

S U S A N

C O M B S

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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



August 1, 2013

Robert Madding  
Superintendent  
Nederland Independent School District  
220 17<sup>th</sup> St.  
Nederland, Texas 77627

Dear Superintendent Madding:

On May 3, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 279) for a limitation on appraised value under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313<sup>1</sup>. This application was originally submitted in March 2013 to the Nederland Independent School District (the school district) by Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities 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 1 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 (\$310 million) 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 Jefferson 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 correct, finds that the applicant is eligible for a limitation and determines that granting the application is

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to the Texas Tax Code, unless otherwise noted.

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 May 3, 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 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 limitation agreement must contain provisions that require:
  - a. the applicant to provide sufficient information to the Central Appraisal District (CAD) to distinguish between and separately appraise qualified property (as defined by 313.021(2)) from any property that is not qualified;
  - b. the school district to confirm with the CAD that the applicant has provided such information; and
  - c. that the Comptroller is provided with the CAD approved information no later than the first annual reporting period following the execution of the agreement;
- 3) The Comptroller must confirm that it received and reviewed the draft agreement and affirm the recommendation made in this letter;
- 4) 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
- 5) 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](mailto: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	Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Manufacturing
School District	Nederland ISD
2011-12 Enrollment in School District	5,005
County	Jefferson
Total Investment in District	\$310,100,000
Qualified Investment	\$310,100,000
Limitation Amount	\$30,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	16
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	16
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$1,595
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	\$1,242
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$82,965
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$19,381,250
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$28,877,612
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$18,036,137
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):	\$15,586,112
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$2,507,440
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$13,291,499
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	54.0%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	86.1%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit	13.9%

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of Sunoco (the project) applying to Nederland 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 16 new jobs when fully operational. All 16 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 South East Texas Regional Planning Commission Region, where Jefferson County is located was \$58,724 in 2011. The annual average manufacturing wage for 2011-2012 for Jefferson County is \$88,348. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$49,894. In addition to a salary of \$82,965, each qualifying position will receive benefits such as 401(k) savings plan, group health benefit for which Sunoco offers to pay at least 80% of the premiums or other chargers for employee-only coverage, dental and vision plans, pre-tax spending plans for medical, dental and vision plans, disability plan, life insurance plan, vacation and holiday pay. The project's total investment is \$310 million, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$19.4 million.

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

According to Sunoco's application, "Based on strong demand for its products and services, Sunoco Logistics Partners, L.P. presently is evaluating opportunities for investment in new and/or expanded manufacturing and other facilities in Canada and at least two other states, in addition to Texas. The proposed Nederland NGL project is competing against these other proposed projects for the necessary capital investment."

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

During the past two years, four projects in the South East Texas Regional Planning Commission 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 Sunoco 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 Sunoco'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 Sunoco**

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2014	729	849	1578	\$43,981,839	\$57,018,161	\$101,000,000
2015	16	111	127	\$1,425,216	\$13,574,784	\$15,000,000
2016	16	64	80	\$1,425,216	\$9,574,784	\$11,000,000
2017	16	56	72	\$1,425,216	\$8,574,784	\$10,000,000
2018	16	47	63	\$1,425,216	\$7,574,784	\$9,000,000
2019	16	43	59	\$1,425,216	\$6,574,784	\$8,000,000
2020	16	47	63	\$1,425,216	\$6,574,784	\$8,000,000
2021	16	56	72	\$1,425,216	\$7,574,784	\$9,000,000
2022	16	56	72	\$1,425,216	\$7,574,784	\$9,000,000
2023	16	64	80	\$1,425,216	\$8,574,784	\$10,000,000
2024	16	62	78	\$1,425,216	\$8,574,784	\$10,000,000
2025	16	64	80	\$1,425,216	\$8,574,784	\$10,000,000
2026	16	64	80	\$1,425,216	\$9,574,784	\$11,000,000
2027	16	66	82	\$1,425,216	\$8,574,784	\$10,000,000
2028	16	70	86	\$1,425,216	\$10,574,784	\$12,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, Sunoco

