

S U S A N

C O M B S

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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



June 27, 2013

Greg Poole
Superintendent
Barbers Hill Independent School District
P.O. Box 1108
Mont Belvieu, Texas 77580-1108

Dear Superintendent Poole:

On April 17, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 278) for a limitation on appraised value under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313¹. This application was originally submitted in March 2013 to the Barbers Hill Independent School District (the school district) by Enterprise Products Operating, LLC (the applicant). This letter presents the results of the Comptroller's review of the application:

- 1) under Section 313.025(h) to determine if the property meets the requirements of Section 313.024 for eligibility for a limitation on appraised value under Chapter 313, Subchapter C; and
- 2) under Section 313.025(d), to make a recommendation to the governing body of the school district as to whether the application should be approved or disapproved using the criteria set out by Section 313.026.

The school district is currently classified as a rural school district in Category I according to the provisions of Chapter 313. Therefore, the applicant properly applied under the provisions of Subchapter C, applicable to rural school districts. The amount of proposed qualified investment (\$1 billion) is consistent with the proposed appraised value limitation sought (\$30 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.

The applicant is an active franchise taxpayer in good standing, as required by Section 313.024(a), and is proposing the construction of a manufacturing facility in Chambers County, an eligible property use under Section 313.024(b). The Comptroller has determined that the property, as described in the application, meets the requirements of Section 313.024 for eligibility for a limitation on appraised value under Chapter 313, Subchapter C.

After reviewing the application using the criteria listed in Section 313.026, and the information provided by the applicant, the Comptroller's recommendation is that this application under Tax Code Chapter 313 be approved.

Our review of the application 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. Our recommendation does not address whether the applicant has complied with all Chapter 313 requirements; the school district is responsible for verifying that all requirements of the statute have been fulfilled. Additionally, Section 313.025 requires the school district to only approve an application if the school district finds that the information in the application is true and

¹ All statutory references are to the Texas Tax Code, unless otherwise noted.

correct, finds that the applicant is eligible for a limitation and determines that granting the application is in the best interest of the school district and this state. As stated above, the Comptroller's recommendation is prepared by generally reviewing the application and supporting documentation in light of the Section 313.026 criteria.

Note that any new building or other improvement existing as of the application review start date of April 17, 2013, or any tangible personal property placed in service prior to that date may not become "Qualified Property" as defined by 313.021(2).

The Comptroller's recommendation is based on the application submitted by the school district and reviewed by the Comptroller. The recommendation may not be used by the school district to support its approval of the property value limitation agreement if the application is modified, the information presented in the application changes, or the limitation agreement does not conform to the application. Additionally, this recommendation is contingent on future compliance with the Chapter 313 and the Texas Administrative Code, with particular reference to the following requirements related to the execution of the agreement:

- 1) The applicant must provide the Comptroller a copy of the proposed limitation on appraised value agreement no later than ten (10) days prior to the meeting scheduled by the school district to consider approving the agreement, so that the Comptroller may review it for compliance with the statutes and the Comptroller's rules as well as consistency with the application;
- 2) The Comptroller must confirm that it received and reviewed the draft agreement and affirm the recommendation made in this letter;
- 3) The school district must approve and execute a limitation agreement that has been reviewed by the Comptroller within a year from the date of this letter; and
- 4) The school district must provide a copy of the signed limitation agreement to the Comptroller within seven (7) days after execution, as required by Section 313.025.

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	Enterprise Products Operating, LLC
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Manufacturing
School District	Barbers Hill ISD
2011-2012 Enrollment in School District	4,420
County	Chambers
Total Investment in District	\$1,000,000,000
Qualified Investment	\$1,000,000,000
Limitation Amount	\$30,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	25
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	25
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$1,250
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	\$1,136
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$65,000
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$40,000,000
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$134,063,765
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$88,820,315
Estimated 15 year M&O tax benefit (after deductions for estimated school district revenue protection--but not including any deduction for supplemental payments or extraordinary educational expenses):	\$85,063,928
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$12,845,875
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$48,999,837
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	63.5%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	85.5%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit.	14.5%

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of Enterprise Products Operating, LLC (the project) applying to Barbers Hill 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 25 new jobs when fully operational. All 25 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 Houston-Galveston Area Council of Governments Region, where Chambers County is located was \$53,711 in 2011. The annual average manufacturing wage for 2011-2012 for Chambers County is \$81,224. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$52,156. In addition to a salary of \$65,000, each qualifying position will receive medical and dental Insurance, life Insurance, 401K savings plan, vacation and holiday pay and employee unit purchase plan. The project's total investment is \$1.1 billion, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$40 million.

