

S U S A N

C O M B S

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

P.O. Box 13528 • AUSTIN, TX 78711-3528



November 21, 2011

Anneliese McMinn
Superintendent
Rio Hondo Independent School District
215 W. Colorado
Rio Hondo, Texas 78583-0220

Dear Superintendent McMinn:

On Oct. 24, 2011, the agency received the completed application for a limitation on appraised value originally submitted to the Rio Hondo Independent School District (Rio Hondo ISD) by DEGS Wind I, LLC (DEGS Wind) on Aug. 3, 2011, under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313. This letter presents the Comptroller's recommendation regarding DEGS Wind's application as required by Section 313.025(d), using the criteria set out by Section 313.026. Our review assumes the truth and accuracy of the statements in the application and that, if the application is approved, the applicant would perform according to the provisions of the agreement reached with the school district. Filing an application containing false information is a criminal offense under Texas Penal Code Chapter 37.

According to the provisions of Chapter 313, Rio Hondo ISD is currently classified as a rural school district in Category 3. The applicant properly applied under the provisions of Subchapter C, as applicable to rural school districts, and the amount of proposed qualified investment (\$27,600,000) is consistent with the proposed appraised value limitation sought (\$10 million). The property value limitation amount noted in this recommendation is based on property values available at the time of application and may change prior to the execution of any final agreement.

DEGS Wind is proposing the construction of a wind power electric generation facility in Cameron County. DEGS Wind is an active franchise taxpayer, as required by Tax Code Section 313.024(a), and is in good standing. After reviewing the application using the criteria listed in Section 313.026, and the information provided by DEGS Wind, the Comptroller's recommendation is that DEGS Wind's application under Tax Code Chapter 313 be approved.

Our recommendation does not address whether the applicant has complied with all Chapter 313 requirements. Chapter 313 places the responsibility to verify that all requirements of the statute have been fulfilled on the school district. Section 313.025 requires the school district to determine if the evidence supports making specific findings that the information in the application is true and correct, the applicant is eligible for a limitation and that granting the application is in the best interest of the school district and state. When approving a job waiver requested under Section 313.025(f-1), the school district must also find that the statutory jobs creation requirement exceeds the industry standard for the number of employees reasonably necessary for the operation of the facility. As stated above, we prepared the recommendation by generally reviewing the application and supporting documentation in light of the Section 313.026 criteria and a cursory review of the industry standard evidence necessary to support the waiver of the required number of jobs.

Mr. Anneliese McMinn
November 21, 2011
Page Two

The Comptroller's recommendation is based on the final, completed application that has been submitted to this office, and may not be used to support an approval if the application is modified, the information presented in the application changes, or the limitation agreement does not conform to the application. This recommendation is contingent on the following:

1. No later than 10 days prior to the meeting scheduled by the district to consider approving the agreement, applicant submitting to this office a draft limitation agreement that complies with the statutes, the Comptroller's rules, and is consistent with the application;
2. The Comptroller providing written confirmation that it received and reviewed the draft agreement and affirming the recommendation made in this letter;
3. The district approving and executing a limitation agreement that has been reviewed by this office within a year from the date of this letter. As required by Comptroller Rule 9.1055 (34 T.A.C. 9.1055), the signed limitation agreement must be forwarded to our office as soon as possible after execution.

During the 81st Legislative Session, House Bill 3676 made a number of changes to the chapter. Please visit our Web site at www.window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/hb1200 to find an outline of the program and links to applicable rules and forms.

Should you have any questions, please contact Robert Wood, director of Economic Development & Analysis Division, by email at robert.wood@cpa.state.tx.us or by phone at 1-800-531-5441, ext. 3-3973, or direct in Austin at 512-463-3973.

Sincerely,



Martin A. Hubert
Deputy Comptroller

Enclosure

cc: Robert Wood

Economic Impact for Chapter 313 Project

Applicant	DEGS Wind I, LLC
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Renewable Energy Electric Generation - Wind
School District	Rio Hondo ISD
2009-10 Enrollment in School District	2,309
County	Cameron
Total Investment in District	\$27,600,000
Qualified Investment	\$27,600,000
Limitation Amount	\$10,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	5*
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	5
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$744
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	\$631
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$38,664
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$5,520,000
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$3,318,151
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$1,341,746
Estimated 15 year M&O tax benefit (<i>after</i> deductions for estimated school district revenue protection--but not including any deduction for supplemental payments or extraordinary educational expenses):	\$1,018,585
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$206,833
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$2,299,566
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	30.7%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	84.6%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit.	15.4%
* Applicant is requesting district to waive requirement to create minimum number of qualifying jobs pursuant to Tax Code, 313.025 (f-1).	

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of DEGS Wind (the project) applying to Rio Hondo Independent School District (the district), as required by Tax Code, 313.026. This evaluation is based on information provided by the applicant and examines the following criteria:

- (1) the recommendations of the comptroller;
- (2) the name of the school district;
- (3) the name of the applicant;
- (4) the general nature of the applicant's investment;
- (5) the relationship between the applicant's industry and the types of qualifying jobs to be created by the applicant to the long-term economic growth plans of this state as described in the strategic plan for economic development submitted by the Texas Strategic Economic Development Planning Commission under Section 481.033, Government Code, as that section existed before February 1, 1999;
- (6) the relative level of the applicant's investment per qualifying job to be created by the applicant;
- (7) the number of qualifying jobs to be created by the applicant;
- (8) the wages, salaries, and benefits to be offered by the applicant to qualifying job holders;
- (9) the ability of the applicant to locate or relocate in another state or another region of this state;
- (10) the impact the project will have on this state and individual local units of government, including:
 - (A) tax and other revenue gains, direct or indirect, that would be realized during the qualifying time period, the limitation period, and a period of time after the limitation period considered appropriate by the comptroller; and
 - (B) economic effects of the project, including the impact on jobs and income, during the qualifying time period, the limitation period, and a period of time after the limitation period considered appropriate by the comptroller;
- (11) the economic condition of the region of the state at the time the person's application is being considered;
- (12) the number of new facilities built or expanded in the region during the two years preceding the date of the application that were eligible to apply for a limitation on appraised value under this subchapter;
- (13) the effect of the applicant's proposal, if approved, on the number or size of the school district's instructional facilities, as defined by Section 46.001, Education Code;
- (14) the projected market value of the qualified property of the applicant as determined by the comptroller;
- (15) the proposed limitation on appraised value for the qualified property of the applicant;
- (16) the projected dollar amount of the taxes that would be imposed on the qualified property, for each year of the agreement, if the property does not receive a limitation on appraised value with assumptions of the projected appreciation or depreciation of the investment and projected tax rates clearly stated;
- (17) the projected dollar amount of the taxes that would be imposed on the qualified property, for each tax year of the agreement, if the property receives a limitation on appraised value with assumptions of the projected appreciation or depreciation of the investment clearly stated;
- (18) the projected effect on the Foundation School Program of payments to the district for each year of the agreement;
- (19) the projected future tax credits if the applicant also applies for school tax credits under Section 313.103; and
- (20) the total amount of taxes projected to be lost or gained by the district over the life of the agreement computed by subtracting the projected taxes stated in Subdivision (17) from the projected taxes stated in Subdivision (16).

