

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED
ARKEMA, INC. PROJECT ON THE FINANCES OF THE LA PORTE
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED
CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY VALUE LIMITATION**

March 7, 2011

Final Report

PREPARED BY



Estimated Impact of the Proposed ARKEMA, Inc. Project on the Finances of the La Porte Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

Introduction

ARKEMA, Inc. (ARKEMA) has requested that the La Porte Independent School District (LPISD) consider granting a property value limitation under Chapter 313 of the Tax Code for a chemical manufacturing project. An application was submitted to LPISD on December 30, 2010. ARKEMA proposes to invest \$104 million to construct this project in LPISD.

The ARKEMA 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, LPISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$30 million. Based on the application, the qualifying time period would begin with the 2012-13 school year. The full taxable value of the investment is expected to reach \$99.2 million in 2014-15, 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 2012-13 and 2013-14 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 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years. Beginning in 2014-15, 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 LPISD currently levying a \$0.285 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. HB 1 established a “target” revenue system per student that has the effect of largely neutralizing the third-year revenue losses associated with a Chapter 313 property value limitation, at least up to a district’s compressed M&O tax rate. The additional four to 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 were expected to generate higher revenue amounts per WADA in the 2009-10 school year. 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. In the case of LPISD, however, it appears that the District will remain at the \$120 per WADA minimum hold-harmless level under all of the scenarios examined as part of this analysis.

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 ARKEMA 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 maintain static enrollment and 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. An earlier value limitation agreement for Air Liquide is factored into the base model used here, although the impact of the proposed ARKEMA project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts are held constant at 11,702 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the ARKEMA project on the finances of LPISD. The District's local tax base reached \$5.8 billion for the 2010 tax year. While the District's tax base experienced value growth during the latter part of the last decade, it did fall off in 2010. The underlying \$5.8 billion taxable value for 2010-11 is maintained for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. LPISD is a relatively wealthy district in terms of property wealth per student but is not currently subject to recapture, with wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$384,651 for the 2010-11 school year. These assumptions are summarized in Table 1.

School Finance Impact

A baseline model was prepared for LPISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2026-27 school year. Beyond the 2010-11 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88th 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 ARKEMA 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 ARKEMA value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2014-15 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 \$1.04 is used throughout this analysis.

A summary of the differences between these models is presented in Table 4. The model results show approximately \$91.3 million a year in net General Fund revenue.

Under these assumptions, LPISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2014-15 school year (-\$42,348). The revenue reduction results from the mechanics of the four cents eligible for the Austin ISD yield, 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 the state property value study.

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. This methodology has been

incorporated into these estimates and the typical result is an increase in the hold-harmless formula amounts owed to the school district by the company that receives the value limitation. The extent to which this affects a school district's finances appears to be influenced by the scale of the value limitation reduction relative to the district's underlying tax base, as well as its I&S tax rate.

In the case of LPISD, 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 \$1.04 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 \$4.9 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, ARKEMA would be eligible for a tax credit for taxes paid on value in excess of the value limitation in each of the first two years. The tax credits are expected to total approximately \$68,874 over the life of the agreement, with no unpaid tax credits anticipated. (The school district is reimbursed by the state for the cost of the tax credit payments.) The key LPISD revenue losses are associated with the additional four-cent levy eligible for the Austin ISD yield and expected to total approximately \$92,502 over the course of the agreement. In total, the potential net tax benefits are estimated to total \$4.9 million over the life of the agreement.

Facilities Funding Impact

The ARKEMA project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with LPISD currently levying a \$0.285 I&S rate. The value of the ARKEMA 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. At its peak taxable value, the project adds 1.7 percent to LPISD's current tax base, which should assist the District in meeting its debt service obligations.

The ARKEMA project is not expected to affect LPISD in terms of enrollment. Given that much of what is proposed expands existing operations, only five new full-time positions are expected to be created as a result of the project. This is not expected to have an impact on student growth in the District.

Conclusion

The proposed ARKEMA manufacturing project enhances the tax base of LPISD. It reflects continued capital investment in 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 \$4.9 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 LPISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