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

According to Enterprise Products Operating, LLC's application, "Enterprise is a leading midstream energy company with a large pipeline foot print in the United States. These pipelines provide substantial flexibility in plant location. Enterprise has Gas manufacturing locations in TX, LA, NM, CO, and WY. These pipelines provide substantial flexibility in determining where plants are built. Enterprise has significant assets in Louisiana including interstate pipelines which can and do move product to and from Texas. This allows potential manufacturing facilities to be managed via pipelines in neighboring states. Like most businesses, for every significant investment we make, there is a thorough review of the tax incentives offered in the region which helps determine Enterprise's long term investment approach in a site selection."

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

During the past two years, 30 projects in the Houston-Galveston Area Council of Governments 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 Enterprise Products Operating, LLC project requires appear to be in line with the focus and themes of the plan. Texas identified manufacturing as one of six target clusters in the Texas Cluster Initiative. The plan stresses the importance of technology in all sectors of the manufacturing industry.

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

Table 1 depicts Enterprise Products Operating, LLC'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 16 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 Enterprise Products Operating, LLC

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2013	700	776	1476	\$36,400,000	\$50,600,000	\$87,000,000
2014	725	878	1603	\$38,025,000	\$64,975,000	\$103,000,000
2015	25	145	170	\$1,625,000	\$20,375,000	\$22,000,000
2016	25	143	168	\$1,625,000	\$18,375,000	\$20,000,000
2017	25	135	160	\$1,625,000	\$17,375,000	\$19,000,000
2018	25	137	162	\$1,625,000	\$17,375,000	\$19,000,000
2019	25	145	170	\$1,625,000	\$17,375,000	\$19,000,000
2020	25	161	186	\$1,625,000	\$18,375,000	\$20,000,000
2021	25	176	201	\$1,625,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,000,000
2022	25	186	211	\$1,625,000	\$20,375,000	\$22,000,000
2023	25	194	219	\$1,625,000	\$22,375,000	\$24,000,000
2024	25	163	188	\$1,625,000	\$20,375,000	\$22,000,000
2025	25	147	172	\$1,625,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,000,000
2026	25	135	160	\$1,625,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,000,000
2027	25	129	154	\$1,625,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,000,000
2028	25	129	154	\$1,625,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, Enterprise Products Operating, LLC

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was \$1.74 billion in 2011-2012. Barbers Hill ISD's ad valorem tax base in 2011-2012 was \$3.39 billion. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at \$347,943 for fiscal 2011-2012. During that same year, Barbers Hill ISD's estimated wealth per WADA was \$669,576. 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, Chambers County and city of Baytown Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from Enterprise Products Operating, LLC's application. Enterprise Products Operating, LLC has applied for both a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code and tax abatements with the county and city. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the Enterprise Products Operating, LLC project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

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 \$134,063,765. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$88,820,315.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of Chambers 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

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

Form 50-296

Applicant Name: **Enterprise Products, LP (PDH Project)**
 ISD Name: **Barbers Hill ISD**

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Qualified Property			Reductions from Market Value	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	2013-2014	2013	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2014-2015	2014	-	-	550,000,000	41,250,000	508,750,000	508,750,000
2	2015-2016	2015	-	-	825,000,000	61,875,000	763,125,000	763,125,000
3	2016-2017	2016	-	-	1,078,000,000	80,850,000	997,150,000	30,000,000
4	2017-2018	2017	-	-	1,056,000,000	79,200,000	976,800,000	30,000,000
5	2018-2019	2018	-	-	1,034,000,000	77,550,000	956,450,000	30,000,000
6	2019-2020	2019	-	-	1,012,000,000	75,900,000	936,100,000	30,000,000
7	2020-2021	2020	-	-	990,000,000	74,250,000	915,750,000	30,000,000
8	2021-2022	2021	-	-	968,000,000	72,600,000	895,400,000	30,000,000
9	2022-2023	2022	-	-	946,000,000	70,950,000	875,050,000	30,000,000
10	2023-2024	2023	-	-	924,000,000	69,300,000	854,700,000	30,000,000
11	2024-2025	2024	-	-	902,000,000	67,650,000	834,350,000	834,350,000
12	2025-2026	2025	-	-	880,000,000	66,000,000	814,000,000	814,000,000
13	2026-2027	2026	-	-	858,000,000	64,350,000	793,650,000	793,650,000
14	2027-2028	2027	-	-	836,000,000	62,700,000	773,300,000	773,300,000
15	2028-2029	2028	-	-	814,000,000	61,050,000	752,950,000	752,950,000

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.

[Signature]
 DATE: 3/14/2013

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

Schedule C- Application: Employment Information

Form 50-296

Applicant Name **Enterprise Products, LP (PDH Project)**
 ISD Name **Barbers Hill ISD**

	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	2013-2014	2013	700 FTE	\$ 52,000.00	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	700 FTE	\$ 52,000.00	25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	2	2015-2016	2015			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	3	2016-2017	2016			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	4	2017-2018	2017			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	5	2018-2019	2018			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
Value Limitation Period	6	2019-2020	2019			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	7	2020-2021	2020			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	8	2021-2022	2021			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	9	2022-2023	2022			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	10	2023-2024	2023			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
Credit Settle-Up Period	11	2024-2025	2024			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	12	2025-2026	2025			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	13	2026-2027	2026			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
Post- Settle-Up Period	14	2027-2028	2027			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000
	15	2028-2029	2028			25	\$ 65,000	25	\$ 65,000

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.