Wages, salaries and benefits [313.026(6-8)]

After construction, the project will create five new jobs when fully operational. All five jobs will meet the criteria for qualifying jobs as specified in Tax Code Section 313.021(3). According to the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), the regional manufacturing wage for the Lower Rio Grande Valley State Planning Region, where Cameron County is located was \$29,848 in 2010. The annual average manufacturing wage for 2010 for Cameron County is \$38,389. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$26,195. In addition to a salary of \$38,664, each qualifying position will receive benefits such as full package benefits including medical, dental and life insurance of which a portion of the premiums will be paid for by the LLC. In addition, each employee will receive competitive vacation time, sick leave, and skills training. The project's total investment is \$27.6 million, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$5.5 million.

Ability of applicant to locate to another state and [313.026(9)]

According to DEGS Wind's application, "Duke Energy Generation (DEGS WIND I) is a U.S. developer of wind projects, and has operations in several regions and states within the contiguous United States that has sufficient prevailing wind conditions conducive to wind power generation. However, after the Los Vientos wind power project has completed construction the nature of the improvements makes them not readily movable to other locations. The wind turbines and supporting infrastructure are long-lived assets engineered and designed specifically for this project location. The cost of installing the improvements on the site is substantial and the cost to remove, redesign, and relocate the improvements to a different location would be even more substantial. Also, power sales agreements have terms of up to 25 years, and are specific to a certain project, wind characteristics, and electrical delivery point. Therefore, moving the improvements to a different location is not permissible under the contract that provides the project with its primary revenue source. In summary, relocating the improvements to another location, whether in-state or out-of-state, would be both impractical and likely detrimental to the economics of the project."

Number of new facilities in region [313.026(12)]

During the past two years, five projects in the Lower Rio Grande Valley State Planning Region applied for value limitation agreements under Tax Code, Chapter 313.

Relationship of applicant's industry and jobs and Texas's economic growth plans [313.026(5)]

The Texas Economic Development Plan focuses on attracting and developing industries using technology. It also identifies opportunities for existing Texas industries. The plan centers on promoting economic prosperity throughout Texas and the skilled workers that the DEGS Wind project requires appear to be in line with the focus and themes of the plan. Texas identified energy as one of six target clusters in the Texas Cluster Initiative. The plan stresses the importance of technology in all sectors of the energy industry.

Economic Impact [313.026(10)(A), (10)(B), (11), (13-20)]

Table 1 depicts DEGS Wind's estimated economic impact to Texas. It depicts the direct, indirect and induced effects to employment and personal income within the state. The Comptroller's office calculated the economic impact based on 15 years of annual investment and employment levels using software from Regional Economic Models, Inc. (REMI). The impact includes the construction period and the operating period of the project.

Table 1: Estimated Statewide Economic Impact of Investment and Employment in DEGS Wind

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2012	205	161	366	\$6,546,920	\$10,453,080	\$17,000,000
2013	205	162	367	\$6,546,920	\$11,453,080	\$18,000,000
2014	5	9	14	\$193,320	\$2,806,680	\$3,000,000
2015	5	7	12	\$193,320	\$2,806,680	\$3,000,000
2016	5	-2	3	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2017	5	-1	4	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2018	5	-1	4	\$193,320	\$806,680	\$1,000,000
2019	5	3	8	\$193,320	\$806,680	\$1,000,000
2020	5	3	8	\$193,320	\$806,680	\$1,000,000
2021	5	7	12	\$193,320	\$806,680	\$1,000,000
2022	5	7	12	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2023	5	9	14	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2024	5	10	15	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2025	5	14	19	\$193,320	\$1,806,680	\$2,000,000
2026	5	16	21	\$193,320	\$2,806,680	\$3,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, DEGS Wind

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was \$1.6 billion in 2010. Rio Hondo ISD's ad valorem tax base in 2010 was \$205 million. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at \$345,067 for fiscal 2010-2011. During that same year, Rio Hondo ISD's estimated wealth per WADA was \$66,628. The impact on the facilities and finances of the district are presented in Attachment 2.

Table 2 examines the estimated direct impact on ad valorem taxes to the school district and Cameron County, with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from DEGS Wind's application. DEGS Wind has applied for both a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code and tax abatement with Cameron County. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the DEGS Wind project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

Year	Estimated Taxable value for I&S	Estimated Taxable value for M&O	Tax Rate ¹	Rio Hondo ISD I&S Levy	Rio Hondo ISD M&O Levy	Rio Hondo ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (Before Credit Credited)	Rio Hondo ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (After Credit Credited)	Cameron County Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
				0.1191	1.1700			0.3643	
2012	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2013	\$27,678,000	\$27,678,000		\$32,964	\$323,833	\$356,797	\$356,797	\$15,124	\$371,921
2014	\$26,294,100	\$10,000,000		\$31,316	\$117,000	\$148,316	\$148,316	\$14,368	\$162,684
2015	\$24,979,395	\$10,000,000		\$29,750	\$117,000	\$146,750	\$117,203	\$13,650	\$130,853
2016	\$23,730,425	\$10,000,000		\$28,263	\$117,000	\$145,263	\$115,715	\$12,967	\$128,683
2017	\$22,543,904	\$10,000,000		\$26,850	\$117,000	\$143,850	\$114,302	\$12,319	\$126,621
2018	\$21,416,709	\$10,000,000		\$25,507	\$117,000	\$142,507	\$112,960	\$11,703	\$124,663
2019	\$20,345,873	\$10,000,000		\$24,232	\$117,000	\$141,232	\$111,684	\$11,118	\$122,802
2020	\$19,328,580	\$10,000,000		\$23,020	\$117,000	\$140,020	\$110,473	\$10,562	\$121,035
2021	\$18,362,151	\$10,000,000		\$21,869	\$117,000	\$138,869	\$109,322	\$10,034	\$119,356
2022	\$17,444,043	\$17,444,043		\$20,776	\$204,095	\$224,871	\$224,871	\$63,547	\$288,418
2023	\$16,571,841	\$16,571,841		\$19,737	\$193,891	\$213,628	\$213,628	\$60,370	\$273,997
2024	\$15,743,249	\$15,743,249		\$18,750	\$184,196	\$202,946	\$202,946	\$57,351	\$260,297
2025	\$14,956,087	\$14,956,087		\$17,813	\$174,986	\$192,799	\$192,799	\$54,484	\$247,283
2026	\$14,208,282	\$14,208,282		\$16,922	\$166,237	\$183,159	\$183,159	\$51,759	\$234,918
						Total	\$2,314,176	\$399,355	\$2,713,531

Assumes School Value Limitation and Tax Abatement from Cameron County.