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was \$1.74 billion in 2011-2012. Nederland ISD's ad valorem tax base in 2011-2012 was \$2.0 billion. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at \$347,943 for fiscal 2011-2012. During that same year, Nederland ISD's estimated wealth per WADA was \$340,685. 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, Jefferson County, City of Nederland, and Sabine-Neches Navigation District, with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from Sunoco's application. Sunoco has applied for both a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code and tax abatements with the county, city, and navigation district. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the Sunoco project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

**Table 2 Estimated Direct Ad Valorem Taxes with all property tax incentives sought**

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate <sup>1</sup>	Nederland ISD I&S Levy	Nederland ISD M&O Levy	Nederland ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (Before Credit Credited)	Nederland ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (After Credit Credited)	Jefferson County Tax Levy	City of Nederland Tax Levy	Sabine Neches Navigation District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
			0.0650	0.0650	1.0400			0.3650	0.5919	0.0279	
2014	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2015	\$271,100,000	\$271,100,000		\$176,215	\$2,819,440	\$2,995,655	\$2,995,655	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,995,655
2016	\$257,525,000	\$30,000,000		\$167,391	\$312,000	\$479,391	\$479,391	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$479,391
2017	\$244,630,150	\$30,000,000		\$159,010	\$312,000	\$471,010	\$235,505	\$89,290	\$0	\$6,818	\$331,613
2018	\$232,381,345	\$30,000,000		\$151,048	\$312,000	\$463,048	\$231,524	\$84,819	\$0	\$6,476	\$322,820
2019	\$220,746,190	\$30,000,000		\$143,485	\$312,000	\$455,485	\$227,743	\$161,145	\$0	\$12,304	\$401,192
2020	\$209,693,919	\$30,000,000		\$136,301	\$312,000	\$448,301	\$224,151	\$153,077	\$0	\$11,688	\$388,915
2021	\$199,195,309	\$30,000,000		\$129,477	\$312,000	\$441,477	\$220,738	\$727,063	\$0	\$55,516	\$1,003,317
2022	\$189,222,605	\$30,000,000		\$122,995	\$312,000	\$434,995	\$217,497	\$690,663	\$0	\$52,736	\$960,896
2023	\$179,749,441	\$30,000,000		\$116,837	\$312,000	\$428,837	\$214,419	\$656,085	\$0	\$50,096	\$920,600
2024	\$170,750,777	\$170,750,777		\$110,988	\$1,775,808	\$1,886,796	\$950,932	\$623,240	\$0	\$47,588	\$1,621,761
2025	\$162,202,829	\$162,202,829		\$105,432	\$1,686,909	\$1,792,341	\$1,792,341	\$592,040	\$960,002	\$45,206	\$3,389,590
2026	\$154,083,009	\$154,083,009		\$100,154	\$1,602,463	\$1,702,617	\$1,702,617	\$562,403	\$911,945	\$42,943	\$3,219,908
2027	\$146,369,855	\$146,369,855		\$95,140	\$1,522,246	\$1,617,387	\$1,617,387	\$534,250	\$866,294	\$40,793	\$3,058,725
2028	\$139,042,992	\$139,042,992		\$90,378	\$1,446,047	\$1,536,425	\$1,536,425	\$507,507	\$822,930	\$38,751	\$2,905,613
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12,646,325</b>	<b>\$5,381,582</b>	<b>\$3,561,172</b>	<b>\$410,917</b>	<b>\$21,999,996</b>

Assumes School Value Limitation and a Tax Abatements with the County, City, and Navigation District.