Curt Jato

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE 3/14/2013

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

Applicant Name

Enterprise Products, LP (PDH Project)

ISD Name

Barbers Hill ISD

Form 50-296

Other Property Tax Abatements Sought

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax/Calendar Year YYYY	Sales Tax Information			Franchise Tax	County	City	Hospital	Other
				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	Column H: Estimate of Franchise tax due from (or attributable to) the applicant					
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)		2013-2014	2013	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%			Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	1	2014-2015	2014	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	100		Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	
	2	2015-2016	2015	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	100			
	3	2016-2017	2016	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	100			
	4	2017-2018	2017	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	100			
	5	2018-2019	2018	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	78%			
	6	2019-2020	2019	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	57%			
	7	2020-2021	2020	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	35%			
	8	2021-2022	2021	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	35%			
	9	2022-2023	2022	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	35%			
	10	2023-2024	2023	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069	100%	35%			
	11	2024-2025	2024	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069					
	12	2025-2026	2025	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069					
	13	2026-2027	2026	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069					
	14	2027-2028	2027	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069					
	15	2028-2029	2028	\$ 600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 15,196,069					

*For planning, construction and operation of the facility.

Curt Jato

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

3/14/2013

DATE

Attachment 2

June 28, 2013

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 Enterprise Products, LP PDH project on the number and size of school facilities in Barbers Hill Independent School District (BHISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the BHISD superintendent, Dr. Greg Poole, the TEA has found that the Enterprise Products, LP PDH project would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in BHISD.

Please feel free to contact me by phone at (512) 463-9186 or by email at al.mckenzie@tea.state.tx.us if you need further information about this issue.

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

June 28, 2013

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 (TEA) has analyzed the revenue gains that would be realized by the proposed Enterprise Products, LP PDH project for the Barbers Hill Independent School District (BHISD). Projections prepared by the TEA State Funding Division confirm the analysis that was prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates and provided to us by your division. We believe the firm's assumptions regarding the potential revenue gain are valid, and its estimates of the impact of the Enterprise Products, LP PDH project on BHISD are correct.

Please feel free to contact me by phone at (512) 463-9186 or by email at al.mckenzie@tea.state.tx.us if you need further information about this issue.

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

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

May 9, 2013

Final Report

PREPARED BY



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

Introduction

Enterprise Products, LP (Enterprise) has requested that the Barbers Hill Independent School District (BHISD) consider granting a property value limitation under Chapter 313 of the Tax Code, also known as the Texas Economic Development Act. In an application submitted to BHISD on March 25, 2013, Enterprise proposes to invest \$1.1 billion to construct a new propane dehydrogenation (PDH) unit in BHISD.

The Enterprise PDH 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, Chapter 313 of the Tax Code granted eligibility to companies engaged in manufacturing, research and development, and renewable electric energy production 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.

Under the provisions of Chapter 313, BHISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$30 million. The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, unless the District and the Company agree to an extension of the start of the two-year qualifying time period. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the qualifying time period will be the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years. Beginning with the 2016-17 school year, 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 (M&O) taxes.

The full taxable value of the project would be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period and thereafter, with BHISD currently levying a \$0.2698 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The full value of the investment is expected to reach \$997 million in the 2016-17 school year, which represents about a 26 percent increase relative to the current underlying tax base, which will provide substantial benefits to BHISD in meeting its debt service obligations. Although depreciation is expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over in future years, the addition of the Enterprise BDH unit will have long-term benefits for the taxpayers of BHISD.

In the case of this 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. BHISD would experience revenue losses as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year that are expected to total nearly \$3.8 million during the eight-year value limitation period. These reductions are addressed in the hold-harmless provisions of the limitation agreement. Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$85.1 million over the course of the agreement, net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District but prior to any supplemental payments negotiated between the company and the District.

School Finance Mechanics

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 its 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.

The third year is often problematical financially for a school district that approves a Chapter 313 value limitation. The implementation of the value limitation may result in a revenue loss to the school district in the third year of the agreement that would not be reimbursed by the state, but require some type of compensation from the applicant under the revenue protection provisions of the agreement. In years 4-10, smaller revenue losses would be anticipated at the compressed M&O tax rate 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. In the case of M&O tax effort in excess of the compressed tax rate, a recurring revenue loss may be incurred.

Under the HB 1 system adopted in 2006, 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.

House Bill 3646 as enacted in 2009 created more "formula" school districts that were less dependent on ASATR state aid than had been the case previously. 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 781 school districts still receiving ASATR to maintain their target revenue funding levels, while an estimated 243 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 formulas. This resulted in 336 districts receiving ASATR funding, with an estimated 688 districts operating on state funding formulas.