Source: CPA, DEGS Wind

¹Tax Rate per \$100 Valuation

Year	Estimated Taxable value for I&S	Estimated Taxable value for M&O	Tax Rate ¹	Rio Hondo ISD I&S Levy	Rio Hondo ISD M&O Levy	Rio Hondo ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies	Cameron County Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes	
				0.1191	1.1700		0.3643		
2012	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2013	\$27,678,000	\$27,678,000		\$32,964	\$323,833	\$356,797	\$100,828	\$457,626	
2014	\$26,294,100	\$26,294,100		\$31,316	\$307,641	\$338,957	\$95,787	\$434,744	
2015	\$24,979,395	\$24,979,395		\$29,750	\$292,259	\$322,009	\$90,998	\$413,007	
2016	\$23,730,425	\$23,730,425		\$28,263	\$277,646	\$305,909	\$86,448	\$392,357	
2017	\$22,543,904	\$22,543,904		\$26,850	\$263,764	\$290,613	\$82,125	\$372,739	
2018	\$21,416,709	\$21,416,709		\$25,507	\$250,575	\$276,083	\$78,019	\$354,102	
2019	\$20,345,873	\$20,345,873		\$24,232	\$238,047	\$262,279	\$74,118	\$336,397	
2020	\$19,328,580	\$19,328,580		\$23,020	\$226,144	\$249,165	\$70,412	\$319,577	
2021	\$18,362,151	\$18,362,151		\$21,869	\$214,837	\$236,706	\$66,892	\$303,598	
2022	\$17,444,043	\$17,444,043		\$20,776	\$204,095	\$224,871	\$63,547	\$288,418	
2023	\$16,571,841	\$16,571,841		\$19,737	\$193,891	\$213,628	\$60,370	\$273,997	
2024	\$15,743,249	\$15,743,249		\$18,750	\$184,196	\$202,946	\$57,351	\$260,297	
2025	\$14,956,087	\$14,956,087		\$17,813	\$174,986	\$192,799	\$54,484	\$247,283	
2026	\$14,208,282	\$14,208,282		\$16,922	\$166,237	\$183,159	\$51,759	\$234,918	
						Total	\$3,655,922	\$1,033,139	\$4,689,061

Source: CPA, DEGS Wind

¹Tax Rate per \$100 Valuation

Attachment 1 includes schedules A, B, C, and D provided by the applicant in the application. Schedule A shows proposed investment. Schedule B is the projected market value of the qualified property. Schedule C contains employment information, and Schedule D contains tax expenditures and other tax abatement information.

Attachment 2, provided by the district and reviewed by the Texas Education Agency, contains information relating to the financial impact of the proposed project on the finances of the district as well as the tax benefit of the value limitation. "Table 5" in this attachment shows the estimated 15 year M&O tax levy without the value limitation agreement would be \$3,318,151. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$1,341,746.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of Cameron County.

Disclaimer: This examination is based on information from the application submitted to the school district and forwarded to the comptroller. It is intended to meet the statutory requirement of Chapter 313 of the Tax Code and is not intended for any other purpose.

Attachments

1. Schedules A, B, C, and D provided by applicant in application
2. School finance and tax benefit provided by district
3. County Economic Overview

Attachment 1

Applicant Name: **DEGS WIND I, LLC**
 ISD Name: **Rio Hondo ISD**

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS

(Estimated investment in each year. Do not put cumulative totals.)

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year below) YYYY	Column A: Tangible Personal Property (The amount of new investment (original cost) placed in service of building during this year)	Column B: Building or permanent nonremovable component (annual amount only)	Column C: Sum of A and B Qualifying Investment (during the qualifying time period)	Column D: Other investment that is not qualified investment but investment affecting economic impact and total value	Column E: Total Investment (A+B+D)
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals) Investment made before filing complete application with district (neither qualified property nor eligible to become qualified investment) Investment made after filing complete application with district, but before final board approval of application (eligible to become qualified property) Investment made after final board approval of application and before Jan. 1 of first complete tax year of qualifying time period (qualified investment and eligible to become qualified property) Complete tax years of qualifying time period Value Limitation Period Continue to Maintain Viable Presence Post-Settle-Up Period Post-Settle-Up Period	1	2012 - 2013	\$27,678,000	\$	\$27,678,000	\$	\$27,678,000
	2	2013 - 2014					
	3	2014 - 2015					
	4	2015 - 2016					
	5	2016 - 2017					
	6	2017 - 2018					
	7	2018 - 2019					
	8	2019 - 2020					
	9	2020 - 2021					
	10	2021 - 2022					
	11	2022 - 2023					
	12	2023 - 2024					
	13	2024 - 2025					
	14	2025 - 2026					
	15	2026 - 2027					

Qualifying Time Period usually begins with the final board approval of the application and extends generally for the following two complete tax years.

Column A: This represents the total dollar amount of planned investment in tangible personal property the applicant considers qualified investment - as defined in Tax Code §313.021(1)(A)-(D). For the purposes of investment, please list amount invested each year, not cumulative totals.

Column B: Include estimates of investment for "replacement" property-property that is part of original agreement but scheduled for probable replacement during limitation period. The total dollar amount of planned investment each year in buildings or nonremovable component of buildings that the applicant considers qualified investment under Tax Code §313.021(1)(E).

Column D: Dollar value of other investment that may not be qualified investment but that may affect economic impact and total value-for planning, construction and operation of the facility. The most significant example for many projects would be land. Other examples may be items such as professional services, etc. Note: Land can be listed as part of investment during the "pre-year 1" time period. It cannot be part of qualifying investment.

Notes: For advanced clean energy projects, nuclear projects, projects with deferred qualifying time periods, and projects with lengthy application review periods, insert additional rows as needed. This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with a final appraisal data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE: [Signature] DATE: 6-1-11

Schedule B (Rev. May 2010): Estimated Market And Taxable Value

Applicant Name
ISD Name

DEGS WIND I, LLC
Rio Hondo ISD

Form 50-296

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Qualified Property			Reductions from Market	Estimated Taxable Value	
			Estimated Market Value of Land	Estimated Total Market Value of new buildings or other new improvements	Estimated Total Market Value of tangible personal property in the new building or "in or on the new improvement"		Final taxable value for i&S - after all reductions	Final taxable value for M&O—after all reductions
pre-year 1								
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2012 - 2013	2012	\$ -	\$ -	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
	2	2013 - 2014	2013	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,678,000	\$ 27,678,000	\$ 27,678,000
	3	2014 - 2015	2014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,294,100	\$ 26,294,100	\$ 10,000,000
	4	2015 - 2016	2015	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,979,395	\$ 24,979,395	\$ 10,000,000
	5	2016 - 2017	2016	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,730,425	\$ 23,730,425	\$ 10,000,000
Value Limitation Period	6	2017 - 2018	2017	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,543,904	\$ 22,543,904	\$ 10,000,000
	7	2018 - 2019	2018	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,416,709	\$ 21,416,709	\$ 10,000,000
	8	2019 - 2020	2019	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,345,873	\$ 20,345,873	\$ 10,000,000
	9	2020 - 2021	2020	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,328,580	\$ 19,328,580	\$ 10,000,000
	10	2021 - 2022	2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,362,151	\$ 18,362,151	\$ 10,000,000
Credit Settle-Up Period	11	2022 - 2023	2022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,444,043	\$ 17,444,043	\$ 17,444,043
	12	2023 - 2024	2023	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,571,841	\$ 16,571,841	\$ 16,571,841
	13	2024 - 2025	2024	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,743,249	\$ 15,743,249	\$ 15,743,249
Post- Settle-Up Period	14	2025 - 2026	2025	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,956,087	\$ 14,956,087	\$ 14,956,087
Post- Settle-Up Period	15	2026 - 2027	2026	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,208,282	\$ 14,208,282	\$ 14,208,282

Notes: Market value in future years is good faith estimate of future taxable value for the purposes of property taxation.