Table 1 – Base District Information with ARKEMA, Inc. 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	2012-13	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,065,415,830	\$6,065,415,830	\$6,020,945,490	\$6,020,945,490	\$387,471	\$387,471
2	2013-14	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,915,131,210	\$5,915,131,210	\$6,194,020,490	\$6,194,020,490	\$398,609	\$398,609
3	2014-15	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,977,688,710	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,081,740,269	\$6,081,740,269	\$391,384	\$391,384
4	2015-16	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,975,705,110	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,142,973,939	\$6,088,674,165	\$395,324	\$391,830
5	2016-17	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,973,761,170	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,139,706,232	\$6,086,963,398	\$395,114	\$391,720
6	2017-18	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,969,951,010	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,135,703,981	\$6,084,486,956	\$394,857	\$391,561
7	2018-19	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,966,293,410	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,129,937,878	\$6,081,711,469	\$394,485	\$391,382
8	2019-20	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,962,782,010	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,124,421,631	\$6,079,066,093	\$394,130	\$391,212
9	2020-21	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$5,959,411,110	\$5,908,508,710	\$6,119,144,020	\$6,076,544,600	\$393,791	\$391,049
10	2021-22	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,066,349,610	\$6,018,683,310	\$6,114,094,739	\$6,074,141,157	\$393,466	\$390,895
11	2022-23	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,052,998,750	\$6,052,998,750	\$6,194,954,270	\$6,157,540,721	\$398,670	\$396,262
12	2023-24	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,040,535,840	\$6,040,535,840	\$6,181,603,410	\$6,181,603,410	\$397,810	\$397,810
13	2024-25	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,028,898,730	\$6,028,898,730	\$6,169,140,500	\$6,169,140,500	\$397,008	\$397,008
14	2025-26	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,018,029,790	\$6,018,029,790	\$6,157,503,390	\$6,157,503,390	\$396,259	\$396,259
15	2026-27	11,701.96	15,539.07	\$1.0400	\$0.2850	\$6,007,861,308	\$6,007,861,308	\$6,146,634,450	\$6,146,634,450	\$395,560	\$395,560

*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	2012-13	\$59,992,540	\$18,949,618	\$8,706,670	\$0	\$0	\$2,396,582	\$1,312,673	\$0	\$91,358,082
2	2013-14	\$58,489,618	\$17,218,781	\$11,940,428	\$0	\$0	\$2,336,543	\$1,178,740	\$0	\$91,164,110
3	2014-15	\$59,115,225	\$18,341,639	\$10,191,964	\$0	\$0	\$2,361,535	\$1,256,940	\$0	\$91,267,303
4	2015-16	\$59,095,388	\$17,729,272	\$10,824,168	\$0	\$0	\$2,360,743	\$1,220,461	\$0	\$91,230,031
5	2016-17	\$59,075,947	\$17,761,951	\$10,810,929	\$0	\$0	\$2,359,966	\$1,221,965	\$0	\$91,230,758
6	2017-18	\$59,037,844	\$17,801,975	\$10,809,008	\$0	\$0	\$2,358,444	\$1,223,512	\$0	\$91,230,783
7	2018-19	\$59,001,266	\$17,859,639	\$10,787,922	\$0	\$0	\$2,356,983	\$1,226,121	\$0	\$91,231,931
8	2019-20	\$58,966,150	\$17,914,804	\$10,767,873	\$0	\$0	\$2,355,580	\$1,228,617	\$0	\$91,233,024
9	2020-21	\$58,932,439	\$17,967,583	\$10,748,805	\$0	\$0	\$2,354,233	\$1,231,004	\$0	\$91,234,064
10	2021-22	\$60,001,878	\$18,018,079	\$9,628,870	\$0	\$0	\$2,396,955	\$1,256,357	\$0	\$91,302,140
11	2022-23	\$59,868,363	\$17,209,443	\$10,571,022	\$0	\$0	\$2,391,622	\$1,205,983	\$0	\$91,246,432
12	2023-24	\$59,743,727	\$17,342,958	\$10,562,142	\$0	\$0	\$2,386,643	\$1,211,226	\$0	\$91,246,696
13	2024-25	\$59,627,350	\$17,467,593	\$10,553,884	\$0	\$0	\$2,381,994	\$1,216,121	\$0	\$91,246,942
14	2025-26	\$59,518,656	\$17,583,970	\$10,546,202	\$0	\$0	\$2,377,651	\$1,220,692	\$0	\$91,247,171
15	2026-27	\$59,416,966	\$17,692,665	\$10,539,197	\$0	\$0	\$2,373,589	\$1,224,958	\$0	\$91,247,375

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	2012-13	\$59,992,540	\$18,949,618	\$8,706,670	\$0	\$0	\$2,396,582	\$1,312,673	\$0	\$91,358,082
2	2013-14	\$58,489,618	\$17,218,781	\$11,940,428	\$0	\$0	\$2,336,543	\$1,178,740	\$0	\$91,164,110
3	2014-15	\$58,423,390	\$18,341,639	\$10,883,798	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,242,230	\$0	\$91,224,955
4	2015-16	\$58,423,390	\$18,272,297	\$10,953,140	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,238,158	\$0	\$91,220,882
5	2016-17	\$58,423,390	\$18,289,406	\$10,936,031	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,239,162	\$0	\$91,221,886
6	2017-18	\$58,423,390	\$18,314,171	\$10,911,266	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,240,616	\$0	\$91,223,341
7	2018-19	\$58,423,390	\$18,341,927	\$10,883,510	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,242,247	\$0	\$91,224,972
8	2019-20	\$58,423,390	\$18,368,383	\$10,857,054	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,243,803	\$0	\$91,226,528
9	2020-21	\$58,423,390	\$18,393,599	\$10,831,838	\$0	\$0	\$2,333,898	\$1,245,288	\$0	\$91,228,013
10	2021-22	\$59,525,191	\$18,417,634	\$9,706,002	\$0	\$0	\$2,377,912	\$1,270,216	\$0	\$91,296,955
11	2022-23	\$59,868,363	\$17,583,597	\$10,196,868	\$0	\$0	\$2,391,622	\$1,227,842	\$0	\$91,268,291
12	2023-24	\$59,743,727	\$17,342,958	\$10,562,142	\$0	\$0	\$2,386,643	\$1,211,226	\$0	\$91,246,696
13	2024-25	\$59,627,350	\$17,467,593	\$10,553,884	\$0	\$0	\$2,381,994	\$1,216,121	\$0	\$91,246,942
14	2025-26	\$59,518,656	\$17,583,970	\$10,546,202	\$0	\$0	\$2,377,651	\$1,220,692	\$0	\$91,247,171
15	2026-27	\$59,416,966	\$17,692,665	\$10,539,197	\$0	\$0	\$2,373,589	\$1,224,958	\$0	\$91,247,375