For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, the ASATR reduction percentage will be set in the General Appropriations Act. The 2011 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. It is expected that ASATR state funding will be reduced in future years and eliminated by the 2017-18 school year, based on current state policy.

The initial legislation in the 2013 legislative session shows a further reduction in the number of ASATR districts being reduced to 308 districts under the Senate language, compared with an estimated 266 districts under the initial House language. The final bill language is probably a few

weeks away as this report is being written. As a result, current law will be the basis for the estimates presented below. For the base years in the analysis below,

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 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 agreement. 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 general approach used here is to maintain relatively static base property values. The District's local tax base reached \$3.8 billion for the 2012 tax year and is maintained for the forecast period. In addition, the current six Chapter 313 agreements approved previously by the BHISD Board of Trustees are incorporated into the base estimates. Finally, the projected taxable values of the Enterprise PDH project are also factored into the base model used here. The impact of the limitation value for the proposed project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis. An M&O tax rate of \$1.06 per \$100 is used throughout the forecast period.

Enrollment projections provided by BHISD are used as a basis for these estimates. Student enrollment counts in average daily attendance (ADA) reflect a four percent annual increase under the estimates used here.

The current SB 1 reductions are reflected in the underlying models, since updated legislation is not available at this point. With regard to ASATR funding, the 92.35 percent reduction enacted for the 2012-13 school year and thereafter, until the 2017-18 school year. A statement of legislative intent was adopted in 2011 to no longer fund target revenue by the 2017-18 school year, so that change is reflected in the estimates presented below.

BHISD has estimated state property wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$664,013 for the 2012-13 school year. The enrollment and property value assumptions for the 15 years that are the subject of this analysis are summarized in Table 1.

School Finance Impact

School finance models were prepared for BHISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2028-29 school year. Beyond the 2012-13 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88th percentile or Austin yield that influence future state funding beyond the projected level for that school year. 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. In the case of BHISD, the property wealth per WADA estimates suggest that the

additional six cents of Tier II tax effort levied by the District benefit from the absence of recapture in some years and the equalization support provided by the Austin yield in other years.

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

A second model is developed which adds the value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2016-17 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). A summary of the differences between these models is shown in Table 4.

Under these assumptions, BHISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year (-\$579,806). The revenue reduction results from the mechanics of the up to six cents beyond the compressed M&O tax rate equalized to the Austin yield or not subject to recapture, which reflect the one-year lag in value associated with the property value study. Additional revenue losses are calculated for the out-years that reflect revenue losses associated with what are referred to as the six “golden pennies.” Total formula losses over the course of the agreement are expected to reach \$3.8 million.

As noted previously, no attempt was made to forecast further reductions in ASATR funding beyond the 92.35 percent adjustment adopted for the 2012-13 school year, although it is assumed that ASATR will be eliminated beginning in the 2017-18 school year, based on the 2011 statement of legislative intent.

One risk factor under the estimates presented here relates to the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year. The formula loss of \$579,806 cited above is the difference between the base and the limitation models and is based on an assumption that Enterprise would realize \$10.3 million in M&O tax savings the first year the \$30 million limitation takes effect. Under the estimates presented here and as highlighted in Table 4, an increase in ASATR funding of \$6.52 million and a reduction in recapture of \$3.2 million offset nearly all of the \$10.3 million reduction in M&O taxes in the first year the value limitation is in effect.

As noted previously, ASATR funding is included in the current school funding formulas, with its elimination expected in the 2017-18 school year. What is uncertain at this point is what changes in school funding law will occur between now and the first limitation year, the 2016-17 school year. As a result, the \$6.52 million ASATR offset referenced in these estimates needs to be viewed with caution.

In general, the ASATR offset poses little financial risk to BHISD as a result of the adoption of the value limitation agreement. But a significant reduction of ASATR funding prior to the assumed 2017-18 school year elimination of these funds could reduce the residual tax savings in the first year that the \$30 million value limitation takes effect.

The Comptroller’s state property value study influences these calculations, as noted previously. 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. Two state value

determinations are also made for school districts granting Chapter 313 agreements, consistent with local practice. A consolidated single state property value had been provided previously.

Impact on the Taxpayer

Table 5 summarizes the impact of the proposed property value limitation in terms of the potential tax savings under the property value limitation agreement. The focus of this table is on the M&O tax rate only. As noted previously, the property is fully taxable in the first two years under the agreement. A \$1.06 per \$100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed in 2012-13 and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total \$76.0 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, Enterprise would be eligible for a tax credit for M&O taxes paid on value in excess of the value limitation in each of the first two qualifying 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 \$12.8 million over the life of the agreement, with no unpaid tax credits anticipated. The school district is to be reimbursed by the Texas Education Agency for the cost of these credits.