This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

[Handwritten Signature]

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

9-1-11

DATE

Schedule C- Application: Employment Information

DEGS WIND I, LLC
Rio Hondo ISD

Applicant Name
ISD Name

Form 50-296

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Construction		New Jobs		Qualifying Jobs		
				Column A: Number of Construction FTE's or man- hours (specify)	Column B: Average annual wage rates for construction workers	Column C: Number of new jobs applicant commits to create (cumulative)	Column D: Average annual wage rate for all new jobs.	Column E: Number of qualifying jobs applicant commits to create meeting all criteria of Sec. 313.021(3) (cumulative)	Column F: Average annual wage of qualifying jobs	
	pre-year 1									
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2012 - 2013	2012	200	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	2	2013 - 2014	2013	200	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	3	2014 - 2015	2014	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	4	2015 - 2016	2015	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	5	2016 - 2017	2016	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	6	2017 - 2018	2017	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	7	2018 - 2019	2018	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	8	2019 - 2020	2019	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	9	2020 - 2021	2020	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	10	2021 - 2022	2021	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
Credit Settle-Up Period	11	2022 - 2023	2022	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	12	2023 - 2024	2023	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	13	2024 - 2025	2024	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
	14	2025 - 2026	2025	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	
Post-Settle-Up Period	15	2026 - 2027	2026	0	\$31,768	5	\$38,664	5	\$38,664	

Notes: For job definitions see TAC §9.1051(14) and Tax Code §313.021(3).

This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future-years.


SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

9-1-11
DATE

Schedule D: (Rev. May 2010): Other Tax Information

Applicant Name: **DEGS WIND I, LLC** ISD Name: **Rio Hondo ISD** Form 50-296

		Sales Tax Information		Other Property Tax Abatements Sought					
		Column F: Estimate of total annual expenditures* subject to state sales tax	Column G: Estimate of total annual expenditures* made in Texas NOT subject to sales tax	Franchise Tax	County	City	Hospital	Other	
Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax/Calendar Year YYYY	Column H: Estimate of Franchise tax due from (or attributable to) the applicant	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)									
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2012 - 2013	\$8,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	2	2013 - 2014	\$3,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	3	2014 - 2015	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	4	2015 - 2016	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	5	2016 - 2017	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	6	2017 - 2018	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	7	2018 - 2019	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	8	2019 - 2020	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	9	2020 - 2021	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
	10	2021 - 2022	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	85	0	0	85
Value Limitation Period	11	2022 - 2023	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	0	0	0	0
	12	2023 - 2024	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	0	0	0	0
	13	2024 - 2025	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	0	0	0	0
Continue to Maintain Viable Presence	14	2025 - 2026	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	0	0	0	0
	15	2026 - 2027	\$325,000	\$130,000	\$44,587	0	0	0	0
Credit Settle-Up Period	16								
	17								
Post-Settle-Up Period	18								
	19								

*For planning, construction and operation of the facility.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE: 

DATE: 9-1-11

Attachment 2

November 10, 2011

Mr. Robert Wood
Director, Economic Development and Analysis
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Lyndon B. Johnson State Office Building
111 East 17th Street
Austin, Texas 78774

Dear Mr. Wood:

As required by the Tax Code, §313.025 (b-1), the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has evaluated the impact of the proposed DEGS Wind I LLC project on the number and size of school facilities in Rio Hondo Independent School District (RHISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the RHISD superintendent, Ms. Anneliese McMinn, the TEA has found that the DEGS Wind I LLC project would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in RHISD.

Please feel free to contact Al McKenzie, manager of forecasting, facilities, and transportation, by phone at (512) 463-9186 or by email at al.mckenzie@tea.state.tx.us if you need further information regarding this issue.

Sincerely,



Belinda Dyer
Division Manager
Office of School Finance

BD/bd

November 10, 2011

Mr. Robert Wood
Director, Economic Development and Analysis
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Lyndon B. Johnson State Office Building
111 East 17th Street
Austin, Texas 78774

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Texas Education Agency has analyzed the revenue gains that would be realized by the proposed DEGS Wind I LLC project for the Rio Hondo Independent School District (RHISD). Projections prepared by our Office of School Finance confirm the analysis that was prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates and provided to us by your division. We believe their assumptions regarding the potential revenue gain are valid, and their estimates of the impact of the DEGS Wind I LLC project on RHISD are correct.

Please feel free to contact Al McKenzie, manager of forecasting, facilities, and transportation, by phone at (512) 463-9186 or by email at al.mckenzie@tea.state.tx.us if you need further information regarding this issue.

Sincerely,



Belinda Dyer
Division Manager
Office of School Finance

BD/bd

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEGS
WIND I, LLC PROJECT ON THE FINANCES OF THE RIO HONDO
ISD UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY VALUE
LIMITATION**

September 23, 2011

Final Report

PREPARED BY



Estimated Impact of the Proposed DEGS WIND I, LLC Project on the Finances of the Rio Hondo ISD under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

Introduction

DEGS Wind I, LLC (Duke Energy) has requested that the Rio Hondo ISD (RHISD) consider granting a property value limitation under Chapter 313 of the Tax Code for a new renewable electric wind energy generation project. An application was submitted to RHISD on August 8, 2011. Duke Energy proposes to invest \$27.7 million to construct a new wind energy project in RHISD.

The Duke Energy 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, RHISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$10 million. Based on the application, the qualifying time period would begin with the 2012-13 school year. The full value of the investment is expected to reach \$27.7 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 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 \$10 million and remain at that level of taxable value for eight years for maintenance and operations taxes. (If the project value falls below \$10 million, the actual value would be the basis for the limitation, although no tax savings would result.) The full taxable value of the project could be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period, with RHISD currently levying a \$0.119 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. This generally resulted 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.

Under the HB 1 system, most school districts received additional state aid for tax reduction (ASATR) that was used to maintain their target revenue amounts established at the revenue levels under old law for the 2005-06 or 2006-07 school years, whichever was highest. In terms of new Chapter 313 property value limitation agreements, adjustments to ASATR funding often moderated the impact of the reduced M&O collections as a result of the limitation, in contrast with the earlier formula-driven finance system. RHISD has a relatively low target revenue of \$4,817 per WADA—compared with a state average of \$5,185 per WADA—and was not a beneficiary of much ASATR funding, especially in recent years since the passage of HB 3646.

In the case of HB 3646—the school finance system changes approved by the Legislature in 2009—the starting point was the target revenue provisions from HB 1, that were 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 did 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 70 percent of all school districts were funded at the minimum \$120 per WADA level, while approximately 30 percent 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.

The formula reductions enacted under Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) as approved in the First Called Session in 2011 are designed to make \$4 billion in reductions to the existing school funding formulas for the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. For the 2011-12 school year, across-the-board reductions were made that reduced each district's WADA count and resulted in an estimated 797 school districts still receiving ASATR to maintain their target revenue funding levels, while an estimated 227 districts operating directly on the state formulas.