Source: CPA, Sunoco

<sup>1</sup>Tax Rate per \$100 Valuation

**Table 3 Estimated Direct Ad Valorem Taxes without property tax incentives**

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate <sup>1</sup>	Nederland ISD I&S Levy	Nederland ISD M&O Levy	Nederland ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies	Jefferson County Tax Levy	City of Nederland Tax Levy	Sabine Neches Navigation District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes	
			0.0650	0.0650	1.0400		0.3650	0.5919	0.0279		
2014	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2015	\$271,100,000	\$271,100,000		\$176,215	\$2,819,440	\$2,995,655	\$989,515	\$1,604,513	\$75,556	\$5,665,239	
2016	\$257,525,000	\$257,525,000		\$167,391	\$2,678,260	\$2,845,651	\$939,966	\$1,524,169	\$71,772	\$5,381,559	
2017	\$244,630,150	\$244,630,150		\$159,010	\$2,544,154	\$2,703,163	\$892,900	\$1,447,851	\$68,178	\$5,112,093	
2018	\$232,381,345	\$232,381,345		\$151,048	\$2,416,766	\$2,567,814	\$848,192	\$1,375,356	\$64,765	\$4,856,126	
2019	\$220,746,190	\$220,746,190		\$143,485	\$2,295,760	\$2,439,245	\$805,724	\$1,306,493	\$61,522	\$4,612,984	
2020	\$209,693,919	\$209,693,919		\$136,301	\$2,180,817	\$2,317,118	\$765,383	\$1,241,080	\$58,442	\$4,382,022	
2021	\$199,195,309	\$199,195,309		\$129,477	\$2,071,631	\$2,201,108	\$727,063	\$1,178,943	\$55,516	\$4,162,630	
2022	\$189,222,605	\$189,222,605		\$122,995	\$1,967,915	\$2,090,910	\$690,663	\$1,119,920	\$52,736	\$3,954,228	
2023	\$179,749,441	\$179,749,441		\$116,837	\$1,869,394	\$1,986,231	\$656,085	\$1,063,852	\$50,096	\$3,756,265	
2024	\$170,750,777	\$170,750,777		\$110,988	\$1,775,808	\$1,886,796	\$623,240	\$1,010,594	\$47,588	\$3,568,218	
2025	\$162,202,829	\$162,202,829		\$105,432	\$1,686,909	\$1,792,341	\$592,040	\$960,002	\$45,206	\$3,389,590	
2026	\$154,083,009	\$154,083,009		\$100,154	\$1,602,463	\$1,702,617	\$562,403	\$911,945	\$42,943	\$3,219,908	
2027	\$146,369,855	\$146,369,855		\$95,140	\$1,522,246	\$1,617,387	\$534,250	\$866,294	\$40,793	\$3,058,725	
2028	\$139,042,992	\$139,042,992		\$90,378	\$1,446,047	\$1,536,425	\$507,507	\$822,930	\$38,751	\$2,905,613	
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,682,462</b>	<b>\$10,134,931</b>	<b>\$16,433,943</b>	<b>\$773,864</b>	<b>\$58,025,201</b>

Source: CPA, Sunoco

<sup>1</sup>Tax 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 \$28,877,612. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$18,036,137.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of Jefferson 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: Oneok Hydrocarbon, LP  
 ISD Name: Nederland ISD

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS											
(Estimated investment in each year. Do not put cumulative totals.)											
Year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year below) YYYY	Column A: Tangible Personal Property (original cost) placed in service during this year	Column B: Building or permanent nonremovable component of building (annual amount only)	Column C: Sum of A and B (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)	2013-2014	2013	1	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 310,100,000	\$ 311,100,000	\$	\$ 311,100,000		
				2	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		
				3							
				4							
				5							
				6							
				7							
				8							
				9							
				10							
				11							
				12							
				13							
				14							
				15							
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	Complete tax years of qualifying time period										
Credit Settle-Up Period	Value Limitation Period										
Post-Settle-Up Period	Continue to Maintain Viable Presence										
Post-Settle-Up Period	Post-Settle-Up Period										

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 §313.02(1)(A)-(D). For the purposes of investment, please list amount invested each year, not cumulative totals.

Column B: 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 §313.02(1)(E).

Column C: 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.

Column D: Note: Land can be listed as part of investment during the "pre-year 1" time period. It cannot be part of qualifying investment.

Column E: Notes: For advanced clean energy projects, nuclear projects, projects with deferral-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 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.

7/1/13

DATE

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

**Schedule B (Rev. May 2010): Estimated Market And Taxable Value**  
**Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC**