The key BHISD revenue losses are expected to total approximately \$3.8 million over the course of the agreement. In total, the potential net tax benefits (inclusive of tax credits but after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to total \$85.1 million over the life of the agreement. (This amount is prior to any supplemental payments permitted by laws that are negotiated by the school district and the company.) While legislative changes to ASATR funding could increase the hold-harmless amount owed in the initial year of the agreement, there would still be a substantial tax benefit to under the value limitation agreement for the remaining years that the limitation is in effect.

Facilities Funding Impact

The project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with BHISD currently levying a \$0.2698 per \$100 I&S rate. Relative to the Districts underlying tax base of \$3.8 billion (exclusive of the six approved Chapter 313 agreements), the peak taxable value of the Enterprise PDH project is expected to reach \$997 million in the 2016-17 school year, which would represent a 26 percent increase in taxable value above the base level. This should assist BHISD in meeting its future debt service needs.

The project is not expected to affect BHISD in terms of enrollment. Based on the application, there will be 25 new jobs created when the Enterprise PDH project is put into operation. Continued expansion of the project and related development 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 project enhances the tax base of BHISD. It reflects continued capital investment in keeping with the goals of Chapter 313 of the Tax Code.

Under the assumptions outlined above, the potential tax savings for Enterprise under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$85.1 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses, but prior to any supplemental payments to BHISD permitted by law.) The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of BHISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

Table 1 – Base District Information with Enterprise Products, LP (PDIT) 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
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	4,537.08	5,295.23	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,256,641,715	\$4,256,641,715	\$4,032,104,594	\$4,032,104,594	\$761,460	\$761,460
1	2014-15	4,718.56	5,487.99	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,467,607,219	\$4,467,607,219	\$4,201,545,635	\$4,201,545,635	\$765,589	\$765,589
2	2015-16	4,907.30	5,773.51	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,721,982,219	\$4,721,982,219	\$4,412,511,139	\$4,412,511,139	\$764,269	\$764,269
3	2016-17	5,103.60	5,979.83	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,956,007,219	\$3,988,857,219	\$4,666,886,139	\$4,666,886,139	\$780,438	\$780,438
4	2017-18	5,307.74	6,193.58	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,935,657,219	\$3,988,857,219	\$4,900,911,139	\$3,933,761,139	\$791,289	\$635,136
5	2018-19	5,520.05	6,443.95	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,915,307,219	\$3,988,857,219	\$4,880,561,139	\$3,933,761,139	\$757,386	\$610,458
6	2019-20	5,740.85	6,701.69	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$4,894,957,219	\$3,988,857,219	\$4,860,211,139	\$3,933,761,139	\$725,221	\$586,980
7	2020-21	5,970.49	6,969.74	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,030,056,915	\$4,144,306,915	\$4,839,861,139	\$3,933,761,139	\$694,410	\$564,405
8	2021-22	6,209.31	7,248.52	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,155,641,357	\$4,290,241,357	\$4,974,960,835	\$4,089,210,835	\$686,342	\$564,145
9	2022-23	6,457.68	7,538.44	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,687,981,113	\$4,842,931,113	\$5,100,545,277	\$4,235,145,277	\$676,605	\$561,807
10	2023-24	6,715.99	7,839.96	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,618,046,613	\$4,793,346,613	\$5,632,885,033	\$4,787,835,033	\$718,484	\$610,697
11	2024-25	6,984.63	8,153.54	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,549,839,679	\$5,549,839,679	\$5,562,950,533	\$4,738,250,533	\$682,275	\$581,128
12	2025-26	7,264.01	8,479.66	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,483,276,070	\$5,483,276,070	\$5,494,743,599	\$5,494,743,599	\$647,991	\$647,991
13	2026-27	7,554.57	8,818.83	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,419,267,706	\$5,419,267,706	\$5,428,179,990	\$5,428,179,990	\$615,522	\$615,522
14	2027-28	7,856.75	9,171.56	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,357,662,172	\$5,357,662,172	\$5,364,171,626	\$5,364,171,626	\$584,870	\$584,870
15	2028-29	8,171.02	9,538.41	\$1.0600	\$0.2698	\$5,298,316,685	\$5,298,316,685	\$5,302,566,092	\$5,302,566,092	\$555,917	\$555,917

