	-\$14,454
6	2016-17	-\$1,714,586	\$0	\$1,263,777	\$0	\$450,809	-\$102,956	\$86,957	\$75	-\$15,924
7	2017-18	-\$1,649,782	\$0	\$1,649,782	\$0	\$0	-\$99,064	\$84,622	\$72	-\$14,370
8	2018-19	-\$1,584,979	\$9,288,168	\$6,414,325	\$0	\$0	-\$95,173	\$820,163	\$448	\$14,842,953
9	2019-20	-\$1,520,176	\$12,083,584	\$5,499,412	\$0	\$0	-\$91,282	\$918,976	\$389	\$16,890,903
10	2020-21	-\$1,455,373	\$11,278,066	\$4,594,911	\$0	\$0	-\$87,391	\$868,936	\$374	\$15,199,524
11	2021-22	\$0	\$10,037,079	\$2,677,724	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$797,792	\$357	\$13,512,953
12	2022-23	\$0	\$7,642,527	\$3,309,878	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$580,785	\$277	\$11,533,467
13	2023-24	\$0	\$6,369,693	\$2,758,631	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$483,751	\$234	\$9,612,309
14	2024-25	\$0	\$5,052,310	\$2,188,089	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$383,753	\$182	\$7,624,333
15	2025-26	\$0	\$3,688,816	\$1,597,578	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$280,313	\$132	\$5,566,839

**Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the Enterprise Operating Products, LLC Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to BHISD at \$1.0601 M&O Tax Rate**

Year of Agreement	School Year	Project Value	Estimated Taxable Value	Value Savings	Taxes Before Value Limit	Taxes after Value Limit	Tax Savings @ Projected M&O Rate	Tax Credits for First Two Years Above Limit	Tax Benefit to Company Before Revenue Protection	School District Revenue Losses	Estimated Net Tax Benefits
1	2011-12	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2012-13	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2013-14	\$218,380,000	\$30,000,000	\$188,380,000	\$2,315,046	\$318,030	\$1,997,016	\$0	\$1,997,016	-\$122,658	\$1,874,358
4	2014-15	\$212,250,000	\$30,000,000	\$182,250,000	\$2,250,062	\$318,030	\$1,932,032	\$0	\$1,932,032	-\$14,936	\$1,917,096
5	2015-16	\$205,580,000	\$30,000,000	\$175,580,000	\$2,179,354	\$318,030	\$1,861,324	\$0	\$1,861,324	-\$14,454	\$1,846,870
6	2016-17	\$201,450,000	\$30,000,000	\$171,450,000	\$2,135,571	\$318,030	\$1,817,541	\$0	\$1,817,541	-\$15,924	\$1,801,617
7	2017-18	\$194,970,000	\$30,000,000	\$164,970,000	\$2,066,877	\$318,030	\$1,748,847	\$0	\$1,748,847	-\$14,370	\$1,734,476
8	2018-19	\$188,490,000	\$30,000,000	\$158,490,000	\$1,998,182	\$318,030	\$1,680,152	\$0	\$1,680,152	\$0	\$1,680,152
9	2019-20	\$182,010,000	\$30,000,000	\$152,010,000	\$1,929,488	\$318,030	\$1,611,458	\$0	\$1,611,458	\$0	\$1,611,458
10	2020-21	\$175,530,000	\$30,000,000	\$145,530,000	\$1,860,794	\$318,030	\$1,542,764	\$0	\$1,542,764	\$0	\$1,542,764
11	2021-22	\$169,050,000	\$169,050,000	\$0	\$1,792,099	\$1,792,099	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	2022-23	\$162,760,000	\$162,760,000	\$0	\$1,725,419	\$1,725,419	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2023-24	\$153,461,000	\$153,461,000	\$0	\$1,626,840	\$1,626,840	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2024-25	\$143,629,000	\$143,629,000	\$0	\$1,522,611	\$1,522,611	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2025-26	\$134,308,660	\$134,308,660	\$0	\$1,423,806	\$1,423,806	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					<b>\$24,826,150</b>	<b>\$10,635,015</b>	<b>\$14,191,135</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$14,191,135</b>	<b>-\$182,343</b>	<b>\$14,008,792</b>

**Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years**

	Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits
	\$0	\$0	\$0
Credits Earned			\$0
Credits Paid			<u>\$0</u>
Excess Credits Unpaid			\$0