Form 50-296

Applicant Name  
 ISD Name

Nederland ISD

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (FY in actual tax year) YYYY	Estimated Market Value of Land	Qualified Property		Reductions from Market Value	Estimated Taxable Value		
				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 M&O—after all reductions	Final taxable value for I&S after all reductions	
pre-year 1	2013-2014	2013	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2	2015-2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3	2016-2017	-	310,100,000	1,000,000	40,000,000	271,100,000	271,100,000	271,100,000
	4	2017-2018	-	294,595,000	930,000	38,000,000	257,525,000	257,525,000	30,000,000
	5	2018-2019	-	279,865,250	864,900	36,100,000	244,630,150	244,630,150	30,000,000
	6	2019-2020	-	265,871,988	804,357	34,295,000	232,381,345	232,381,345	30,000,000
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	7	2020-2021	-	252,578,388	748,052	32,580,250	220,746,190	220,746,190	30,000,000
	8	2021-2022	-	239,949,469	695,688	30,951,238	209,693,919	209,693,919	30,000,000
	9	2022-2023	-	227,951,995	646,990	29,403,676	199,195,309	199,195,309	30,000,000
	10	2023-2024	-	216,554,396	601,701	27,933,492	189,222,605	189,222,605	30,000,000
	11	2024-2025	-	205,726,676	559,582	26,536,817	179,749,441	179,749,441	30,000,000
	12	2025-2026	-	195,440,342	520,411	25,209,976	170,750,777	170,750,777	170,750,777
Credit Settle-Up Period	13	2026-2027	-	185,668,325	483,982	23,949,478	162,202,829	162,202,829	162,202,829
	14	2027-2028	-	176,384,909	450,104	22,752,004	154,083,009	154,083,009	154,083,009
	15	2028-2029	-	167,565,663	418,596	21,614,404	146,369,855	146,369,855	146,369,855
Post- Settle-Up Period			-	159,187,380	389,295	20,533,683	139,042,992	139,042,992	139,042,992

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]*  
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

7/1/13  
 DATE

Applicant Name  
ISD Name

Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC  
Nederland ISD


Schedule C - Application: Employment Information

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	2013-2014	2013			0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	1,500,000 hours	\$ 60,000.00	8	\$ 89,076.00	8	\$ 89,076.00
	2	2015-2016	2015			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	3	2016-2017	2016			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	4	2017-2018	2017			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	5	2018-2019	2018			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
Value Limitation Period	6	2019-2020	2019			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	7	2020-2021	2020			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	8	2021-2022	2021			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	9	2022-2023	2022			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	10	2023-2024	2023			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
Credit Settle-Up Period	11	2024-2025	2024			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	12	2025-2026	2025			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
	13	2026-2027	2026			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
Post-Settle-Up Period	14	2027-2028	2027			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00
Post-Settle-Up Period	15	2028-2029	2028			16	\$ 89,076.00	16	\$ 89,076.00

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

7/1/13  
DATE

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

Applicant Name

Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC

ISD Name

Nederland ISD

Form 50-296

Sales Tax Information				Other Property Tax Abatements Sought			
Sales Taxable Expenditures		Franchise Tax	County	City	Hospital	Navigation District	
Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax/Calendar Year YYYY	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	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
	2013-2014	2013					
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)							
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	\$ 125,325,000	\$ 114,000,000			
	2	2015-2016	\$ 33,420,000	\$ 30,400,000	\$ 59,092.80	100	100
Value Limitation Period	3	2016-2017	\$ 130,000		\$ 60,274.66	100	100
	4	2017-2018	\$ 130,000		\$ 61,480.15	90	90
	5	2018-2019	\$ 130,000		\$ 62,709.75	90	90
	6	2019-2020	\$ 130,000		\$ 63,963.95	80	80
	7	2020-2021	\$ 130,000		\$ 65,243.23	80	80
Credit Settle-Up Period	8	2021-2022	\$ 130,000		\$ 66,548.09		
	9	2022-2023	\$ 130,000		\$ 67,879.05		
	10	2023-2024	\$ 130,000		\$ 69,236.63		
Post-Settle-Up Period	11	2024-2025	\$ 130,000		\$ 70,621.37		
	12	2025-2026	\$ 130,000		\$ 72,033.79		
	13	2026-2027	\$ 130,000		\$ 73,474.47		
Post-Settle-Up Period	14	2027-2028	\$ 130,000		\$ 74,943.96		
	15	2028-2029	\$ 130,000		\$ 76,442.84		

\*For planning, construction and operation of the facility

*[Signature]*  
SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

7/1/15  
DATE

# **Attachment 2**

July 26, 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 Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC (Sunoco Logistics) project for the Nederland Independent School District (NISD). 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 Sunoco Logistics project on NISD are correct.