*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
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	\$42,819,179	\$1,442,271	\$3,196,959	\$0	-\$12,199,724	\$2,566,881	\$0	\$0	\$37,825,567
1	2014-15	\$44,886,745	\$1,499,791	\$3,120,843	\$0	-\$12,969,735	\$2,690,826	\$0	\$0	\$39,228,471
2	2015-16	\$47,379,744	\$1,713,301	\$3,137,666	\$0	-\$13,798,711	\$2,840,274	\$0	\$0	\$41,272,274
3	2016-17	\$49,866,743	\$2,125,823	\$3,467,562	\$0	-\$15,659,188	\$2,989,362	\$0	\$0	\$42,790,302
4	2017-18	\$49,663,233	\$1,853,943	\$0	\$0	-\$15,643,777	\$2,977,162	\$0	\$0	\$38,850,560
5	2018-19	\$49,459,723	\$2,300,013	\$0	\$0	-\$14,473,058	\$2,964,962	\$0	\$0	\$40,251,640
6	2019-20	\$49,256,213	\$2,005,610	\$0	\$0	-\$12,455,758	\$2,952,762	\$0	\$0	\$41,758,827
7	2020-21	\$50,576,186	\$2,487,695	\$0	\$0	-\$11,660,221	\$3,031,891	\$0	\$0	\$44,435,551
8	2021-22	\$51,802,905	\$2,189,268	\$0	\$0	-\$11,054,072	\$3,105,429	\$0	\$0	\$46,023,530
9	2022-23	\$57,016,026	\$2,690,690	\$0	\$0	-\$12,065,459	\$3,417,940	\$0	\$0	\$51,059,196
10	2023-24	\$56,326,562	\$2,346,281	\$0	\$0	-\$13,875,508	\$3,376,609	\$0	\$0	\$48,173,944
11	2024-25	\$55,493,153	\$2,910,251	\$0	\$0	-\$12,083,694	\$3,326,648	\$0	\$0	\$49,646,358
12	2025-26	\$54,840,797	\$3,028,661	\$0	\$0	-\$9,817,037	\$3,287,541	\$0	\$0	\$51,337,963
13	2026-27	\$54,213,484	\$3,147,728	\$0	\$0	-\$7,499,861	\$3,249,936	\$0	\$0	\$53,111,286
14	2027-28	\$53,609,719	\$3,273,637	\$0	\$0	-\$5,135,925	\$3,213,742	\$81,489	\$0	\$55,042,661
15	2028-29	\$53,028,104	\$3,404,582	\$0	\$0	-\$2,721,133	\$3,178,876	\$250,361	\$0	\$57,140,790

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
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	\$42,819,179	\$1,442,271	\$3,196,959	\$0	-\$12,199,724	\$2,566,881	\$0	\$0	\$37,825,567
1	2014-15	\$44,886,745	\$1,499,791	\$3,120,843	\$0	-\$12,969,735	\$2,690,826	\$0	\$0	\$39,228,471
2	2015-16	\$47,379,744	\$1,713,301	\$3,137,666	\$0	-\$13,798,711	\$2,840,274	\$0	\$0	\$41,272,274
3	2016-17	\$40,194,760	\$2,125,823	\$9,986,360	\$0	-\$12,506,003	\$2,409,555	\$0	\$0	\$42,210,496
4	2017-18	\$40,194,760	\$1,853,943	\$0	\$0	-\$6,190,573	\$2,409,555	\$0	\$0	\$38,267,685
5	2018-19	\$40,194,760	\$2,300,013	\$0	\$0	-\$5,289,852	\$2,409,555	\$0	\$0	\$39,614,476
6	2019-20	\$40,194,760	\$2,005,610	\$0	\$0	-\$3,565,101	\$2,409,555	\$52,215	\$0	\$41,097,040
7	2020-21	\$41,718,243	\$2,487,695	\$0	\$0	-\$2,704,572	\$2,500,884	\$156,391	\$0	\$44,158,541
8	2021-22	\$43,148,472	\$2,169,268	\$0	\$0	-\$2,322,764	\$2,586,622	\$163,023	\$0	\$45,744,620
9	2022-23	\$48,565,103	\$2,690,690	\$0	\$0	-\$2,949,619	\$2,911,332	\$196,366	\$0	\$51,413,872
10	2023-24	\$48,079,150	\$2,346,281	\$0	\$0	-\$5,872,623	\$2,882,201	\$0	\$0	\$47,435,009
11	2024-25	\$55,493,153	\$2,910,251	\$0	\$0	-\$5,011,143	\$3,326,648	\$106,314	\$0	\$56,825,223
12	2025-26	\$54,840,797	\$3,026,661	\$0	\$0	-\$9,817,037	\$3,287,541	\$0	\$0	\$51,337,963
13	2026-27	\$54,213,484	\$3,147,728	\$0	\$0	-\$7,499,861	\$3,249,936	\$0	\$0	\$53,111,286
14	2027-28	\$53,609,719	\$3,273,637	\$0	\$0	-\$5,135,925	\$3,213,742	\$81,489	\$0	\$55,042,661
15	2028-29	\$53,028,104	\$3,404,582	\$0	\$0	-\$2,721,133	\$3,178,876	\$250,361	\$0	\$57,140,790