For the 2012-13 school year, the SB 1 changes called for smaller across-the-board reductions and funding ASATR-receiving target revenue districts at 92.35 percent of the level provided for under the existing funding formula. For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, the ASATR reduction percentage will be set in the appropriations bill. The recent legislative session also saw the adoption of a statement of legislative intent to no longer fund target revenue (through ASATR) by the 2017-18 school year.

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 Duke Energy 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. The current SB 1 reductions are reflected in the underlying models. Student enrollment counts are held constant at 2,095 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the Duke Energy project on the finances of RHISD. The District's local tax base reached an estimated \$211 million for the 2011 tax year. The underlying \$211 million taxable value for 2011-12 is maintained for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. RHISD is not a property-wealthy district, with estimated wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$68,138 for the 2012-13 school year. These assumptions are summarized in Table 1.

School Finance Impact

A baseline model was prepared for RHISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2025-26 school year. Beyond the 2010-11 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88th percentile or Austin yield—now a yield of \$59.97 per WADA for the current biennium—that influences 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 Duke Energy 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 Duke Energy 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 \$1.17 is used throughout this analysis.

A summary of the differences between these models is shown in Table 4. The model results show approximately \$17.8 million a year in net General Fund revenue.

Under these assumptions, RHISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2014-15 school year (-\$323,161). The revenue reduction results from the mechanics of six cents equalized to the Austin ISD yield, as well as local M&O taxes and related state aid for tax effort up to the \$1.17 M&O rate.

The estimated tax savings for the 2014-15 tax year are estimated to total \$190,641 under the value limitation, which is less than the combined state and local revenue loss for RHISD. This comes about because there are no funding formula offsets in the 2014-15 school year. Once the state property value study begins to recognize the \$10 million limitation, however, formula changes result that offset the reduction in M&O taxes beginning with the 2015-16 school year and thereafter. . (See Table 4.)

The Comptroller's Property Tax Assistance Division announced recently that it would be adopting a rule this fall that would implement the use of two values for school districts for its 2011 state property value study. These are the state values that will be used to calculate state aid and recapture in the 2012-13 school year.

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 through the 2010 tax year, however, only a single deduction amount was 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 levy M&O taxes only.

Under the Duke Energy request for a value limitation, the 2014 state property value used for the 2015-16 school year would be the first year that this change in the value study would be reflected in funding formula calculations for the new Duke Energy project. This change has been made in the models presented here and benefits both the District and the Company.

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 \$1.17 per \$100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed in 2011-12 and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total \$1.1 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, Duke Energy 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 credit amount is paid out slowly through years 4-10 due to statutory limits on the scale of these payments over these seven years, with catch-up payments permitted in years 11-13. The tax credits are expected to total approximately \$207,000 over the life of the agreement, with no unpaid tax credits anticipated. The District is to be reimbursed by the state for the tax credit payments.

The key RHISD revenue losses are associated with a reduction in local M&O tax effort and its impact on state funding above the \$0.98 compressed M&O tax effort. These losses are estimated

to total -\$323,161 in the first year the \$10 million limitation takes effect under the agreement. The potential net tax benefits are estimated to total \$1.0 million over the life of the agreement. While the hold-harmless amount exceeds the amount of tax savings in the 2014-15 school year, there would still be a substantial tax benefit to Duke Energy under the value limitation agreement for the remaining years that the limitation is in effect.

Facilities Funding Impact

The Duke Energy project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with RHISD currently levying a \$0.119 I&S rate. The value of the Duke Energy 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. At its peak taxable value, the project adds about 13.8 percent to RHISD's current tax base. At the same time, however, the District's wealth per ADA remains well below the \$350,000 per ADA guarantee under the state's facilities programs. Any initial help on facilities funding is expected to occur the first year the project's value appears on the local tax roll for I&S purposes.

The Duke Energy project is not expected to affect RHISD in terms of enrollment. Continued expansion of the renewable energy industry could result in additional employment in the area and an increase in the school-age population, but this project is unlikely to have much impact on a stand-alone basis.

Conclusion

The proposed Duke Energy renewable electric wind energy project enhances the tax base of RHISD. It reflects continued capital investment in renewable electric energy generation, 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 \$1.0 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 RHISD, which may assist the District when the project first appears on the local I&S tax roll.

Table 1 – Base District Information with Duke Energy 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	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$211,263,551	\$211,263,551	\$206,958,634	\$206,958,634	\$68,138	\$68,138
2	2013-14	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$238,941,551	\$238,941,551	\$206,958,634	\$206,958,634	\$68,138	\$68,138
3	2014-15	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$237,557,651	\$221,263,551	\$234,636,634	\$216,958,634	\$77,250	\$77,250
4	2015-16	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$236,242,946	\$221,263,551	\$233,252,734	\$216,958,634	\$76,794	\$71,430
5	2016-17	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$234,993,976	\$221,263,551	\$231,938,029	\$216,958,634	\$76,362	\$71,430
6	2017-18	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$233,807,455	\$221,263,551	\$230,689,059	\$216,958,634	\$75,950	\$71,430
7	2018-19	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$232,680,280	\$221,263,551	\$229,502,538	\$216,958,634	\$75,560	\$71,430
8	2019-20	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$231,609,424	\$221,263,551	\$228,375,343	\$216,958,634	\$75,189	\$71,430
9	2020-21	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$230,592,131	\$221,263,551	\$227,304,507	\$216,958,634	\$74,836	\$71,430
10	2021-22	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$229,625,702	\$221,263,551	\$226,287,214	\$216,958,634	\$74,501	\$71,430
11	2022-23	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$228,707,594	\$228,707,594	\$225,320,785	\$216,958,634	\$74,183	\$71,430
12	2023-24	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$227,835,392	\$227,835,392	\$224,402,677	\$224,402,677	\$73,881	\$73,881
13	2024-25	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$227,006,800	\$227,006,800	\$223,530,475	\$223,530,475	\$73,594	\$73,594
14	2025-26	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$226,219,638	\$226,219,638	\$222,701,883	\$222,701,883	\$73,321	\$73,321
15	2026-27	2,091.71	3,037.36	\$1.1700	\$0.1191	\$225,471,833	\$225,471,833	\$221,914,721	\$221,914,721	\$73,062	\$73,062