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

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager  
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

July 26, 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 Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC (Sunoco Logistics) project on the number and size of school facilities in Nederland Independent School District (NISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the NISD chief financial officer, Ms. Melissa Wong, the TEA has found that the Sunoco Logistics project would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in NISD.

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

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager  
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

**REVISED SUMMARY OF THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE  
PROPOSED SUNOCO PARTNERS NGL FACILITIES LLC PROJECT  
ON THE FINANCES OF THE NEDERLAND INDEPENDENT SCHOOL  
DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY  
VALUE LIMITATION**

July 15, 2013

Final Report (Revised)

**PREPARED BY**



# **Revised Summary of the Financial Impact of the Proposed Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC Project on the Finances of the Nederland Independent School District Under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation**

## **Introduction**

Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC (Sunoco Logistics) has requested that the Nederland ISD Independent School District (NISD) 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 NISD on March 25, 2013, Sunoco Logistics proposes to invest \$320 million to construct a new natural gas liquids manufacturing project in NISD. The original application was amended on July 12, 2013. This revised report reflects several changes made in Schedule B that is included in the amended application.

The Sunoco Logistics 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, NISD 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. 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, with NISD currently levying a \$0.065 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The taxable value of the investment is expected to reach \$271 million in the 2015-16 school year, representing an approximate 12.4 percent increase in the District's base taxable value for I&S purposes. After its peak value year, depreciation is expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement and beyond.

In the case of the Sunoco Logistics 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. Under current law, NISD would experience a revenue loss of \$2.45 million as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year. No out-year revenue losses are anticipated.

---

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$15.6 million over the course of the agreement. This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for 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 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 periods (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 of the agreement 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 often results 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 when the state M&O 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.

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 during the First Called Session in 2011 made \$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 students in weighted average daily attendance (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 operated directly on the state formulas. For the 2012-13 school year, the 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, with 689 districts operating on formula and 335 districts still receiving ASATR funding.

Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 1025 as passed by the 83<sup>rd</sup> Legislature made significant increases to the basic allotment and other formula changes by appropriation. The ASATR reduction percentage is increased slightly to 92.63 percent, while the basic allotment is increased by \$325 and \$365, respectively, for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. A slight increase in the guaranteed yield for the six cents above compressed—known as the Austin yield—is also included. With the basic allotment increase, it is estimated that approximately 300 school districts will still receive ASATR in the 2013-14 school year and 273 districts would do so in the 2014-15

school year. Current state policy calls for ASATR funding to be eliminated by the 2017-18 school year.

In the case of NISD, it is classified as a formula school district and has not received ASATR funds in recent years. The District's target revenue is \$4,827 per WADA at its compressed tax rate of \$0.98 per \$100, about \$400 less than the state average, generating little need for hold-harmless funds as a result. Based on the estimates presented below, BISD is not expected to receive future ASATR funds with or without the value limitation in place.

One concern in projecting into the future is that the underlying state statutes in the Education Code were not changed in order to provide these funding increases. All of the major formula changes were made by appropriation, which gives them only a two-year lifespan unless renewed in the 2015 legislative session. Despite this uncertainty, it is assumed that these changes will remain in effect for the forecast period for the purpose of these estimates, assuming a continued legislative commitment to these funding levels in future years.

A 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 Sunoco Logistics 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 general 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 SB 1 and HB 1025 basic allotment increases are reflected in the underlying models. With regard to ASATR funding, the 92.63 percent reduction enacted for the 2013-14 school year and is maintained 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. The projected taxable values of the Sunoco Logistics project are also factored into the base model used here in order to simulate the financial impact of constructing the project in the absence of a value limitation agreement. The impact of the limitation value for the proposed Sunoco Logistics project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts are held constant at 4,746 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the Sunoco Logistics project on the finances of NISD. The District's local tax base reached \$2.1 billion for the 2012 tax year and is maintained at that level for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. An M&O tax rate of \$1.04 per \$100 is used throughout this analysis. NISD has estimated state property wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$341,367 for the 2013-14 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 NISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2028-29 school year. Beyond the 2014-15 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88<sup>th</sup> 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.