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
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2014-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2015-16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2016-17	-\$9,671,983	\$0	\$6,518,797	\$0	\$3,153,185	-\$579,806	\$0	\$0	-\$579,806
4	2017-18	-\$9,468,473	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,463,205	-\$567,607	\$0	\$0	-\$582,875
5	2018-19	-\$9,264,963	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,183,206	-\$555,407	\$0	\$0	-\$637,164
6	2019-20	-\$9,061,453	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,890,657	-\$543,207	\$52,215	\$0	-\$661,788
7	2020-21	-\$8,857,943	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,955,650	-\$531,007	\$156,391	\$0	-\$276,910
8	2021-22	-\$8,654,433	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,731,308	-\$518,807	\$163,023	\$0	-\$378,910
9	2022-23	-\$8,450,923	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,115,841	-\$506,607	\$196,366	\$0	\$354,676
10	2023-24	-\$8,247,412	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,002,885	-\$494,408	\$0	\$0	-\$738,935
11	2024-25	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,072,551	\$0	\$106,314	\$0	\$7,178,865
12	2025-26	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2026-27	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2027-28	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2028-29	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the Enterprise Products, LP (PDH) Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to BHSD at \$1.06 M&O Tax Rate

Year of Agreement	School Year	Project Value	Estimated Taxable Value	Value Savings	Assumed M&O Tax Rate	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
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.060	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2014-15	\$508,750,000	\$508,750,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$5,392,750	\$5,392,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2015-16	\$763,125,000	\$763,125,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$8,089,125	\$8,089,125	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2016-17	\$997,150,000	\$30,000,000	\$967,150,000	\$1.060	\$10,569,790	\$318,000	\$10,251,790	\$0	\$10,251,790	-\$579,806	\$9,671,984
4	2017-18	\$976,800,000	\$30,000,000	\$946,800,000	\$1.060	\$10,354,080	\$318,000	\$10,036,080	\$1,476,703	\$11,512,783	-\$582,875	\$10,929,909
5	2018-19	\$956,450,000	\$30,000,000	\$926,450,000	\$1.060	\$10,138,370	\$318,000	\$9,820,370	\$1,449,251	\$11,269,621	-\$637,164	\$10,632,457
6	2019-20	\$936,100,000	\$30,000,000	\$906,100,000	\$1.060	\$9,922,660	\$318,000	\$9,604,660	\$1,421,799	\$11,026,459	-\$661,788	\$10,364,671
7	2020-21	\$915,750,000	\$30,000,000	\$885,750,000	\$1.060	\$9,706,950	\$318,000	\$9,388,950	\$1,394,347	\$10,783,297	-\$276,910	\$10,506,387
8	2021-22	\$895,400,000	\$30,000,000	\$865,400,000	\$1.060	\$9,491,240	\$318,000	\$9,173,240	\$1,366,895	\$10,540,135	-\$278,910	\$10,261,225
9	2022-23	\$875,050,000	\$30,000,000	\$845,050,000	\$1.060	\$9,275,530	\$318,000	\$8,957,530	\$1,339,442	\$10,296,972	\$0	\$10,296,972
10	2023-24	\$854,700,000	\$30,000,000	\$824,700,000	\$1.060	\$9,059,820	\$318,000	\$8,741,820	\$1,311,990	\$10,053,810	-\$738,935	\$9,314,875
11	2024-25	\$834,350,000	\$834,350,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$8,844,110	\$8,844,110	\$0	\$3,085,448	\$3,085,448	\$0	\$3,085,448
12	2025-26	\$814,000,000	\$814,000,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$8,628,400	\$8,628,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2026-27	\$793,650,000	\$793,650,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$8,412,690	\$8,412,690	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2027-28	\$773,300,000	\$773,300,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$8,196,980	\$8,196,980	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2028-29	\$752,950,000	\$752,950,000	\$0	\$1.060	\$7,981,270	\$7,981,270	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals						\$134,063,765	\$58,089,325	\$75,974,440	\$12,845,875	\$88,820,315	-\$3,756,387	\$85,063,928

Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits
\$5,074,750	\$7,771,125	\$12,845,875
Credits Earned		\$12,845,875
Credits Paid		<u>\$12,845,875</u>
Excess Credits Unpaid		\$0

***Note:** School District Revenue-Loss estimates are subject to change based on numerous factors, including legislative and Texas Education Agency administrative changes to school finance formulas, year-to-year appraisals of project values, and changes in school district tax rates. One of the most substantial changes to the school finance formulas related to Chapter 313 revenue-loss projections could be the treatment of Additional State Aid for Tax Reduction (ASATR). Legislative intent is to end ASATR in 2017-18 school year. Additional information on the assumptions used in preparing these estimates is provided in the narrative of this Report.