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	2012-13	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2013-14	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2014-15	-\$691,835	\$0	\$691,835	\$0	\$0	-\$27,637	-\$14,710	\$0	-\$42,348
4	2015-16	-\$671,998	\$543,025	\$128,973	\$0	\$0	-\$26,845	\$17,696	\$0	-\$9,149
5	2016-17	-\$652,557	\$527,455	\$125,102	\$0	\$0	-\$26,068	\$17,196	\$0	-\$8,872
6	2017-18	-\$614,454	\$512,196	\$102,258	\$0	\$0	-\$24,546	\$17,104	\$0	-\$7,442
7	2018-19	-\$577,876	\$482,288	\$95,588	\$0	\$0	-\$23,085	\$16,126	\$0	-\$6,959
8	2019-20	-\$542,760	\$453,579	\$89,181	\$0	\$0	-\$21,682	\$15,186	\$0	-\$6,496
9	2020-21	-\$509,049	\$426,016	\$83,033	\$0	\$0	-\$20,336	\$14,284	\$0	-\$6,052
10	2021-22	-\$476,687	\$399,555	\$77,132	\$0	\$0	-\$19,043	\$13,858	\$0	-\$5,185
11	2022-23	\$0	\$374,154	-\$374,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,859	\$0	\$21,859
12	2023-24	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2024-25	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2025-26	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2026-27	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the ARKEMA, Inc. Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to LPISD at \$1.04 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	2012-13	\$3,875,000	\$3,875,000	\$0	\$40,300	\$40,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2013-14	\$36,622,500	\$36,622,500	\$0	\$380,874	\$380,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2014-15	\$99,180,000	\$30,000,000	\$69,180,000	\$1,031,472	\$312,000	\$719,472	\$0	\$719,472	-\$42,348	\$677,124
4	2015-16	\$97,196,400	\$30,000,000	\$67,196,400	\$1,010,843	\$312,000	\$698,843	\$9,839	\$708,682	-\$9,149	\$699,533
5	2016-17	\$95,252,460	\$30,000,000	\$65,252,460	\$990,626	\$312,000	\$678,626	\$9,839	\$688,465	-\$8,872	\$679,593
6	2017-18	\$91,442,300	\$30,000,000	\$61,442,300	\$951,000	\$312,000	\$639,000	\$9,839	\$648,839	-\$7,442	\$641,397
7	2018-19	\$87,784,700	\$30,000,000	\$57,784,700	\$912,961	\$312,000	\$600,961	\$9,839	\$610,800	-\$6,959	\$603,841
8	2019-20	\$84,273,300	\$30,000,000	\$54,273,300	\$876,442	\$312,000	\$564,442	\$9,839	\$574,281	-\$6,496	\$567,786
9	2020-21	\$80,902,400	\$30,000,000	\$50,902,400	\$841,385	\$312,000	\$529,385	\$9,839	\$539,224	-\$6,052	\$533,172
10	2021-22	\$77,666,300	\$30,000,000	\$47,666,300	\$807,730	\$312,000	\$495,730	\$9,839	\$505,569	-\$5,185	\$500,384
11	2022-23	\$74,559,600	\$74,559,600	\$0	\$775,420	\$775,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	2023-24	\$71,577,200	\$71,577,200	\$0	\$744,403	\$744,403	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2024-25	\$68,714,100	\$68,714,100	\$0	\$714,627	\$714,627	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2025-26	\$65,965,500	\$65,965,500	\$0	\$686,041	\$686,041	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2026-27	\$63,326,900	\$63,326,900	\$0	\$658,600	\$658,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$11,422,722	\$6,496,264	\$4,926,458	\$68,874	\$4,995,332	-\$92,502	\$4,902,830

Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Max Credits</u>
	\$0	\$68,874	\$68,874
Credits Earned			\$68,874
Credits Paid			<u>\$68,874</u>
Excess Credits Unpaid			\$0