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

A second model is developed which adds the Sunoco Logistics 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, NISD would experience a revenue loss of \$2.45 million as a result of the implementation of the \$30 million value limitation in the 2016-17 school year. 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 state property value study. While Sunoco Logistics is expected to receive \$2.37 million in M&O tax savings when the \$30 million limitation takes effect, there are no state formula changes offsetting this reduction until the 2017-18 school year. In addition to the reduction in M&O taxes, NISD would also see an \$83,765 reduction in Tier II state aid in the initial year the limitation takes effect.

The Comptroller’s state property value study has a significant influence on these calculations, beginning in the 2017-18 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. Two state property value determinations are also made for school districts granting Chapter 313 agreements, consistent with local practice, but reflecting the one-year lag. 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 \$1.04 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 \$15.5 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, Sunoco Logistics 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 \$2.5 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 NISD revenue losses are expected to total approximately \$2.45 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 reach \$15.6 million over the life of the agreement.

### **Facilities Funding Impact**

The Sunoco Logistics project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with NISD currently levying a \$0.065 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The value of the Sunoco Logistics project is expected to depreciate over the life of the agreement and beyond, but full access to the additional value is expected to increase the District's projected I&S tax base by 12.4 percent in the project's peak value year.

The Sunoco Logistics project is not expected to affect NISD in terms of enrollment. When the project begins operation, 16 new full-time positions are assumed, based on the information application. 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 Sunoco Logistics natural gas liquids manufacturing project enhances the tax base of NISD. 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 the applicant under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$15.6 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District.) The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of NISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

**Table 1 – Base District Information with Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC Project Value and Limitation Values**

Year of Agreement	School Year	ADA	WADA	M&O Tax Rate	I&S Tax Rate	CAD Value with Project	CAD Value with Limitation	CPTD with Project	CPTD With Limitation	CPTD Value with Project per WADA	CPTD Value with Limitation per WADA
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	4,743.44	6,085.81	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,173,935,621	\$2,173,935,621	\$2,077,497,695	\$2,077,497,695	\$341,367	\$341,367
1	2014-15	4,742.32	6,094.42	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,173,935,621	\$2,173,935,621	\$2,077,497,695	\$2,077,497,695	\$340,885	\$340,885
2	2015-16	4,741.21	6,059.89	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,445,035,621	\$2,445,035,621	\$2,077,497,695	\$2,077,497,695	\$342,828	\$342,828
3	2016-17	4,740.10	6,058.60	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,431,460,621	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,348,597,695	\$2,348,597,695	\$387,647	\$387,647
4	2017-18	4,738.99	6,059.11	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,418,565,771	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,335,022,695	\$2,107,497,695	\$385,374	\$347,823
5	2018-19	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,406,316,966	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,322,127,845	\$2,107,497,695	\$383,169	\$347,754
6	2019-20	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,394,681,811	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,309,879,040	\$2,107,497,695	\$381,148	\$347,754
7	2020-21	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,383,629,540	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,298,243,885	\$2,107,497,695	\$379,228	\$347,754
8	2021-22	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,373,130,930	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,287,191,614	\$2,107,497,695	\$377,405	\$347,754
9	2022-23	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,363,158,226	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,276,693,004	\$2,107,497,695	\$375,672	\$347,754
10	2023-24	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,353,685,062	\$2,203,935,621	\$2,266,720,300	\$2,107,497,695	\$374,027	\$347,754
11	2024-25	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,344,686,398	\$2,344,686,398	\$2,257,247,136	\$2,107,497,695	\$372,463	\$347,754
12	2025-26	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,336,138,250	\$2,336,138,250	\$2,248,248,472	\$2,248,248,472	\$370,979	\$370,979
13	2026-27	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,328,018,630	\$2,328,018,630	\$2,239,700,324	\$2,239,700,324	\$369,568	\$369,568
14	2027-28	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,320,305,476	\$2,320,305,476	\$2,231,580,704	\$2,231,580,704	\$368,228	\$368,228
15	2028-29	4,737.87	6,060.32	\$1.0400	\$0.0650	\$2,312,978,613	\$2,312,978,613	\$2,223,867,550	\$2,223,867,550	\$366,956	\$366,956