Attachment 3

Chambers County

Population

- Total county population in 2010 for Chambers County: 32,332 , up 2.5 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- Chambers County was the state's 91th largest county in population in 2010 and the 25 th fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- Chambers County's population in 2009 was 68.9 percent Anglo (above the state average of 46.7 percent), 10.5 percent African-American (below the state average of 11.3 percent) and 18.4 percent Hispanic (below the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in Chambers County:

Mont Belvieu:	2,913	Anahuac:	2,081
Beach City:	2,058	Old River-Winfree:	1,812
Cove:	307		

Economy and Income

Employment

- September 2011 total employment in Chambers County: 14,359 , up 1.8 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 Chambers County unemployment rate: 10.5 percent, up from 9.4 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:

(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

- Chambers County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 13th with an average per capita income of \$45,257, down 1.5 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 Chambers County averaged \$22.26 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were up 44.2 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in Chambers County during 2010 included:
 - Aquaculture • Rice • Hunting • Hay • Other Beef
- 2011 oil and gas production in Chambers County: 758,413.0 barrels of oil and 3.6 million Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 182 producing oil wells and 62 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 Chambers County during the fourth quarter 2010: \$53.17 million, up 18.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$21.65 million, up 88.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Anahuac:	\$2.21 million, up 1.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Old River-Winfree:	\$0.00
Cove:	\$1.05 million, up 24.0 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 Chambers County through the fourth quarter of 2010: \$192.70 million, down 1.9 percent from the same period in 2009.
- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$64.92 million, up 14.8 percent from the same period in 2009.
Anahuac:	\$8.73 million, down 5.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
Old River-Winfree:	\$0.00
Cove:	\$3.77 million, up 5.7 percent from the same period in 2009.

Annual (2010)

- Taxable sales in Chambers County during 2010: \$192.70 million, down 1.9 percent from 2009.
- Chambers County sent an estimated \$12.04 million (or 0.07 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.

■ Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$64.92 million, up 14.8 percent from 2009.
Anahuac:	\$8.73 million, down 5.0 percent from 2009.
Old River-Winfree:	\$0.00
Cove:	\$3.77 million, up 5.7 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 Chambers County based on the sales activity month of August 2011: \$251,094.84, down 9.6 percent from August 2010.
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$237,085.85, down 10.2 percent from August 2010.
Anahuac:	\$5,641.51, down 26.2 percent from August 2010.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$4,805.15, up 184.3 percent from August 2010.
Cove:	\$3,562.33, down 17.8 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 Chambers County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: \$3.65 million, up 68.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$3.47 million, up 73.2 percent from fiscal 2010.
Anahuac:	\$87,555.03, down 15.7 percent from fiscal 2010.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$49,878.98, up 149.7 percent from fiscal 2010.
Cove:	\$46,617.53, up 27.9 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 Chambers County based on sales activity months through August 2011: \$2.81 million, up 89.1 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months through August 2011 to the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$2.69 million, up 93.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
Anahuac:	\$53,193.97, down 8.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$37,220.66, up 185.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
Cove:	\$28,490.84, up 19.7 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 Chambers County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: \$3.65 million, up 68.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:

Mont Belvieu:	\$3.47 million, up 73.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Anahuac:	\$87,555.03, down 15.7 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$49,878.98, up 149.7 percent from the previous 12-month period.
Cove:	\$46,617.53, up 27.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.

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

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

Mont Belvieu:	\$3.08 million, up 82.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
Anahuac:	\$67,392.60, down 15.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$44,170.61, up 170.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
Cove:	\$34,087.81, up 16.4 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 Chambers County based on sales activity months in 2010: \$2.33 million, up 8.0 percent from 2009.
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:

Mont Beivieu:	\$2.17 million, up 11.7 percent from 2009.
Anahuac:	\$92,526.01, down 38.1 percent from 2009.
Old River-Winfree*:	\$25,685.64, up 20.4 percent from 2009.
Cove:	\$41,933.79, down 3.1 percent from 2009.

*On 10/1/2010, the city of Old River-Winfree's local sales tax rate increased by 0.00 from 1.500 percent to 1.500 percent.

Property Tax

- As of January 2009, property values in Chambers County: \$6.94 billion, down 6.3 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in Chambers County is \$220,680, above the statewide average of \$85,809. About 2.0 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

State Expenditures

- Chambers County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 87th. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: \$129.70 million, up 0.2 percent from FY2009.
- In Chambers County, 8 state agencies provide a total of 47 jobs and \$470,459.00 in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):

- Department of Public Safety	- Department of Transportation
- Parks & Wildlife Department	- AgriLife Extension Service
- Health & Human Services Commission	

Higher Education

- Community colleges in Chambers County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - None.
- Chambers County is in the service area of the following:
 - Galveston College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 2,318 . Counties in the service area include:
 - Chambers County
 - Galveston County
 - Jefferson County
 - Lee College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 6,719 . Counties in the service area include:
 - Chambers County
 - Hardin County
 - Harris County
 - Liberty County
 - San Jacinto Community College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 32,105 . Counties in the service area include:
 - Chambers County
 - Harris County
- Institutions of higher education in Chambers County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - None.

School Districts

- Chambers County had 3 school districts with 17 schools and 6,678 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.)
 - Anahuac ISD had 1,286 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$44,844. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 82 percent.
 - Barbers Hill ISD had 4,096 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$55,305. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 90 percent.
 - East Chambers ISD had 1,296 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$45,678. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 80 percent.