*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	\$2,117,260	\$13,245,791	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,363	\$2,046,894	\$0	\$17,820,298
2	2013-14	\$2,383,093	\$13,245,791	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$461,886	\$2,303,881	\$0	\$18,394,650
3	2014-15	\$2,372,995	\$12,974,533	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$469,929	\$1,999,248	\$0	\$17,778,705
4	2015-16	\$2,360,368	\$12,988,096	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$457,481	\$1,973,105	\$0	\$17,779,051
5	2016-17	\$2,348,372	\$13,000,981	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$455,158	\$1,978,785	\$0	\$17,781,295
6	2017-18	\$2,336,976	\$13,013,221	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$452,948	\$1,980,295	\$0	\$17,783,440
7	2018-19	\$2,328,150	\$13,024,850	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$450,849	\$1,983,643	\$0	\$17,785,493
8	2019-20	\$2,315,865	\$13,035,897	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$448,856	\$1,986,835	\$0	\$17,787,454
9	2020-21	\$2,306,095	\$13,046,391	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$446,962	\$1,989,879	\$0	\$17,789,327
10	2021-22	\$2,296,813	\$13,056,361	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$445,163	\$1,992,781	\$0	\$17,791,118
11	2022-23	\$2,287,995	\$13,065,833	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$443,454	\$1,995,546	\$0	\$17,792,829
12	2023-24	\$2,279,618	\$13,074,831	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$441,831	\$1,998,182	\$0	\$17,794,462
13	2024-25	\$2,271,860	\$13,083,379	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$440,288	\$2,000,804	\$0	\$17,796,021
14	2025-26	\$2,264,099	\$13,091,499	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$438,823	\$2,003,087	\$0	\$17,797,509
15	2026-27	\$2,256,917	\$13,099,214	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$437,431	\$2,005,368	\$0	\$17,798,929

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	\$2,117,260	\$13,245,791	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,363	\$2,046,884	\$0	\$17,820,298
2	2013-14	\$2,383,093	\$13,245,791	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$461,886	\$2,303,881	\$0	\$18,394,650
3	2014-15	\$2,213,305	\$12,974,533	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$1,838,728	\$0	\$17,453,544
4	2015-16	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
5	2016-17	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
6	2017-18	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
7	2018-19	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
8	2019-20	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
9	2020-21	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
10	2021-22	\$2,213,305	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$428,978	\$2,021,340	\$0	\$17,811,409
11	2022-23	\$2,284,801	\$13,147,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$442,835	\$2,086,635	\$0	\$17,962,057
12	2023-24	\$2,276,424	\$13,074,831	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$441,212	\$1,995,383	\$0	\$17,787,849
13	2024-25	\$2,268,488	\$13,083,379	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$439,669	\$1,997,881	\$0	\$17,789,395
14	2025-26	\$2,260,905	\$13,091,499	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$438,204	\$2,000,262	\$0	\$17,790,870
15	2026-27	\$2,253,723	\$13,099,214	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$436,812	\$2,002,530	\$0	\$17,792,279

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	-\$159,690	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$30,951	-\$132,520	\$0	-\$323,161
4	2015-16	-\$147,063	\$159,690	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$28,503	\$48,235	\$0	\$32,358
5	2016-17	-\$135,068	\$146,805	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$28,179	\$44,555	\$0	\$30,114
6	2017-18	-\$123,672	\$134,565	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$23,970	\$41,045	\$0	\$27,968
7	2018-19	-\$112,848	\$122,938	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$21,871	\$37,897	\$0	\$25,916
8	2019-20	-\$102,561	\$111,889	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$19,878	\$34,505	\$0	\$23,955
9	2020-21	-\$92,790	\$101,395	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$17,984	\$31,461	\$0	\$22,081
10	2021-22	-\$83,508	\$91,425	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$16,185	\$28,559	\$0	\$20,291
11	2022-23	-\$3,194	\$81,953	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$619	\$91,069	\$0	\$189,229
12	2023-24	-\$3,194	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$619	-\$2,800	\$0	-\$6,613
13	2024-25	-\$3,194	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$619	-\$2,813	\$0	-\$6,626
14	2025-26	-\$3,194	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$619	-\$2,826	\$0	-\$6,639
15	2026-27	-\$3,194	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$619	-\$2,838	\$0	-\$6,651

Table 5 - Estimated Financial Impact of the Duke Energy Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to RHISD at \$1.17 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	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2013-14	\$27,678,000	\$27,678,000	\$0	\$323,833	\$323,833	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2014-15	\$26,294,100	\$10,000,000	\$16,294,100	\$307,841	\$117,000	\$190,841	\$0	\$190,841	-\$323,161	-\$132,520
4	2015-16	\$24,979,395	\$10,000,000	\$14,979,395	\$292,259	\$117,000	\$175,259	\$29,548	\$204,806	\$0	\$204,806
5	2016-17	\$23,730,425	\$10,000,000	\$13,730,425	\$277,646	\$117,000	\$160,646	\$29,548	\$190,193	\$0	\$190,193
6	2017-18	\$22,543,904	\$10,000,000	\$12,543,904	\$263,764	\$117,000	\$146,764	\$29,548	\$176,311	\$0	\$176,311
7	2018-19	\$21,416,709	\$10,000,000	\$11,416,709	\$250,575	\$117,000	\$133,575	\$29,548	\$163,123	\$0	\$163,123
8	2019-20	\$20,345,873	\$10,000,000	\$10,345,873	\$238,047	\$117,000	\$121,047	\$29,548	\$150,594	\$0	\$150,594
9	2020-21	\$19,328,580	\$10,000,000	\$9,328,580	\$226,144	\$117,000	\$109,144	\$29,548	\$138,892	\$0	\$138,892
10	2021-22	\$18,362,151	\$10,000,000	\$8,362,151	\$214,837	\$117,000	\$97,837	\$29,548	\$127,385	\$0	\$127,385
11	2022-23	\$17,444,043	\$17,444,043	\$0	\$204,095	\$204,095	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	2023-24	\$16,571,841	\$16,571,841	\$0	\$193,891	\$193,891	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2024-25	\$15,743,249	\$15,743,249	\$0	\$184,198	\$184,198	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2025-26	\$14,956,087	\$14,956,087	\$0	\$174,986	\$174,986	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2026-27	\$14,206,282	\$14,206,282	\$0	\$166,237	\$166,237	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals					\$3,318,151	\$2,183,238	\$1,134,913	\$206,833	\$1,341,746	-\$323,161	\$1,018,585
Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years								Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits	
								\$0	\$206,833	\$206,833	
								Credits Eamed		\$206,833	
								Credits Paid		<u>\$206,833</u>	
								Excess Credits Unpaid		\$0	

Attachment 3

Cameron County

Population

- Total county population in 2010 for Cameron County: 402,431 , up 1.8 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- Cameron County was the state's 13rd largest county in population in 2010 and the 43rd fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- Cameron County's population in 2009 was 12.1 percent Anglo (below the state average of 46.7 percent), 0.4 percent African-American (below the state average of 11.3 percent) and 86.6 percent Hispanic (above the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in Cameron County:

Brownsville:	176,859	Harlingen:	65,289
San Benito:	25,365	La Feria:	7,133
Los Fresnos:	5,603	Port Isabel:	5,318
Primera:	4,268	Laguna Vista:	4,039
Santa Rosa:	3,155	Combes:	2,921

Economy and Income

Employment

- September 2011 total employment in Cameron County: 140,427 , down 0.3 percent from September 2010. State total employment increased 0.9 percent during the same period.

(October 2011 employment data will be available November 18, 2011).

- September 2011 Cameron County unemployment rate: 12.9 percent, up from 11.5 percent in September 2010. The statewide unemployment rate for September 2011 was 8.5 percent, up from 8.2 percent in September 2010.
- September 2011 unemployment rate in the city of:

Brownsville:	12.4 percent, up from 11.7 percent in September 2010.
Harlingen:	11.1 percent, up from 8.8 percent in September 2010.
San Benito:	11.7 percent, up from 10.2 percent in September 2010.