\*Basic Allotment: \$5,040; AISD Yield: \$61.86; Equalized Wealth: \$504,000 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	\$20,209,411	\$10,889,231	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,236,239	\$935,535	\$0	\$33,270,415
1	2014-15	\$20,209,411	\$11,492,885	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,236,239	\$1,007,148	\$0	\$33,945,682
2	2015-16	\$22,813,185	\$11,315,281	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,395,515	\$1,151,462	\$0	\$36,875,444
3	2016-17	\$22,727,402	\$8,651,619	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,390,268	\$853,759	\$0	\$33,623,047
4	2017-18	\$22,601,026	\$8,787,220	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,382,537	\$862,176	\$0	\$33,832,959
5	2018-19	\$22,480,981	\$8,919,711	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,375,194	\$870,442	\$0	\$33,646,328
6	2019-20	\$22,368,951	\$9,039,756	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,368,218	\$877,875	\$0	\$33,652,800
7	2020-21	\$22,258,633	\$9,153,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,361,592	\$884,940	\$0	\$33,658,951
8	2021-22	\$22,155,743	\$9,262,103	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,355,298	\$891,655	\$0	\$33,664,798
9	2022-23	\$22,058,006	\$9,364,995	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,349,320	\$898,037	\$0	\$33,670,357
10	2023-24	\$21,965,163	\$9,462,732	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,343,640	\$904,103	\$0	\$33,675,639
11	2024-25	\$21,849,383	\$9,555,574	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,336,558	\$908,721	\$0	\$33,650,236
12	2025-26	\$21,787,283	\$9,643,765	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,331,536	\$914,259	\$0	\$33,656,843
13	2026-27	\$21,689,298	\$9,727,541	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,326,765	\$919,525	\$0	\$33,663,129
14	2027-28	\$21,615,217	\$9,807,118	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,322,234	\$924,529	\$0	\$33,669,098
15	2028-29	\$21,544,847	\$9,882,710	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,317,929	\$929,286	\$0	\$33,674,772

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	\$20,209,411	\$10,889,231	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,236,239	\$935,535	\$0	\$33,270,415
1	2014-15	\$20,209,411	\$11,492,885	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,236,239	\$1,007,148	\$0	\$33,945,682
2	2015-16	\$22,813,185	\$11,315,281	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,395,515	\$1,151,462	\$0	\$36,675,444
3	2016-17	\$20,497,545	\$8,651,619	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$769,994	\$0	\$31,173,022
4	2017-18	\$20,497,545	\$11,017,077	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,001,717	\$0	\$33,770,204
5	2018-19	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
6	2019-20	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
7	2020-21	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
8	2021-22	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
9	2022-23	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
10	2023-24	\$20,497,545	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,253,864	\$1,002,166	\$0	\$33,776,768
11	2024-25	\$21,849,383	\$11,023,192	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,336,558	\$1,068,261	\$0	\$35,277,394
12	2025-26	\$21,767,283	\$9,643,765	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,331,536	\$914,259	\$0	\$33,656,843
13	2026-27	\$21,689,298	\$9,727,541	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,326,765	\$919,525	\$0	\$33,663,129
14	2027-28	\$21,615,217	\$9,807,118	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,322,234	\$924,529	\$0	\$33,669,098
15	2028-29	\$21,544,847	\$9,862,710	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,317,929	\$929,266	\$0	\$33,674,772