(Note: County and state unemployment rates are adjusted for seasonal fluctuations, but the Texas Workforce Commission city unemployment rates are not. Seasonally-adjusted unemployment rates are not comparable with unadjusted rates).

Income

- Cameron County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 248th with an average per capita income of \$22,388, up 1.3 percent from 2008. Statewide average per capita personal income was \$38,609 in 2009, down 3.1 percent from 2008.

Industry

- Agricultural cash values in Cameron County averaged \$144.75 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were up 106.1 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in Cameron County during 2010 included:
 - Corn
 - Grapefruit
 - Sugar Cane
 - Sorghum
 - Nursery
- 2011 oil and gas production in Cameron County: 237.0 barrels of oil and 195,493.0 Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 1 producing oil wells and 2 producing gas wells.

Taxes

Sales Tax - Taxable Sales

(County and city taxable sales data for 1st quarter 2011 is currently targeted for release in mid-September 2011).

Quarterly (September 2010 through December 2010)

- Taxable sales in Cameron County during the fourth quarter 2010: \$671.70 million, up 3.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Brownsville:	\$360.97 million, up 2.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Harlingen:	\$202.61 million, up 2.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
San Benito:	\$40.16 million, up 8.9 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
La Feria:	\$7.61 million, up 8.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Los Fresnos:	\$3.81 million, up 12.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Port Isabel:	\$16.53 million, up 2.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Primera:	\$1.15 million, down 21.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Laguna Vista:	\$733,742.00, down 5.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Santa Rosa:	\$2.20 million, up 26.3 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Combes:	\$1.03 million, up 6.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
South Padre Island:	\$11.42 million, up 5.1 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Rio Hondo:	\$1.38 million, down 0.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Rancho Viejo:	\$740,298.00, up 2.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.

Palm Valley:	\$677,906.00, up 7.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Los Indios:	\$449,726.00, down 32.3 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Bayview:	\$28,506.00, up 10.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.

Taxable Sales through the end of 4th quarter 2010 (January 2010 through December 30, 2010)

- Taxable sales in Cameron County through the fourth quarter of 2010: \$2.56 billion, up 0.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:
 - Brownsville:** \$1.33 billion, up 1.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Harlingen:** \$761.99 million, down 0.6 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - San Benito:** \$149.34 million, up 0.3 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - La Feria:** \$30.16 million, up 0.3 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Los Fresnos:** \$15.21 million, up 1.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Port Isabel:** \$80.54 million, down 4.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Primera:** \$3.36 million, down 16.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Laguna Vista:** \$3.25 million, up 0.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Santa Rosa:** \$7.82 million, up 15.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Combes:** \$3.96 million, up 1.2 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - South Padre Island:** \$89.76 million, down 1.2 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Rio Hondo:** \$5.43 million, down 2.4 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Rancho Viejo:** \$2.43 million, down 12.2 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Palm Valley:** \$2.46 million, up 13.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Los Indios:** \$1.84 million, down 33.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
 - Bayview:** \$99,117.00, up 21.7 percent from the same period in 2009.

Annual (2010)

- Taxable sales in Cameron County during 2010: \$2.56 billion, up 0.1 percent from 2009.
- Cameron County sent an estimated \$160.16 million (or 0.94 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.
- Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:
 - Brownsville:** \$1.33 billion, up 1.1 percent from 2009.
 - Harlingen:** \$761.99 million, down 0.6 percent from 2009.
 - San Benito:** \$149.34 million, up 0.3 percent from 2009.
 - La Feria:** \$30.16 million, up 0.3 percent from 2009.
 - Los Fresnos:** \$15.21 million, up 1.1 percent from 2009.
 - Port Isabel:** \$80.54 million, down 4.0 percent from 2009.
 - Primera:** \$3.36 million, down 16.0 percent from 2009.
 - Laguna Vista:** \$3.25 million, up 0.1 percent from 2009.
 - Santa Rosa:** \$7.82 million, up 15.0 percent from 2009.
 - Combes:** \$3.96 million, up 1.2 percent from 2009.
 - South Padre Island:** \$89.76 million, down 1.2 percent from 2009.
 - Rio Hondo:** \$5.43 million, down 2.4 percent from 2009.
 - Rancho Viejo:** \$2.43 million, down 12.2 percent from 2009.
 - Palm Valley:** \$2.46 million, up 13.0 percent from 2009.
 - Los Indios:** \$1.84 million, down 33.0 percent from 2009.
 - Bayview:** \$99,117.00, up 21.7 percent from 2009.

Sales Tax – Local Sales Tax Allocations

(The release date for sales tax allocations to cities for the sales activity month of September 2011 is currently scheduled for November 9, 2011.)

Monthly

- Statewide payments based on the sales activity month of August 2011: \$505.22 million, up 13.9 percent from August 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Cameron County based on the sales activity month of August 2011: \$5.08 million, up 8.7 percent from August 2010.
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:
 - Brownsville:** \$2.61 million, up 10.2 percent from August 2010.
 - Harlingen:** \$1.52 million, up 8.0 percent from August 2010.
 - San Benito:** \$309,720.15, up 4.9 percent from August 2010.
 - La Feria:** \$79,407.36, up 20.9 percent from August 2010.

Los Fresnos:	\$48,699.70, up 13.5 percent from August 2010.
Port Isabel:	\$185,541.29, up 11.8 percent from August 2010.
Primera:	\$9,025.51, up 4.2 percent from August 2010.
Laguna Vista:	\$14,480.33, up 61.0 percent from August 2010.
Santa Rosa:	\$4,929.92, down 11.3 percent from August 2010.
Combes:	\$9,399.49, up 18.1 percent from August 2010.
South Padre Island:	\$268,233.01, down 1.2 percent from August 2010.
Rio Hondo:	\$15,214.15, down 3.6 percent from August 2010.
Rancho Viejo:	\$3,636.95, up 1.8 percent from August 2010.
Palm Valley:	\$1,990.16, down 38.4 percent from August 2010.
Los Indios:	\$3,221.16, up 2.9 percent from August 2010.
Bayview:	\$388.54, down 11.2 percent from August 2010.

Fiscal Year

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: \$6.08 billion, up 8.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Cameron County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: \$60.72 million, up 4.2 percent from fiscal 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:

Brownsville:	\$31.86 million, up 4.7 percent from fiscal 2010.
Harlingen:	\$18.58 million, up 2.8 percent from fiscal 2010.
San Benito:	\$3.70 million, up 5.8 percent from fiscal 2010.
La Feria:	\$928,906.59, up 5.4 percent from fiscal 2010.
Los Fresnos:	\$501,855.08, up 8.0 percent from fiscal 2010.
Port Isabel:	\$1.89 million, up 3.4 percent from fiscal 2010.
Primera:	\$106,299.62, down 6.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
Laguna Vista:	\$133,013.69, up 18.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
Santa Rosa:	\$62,633.30, up 12.5 percent from fiscal 2010.
Combes:	\$95,026.90, up 17.7 percent from fiscal 2010.
South Padre Island:	\$2.51 million, up 5.8 percent from fiscal 2010.
Rio Hondo:	\$192,488.99, up 4.4 percent from fiscal 2010.
Rancho Viejo:	\$51,702.62, up 14.0 percent from fiscal 2010.
Palm Valley:	\$48,966.98, up 11.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
Los Indios:	\$37,581.59, down 12.2 percent from fiscal 2010.
Bayview:	\$12,785.17, up 156.9 percent from fiscal 2010.

January 2011 through August 2011 (Sales Activity Year-To-Date)

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months through August 2011: \$3.99 billion, up 8.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Cameron County based on sales activity months through August 2011: \$40.00 million, up 4.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months through August 2011 to the city of:

Brownsville:	\$20.79 million, up 5.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
Harlingen:	\$12.07 million, up 2.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
San Benito:	\$2.40 million, up 2.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
La Feria:	\$618,438.79, up 7.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Los Fresnos:	\$342,693.16, up 10.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
Port Isabel:	\$1.33 million, up 2.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Primera:	\$69,611.12, up 4.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
Laguna Vista:	\$98,020.59, up 34.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Santa Rosa:	\$39,101.12, up 4.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Combes:	\$64,931.88, up 22.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
South Padre Island:	\$1.95 million, up 6.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
Rio Hondo:	\$128,349.87, up 4.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
Rancho Viejo:	\$33,722.67, up 14.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
Palm Valley:	\$34,209.62, up 19.1 percent from the same period in 2010.
Los Indios:	\$24,992.22, down 5.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
Bayview:	\$10,782.94, up 220.4 percent from the same period in 2010.

12 months ending in August 2011

- Statewide payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: \$6.08 billion, up 8.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments to all cities in Cameron County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: \$60.72 million, up 4.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:

Brownsville:	\$31.86 million, up 4.7 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Harlingen:	\$18.58 million, up 2.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
San Benito:	\$3.70 million, up 5.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
La Feria:	\$928,906.59, up 5.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Los Fresnos:	\$501,855.08, up 8.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Port Isabel:	\$1.89 million, up 3.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Primera:	\$106,299.62, down 6.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Laguna Vista:	\$133,013.69, up 18.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Santa Rosa:	\$62,633.30, up 12.5 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Combes:	\$95,026.90, up 17.7 percent from the previous 12-month period.
South Padre Island:	\$2.51 million, up 5.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Rlo Hondo:	\$192,488.99, up 4.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Rancho Viejo:	\$51,702.62, up 14.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Palm Valley:	\$48,966.98, up 11.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Los Indios:	\$37,581.59, down 12.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Bayview:	\$12,785.17, up 156.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.

■ **City Calendar Year-To-Date (RJ 2011)**

- Payment to the cities from January 2011 through October 2011:

Brownsville:	\$26.90 million, up 4.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
Harlingen:	\$15.53 million, up 2.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
San Benito:	\$3.09 million, up 5.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
La Feria:	\$776,404.87, up 6.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
Los Fresnos:	\$419,472.69, up 9.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
Port Isabel:	\$1.61 million, up 3.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
Primera:	\$90,275.47, down 3.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
Laguna Vista:	\$114,074.94, up 21.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
Santa Rosa:	\$52,257.93, up 12.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
Combes:	\$82,315.48, up 21.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
South Padre Island:	\$2.18 million, up 5.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
Rio Hondo:	\$159,831.32, up 3.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
Rancho Viejo:	\$43,897.96, up 16.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
Palm Valley:	\$41,593.84, up 12.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
Los Indios:	\$31,139.25, down 11.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
Bayview:	\$11,687.22, up 183.1 percent from the same period in 2010.

Annual (2010)

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months in 2010: \$5.77 billion, up 3.3 percent from 2009.
- Payments to all cities in Cameron County based on sales activity months in 2010: \$59.02 million, down 0.9 percent from 2009.
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:

Brownsville:	\$30.81 million, up 0.4 percent from 2009.
Harlingen:	\$18.27 million, down 2.3 percent from 2009.
San Benito:	\$3.64 million, up 2.2 percent from 2009.
La Feria:	\$887,559.62, up 1.9 percent from 2009.
Los Fresnos:	\$469,941.88, down 5.9 percent from 2009.
Port Isabel:	\$1.86 million, down 5.1 percent from 2009.
Primera:	\$103,242.20, down 16.4 percent from 2009.
Laguna Vista:	\$108,057.96, down 5.3 percent from 2009.
Santa Rosa:	\$61,068.19, down 3.1 percent from 2009.
Combes:	\$82,981.62, up 3.2 percent from 2009.

South Padre Island:	\$2.39 million, down 6.2 percent from 2009.
Rio Hondo:	\$186,437.82, down 4.0 percent from 2009.
Rancho Viejo:	\$47,472.91, down 5.1 percent from 2009.
Palm Valley:	\$43,489.41, up 5.4 percent from 2009.
Los Indios:	\$39,050.30, down 20.5 percent from 2009.
Bayview:	\$5,367.86, up 3.4 percent from 2009.

Property Tax

- As of January 2009, property values in Cameron County: \$16.77 billion, up 0.2 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in Cameron County is \$42,300, below the statewide average of \$85,809. A negligible 0.0 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

State Expenditures

- Cameron County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 8th. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: \$1.82 billion, unchanged 0.0 percent from FY2009.
- In Cameron County, 32 state agencies provide a total of 4,466 jobs and \$38.53 million in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):
 - University of Texas
 - Department of State Health Services (Rio Grande State Center)
 - Department of Family and Protective Services
 - Texas State Technical College
 - Health & Human Services Commission

Higher Education

- Community colleges in Cameron County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - Texas Southmost College, a Public Community College, had 11,043 students.
- Cameron County is in the service area of the following:
 - Texas Southmost College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 11,043. Counties in the service area include:
 - Cameron County
 - Willacy County
- Institutions of higher education in Cameron County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - The University of Texas at Brownsville, a Public University (part of The University of Texas System), had 6,855 students.
 - Texas State Technical College-Harlingen, a Public Technical College (part of Texas State Technical College), had 5,779 students.

School Districts

- Cameron County had 10 school districts with 149 schools and 101,277 students in the 2009-10 school year. (Statewide, the average teacher salary in school year 2009-10 was \$48,263. The percentage of students, statewide, meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all 2009-10 TAKS tests was 77 percent.)
 - Brownsville ISD had 49,080 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$48,412. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 74 percent.
 - Harlingen CISD had 18,142 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,997. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 72 percent.
 - La Feria ISD had 3,447 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,075. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 71 percent.
 - Los Fresnos CISD had 9,721 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$46,326. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 84 percent.
 - Point Isabel ISD had 2,525 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$46,318. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 73 percent.
 - Rio Hondo ISD had 2,309 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,139. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 63 percent.
 - San Benito CISD had 11,193 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$46,103. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 69 percent.
 - Santa Maria ISD had 666 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$42,063. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 54 percent.
 - Santa Rosa ISD had 1,172 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$44,891. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 72 percent.

- South Texas ISD had 3,022 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$52,516. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 90 percent.