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	-\$2,229,856	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$136,404	-\$83,765	\$0	-\$2,450,025
4	2017-18	-\$2,103,481	\$2,229,857	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$128,673	\$139,541	\$0	\$137,245
5	2018-19	-\$1,983,436	\$2,103,481	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$121,330	\$131,724	\$0	\$130,439
6	2019-20	-\$1,869,406	\$1,983,436	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$114,354	\$124,292	\$0	\$123,967
7	2020-21	-\$1,761,088	\$1,869,406	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$107,728	\$117,227	\$0	\$117,816
8	2021-22	-\$1,658,197	\$1,761,089	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$101,434	\$110,512	\$0	\$111,969
9	2022-23	-\$1,560,460	\$1,658,197	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$95,456	\$104,129	\$0	\$106,411
10	2023-24	-\$1,467,618	\$1,560,460	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$89,776	\$98,063	\$0	\$101,129
11	2024-25	\$0	\$1,467,618	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$159,540	\$0	\$1,627,158
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 Sunoco Partners NGL Facilities LLC Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to NISD at \$1.04 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	\$1.040	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2014-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.040	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2015-16	\$271,100,000	\$271,100,000	\$0	\$1.040	\$2,819,440	\$2,819,440	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2016-17	\$257,525,000	\$30,000,000	\$227,525,000	\$1.040	\$2,678,260	\$312,000	\$2,366,260	\$0	\$2,366,260	-\$2,450,025	-\$83,765
4	2017-18	\$244,630,150	\$30,000,000	\$214,630,150	\$1.040	\$2,544,154	\$312,000	\$2,232,154	\$235,505	\$2,467,658	\$0	\$2,467,658
5	2018-19	\$232,381,345	\$30,000,000	\$202,381,345	\$1.040	\$2,416,766	\$312,000	\$2,104,766	\$231,524	\$2,336,290	\$0	\$2,336,290
6	2019-20	\$220,746,190	\$30,000,000	\$190,746,190	\$1.040	\$2,295,760	\$312,000	\$1,983,760	\$227,743	\$2,211,503	\$0	\$2,211,503
7	2020-21	\$209,693,919	\$30,000,000	\$179,693,919	\$1.040	\$2,180,817	\$312,000	\$1,868,817	\$224,151	\$2,092,967	\$0	\$2,092,967
8	2021-22	\$199,195,309	\$30,000,000	\$169,195,309	\$1.040	\$2,071,631	\$312,000	\$1,759,631	\$220,738	\$1,980,370	\$0	\$1,980,370
9	2022-23	\$189,222,605	\$30,000,000	\$159,222,605	\$1.040	\$1,967,915	\$312,000	\$1,655,915	\$217,497	\$1,873,412	\$0	\$1,873,412
10	2023-24	\$179,749,441	\$30,000,000	\$149,749,441	\$1.040	\$1,869,394	\$312,000	\$1,557,394	\$214,419	\$1,771,813	\$0	\$1,771,813
11	2024-25	\$170,750,777	\$170,750,777	\$0	\$1.040	\$1,775,808	\$1,775,808	\$0	\$935,864	\$935,864	\$0	\$935,864
12	2025-26	\$162,202,629	\$162,202,629	\$0	\$1.040	\$1,686,907	\$1,686,907	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2026-27	\$154,083,009	\$154,083,009	\$0	\$1.040	\$1,602,463	\$1,602,463	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2027-28	\$146,369,855	\$146,369,855	\$0	\$1.040	\$1,522,246	\$1,522,246	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2028-29	\$139,042,992	\$139,042,992	\$0	\$1.040	\$1,446,047	\$1,446,047	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
						\$28,877,609	\$13,348,912	\$15,528,697	\$2,507,440	\$18,036,137	-\$2,450,025	\$15,586,112
Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years								Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits		
								Credits Eamed		\$2,507,440		
								Credits paid		\$2,507,440		
								Excess Credits Unpaid		\$2,507,440		
										\$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**

## Jefferson County

### Population

- Total county population in 2010 for Jefferson County: 243,933 , up 0.2 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- Jefferson County was the state's 20st largest county in population in 2010 and the 181st fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- Jefferson County's population in 2009 was 46.6 percent Anglo (below the state average of 46.7 percent), 34.1 percent African-American (above the state average of 11.3 percent) and 15.2 percent Hispanic (below the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in Jefferson County:

Beaumont:	110,110	Port Arthur:	56,694
Nederland:	16,053	Groves:	14,299
Port Neches:	12,525	Bevil Oaks:	1,204
China:	1,023	Nome:	477
Taylor Landing:	211		

### Economy and Income

#### *Employment*

- September 2011 total employment in Jefferson County: 105,661 , up 0.6 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 Jefferson County unemployment rate: 11.9 percent, up from 10.9 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:

Beaumont:	11.1 percent, up from 9.6 percent in September 2010.
Port Arthur:	14.9 percent, up from 14.4 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*

- Jefferson County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 59th with an average per capita income of \$37,139, up 0.1 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 Jefferson County averaged \$44.36 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were up 16.0 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in Jefferson County during 2010 included:
  - Aquaculture      • Nursery      • Hay      • Rice      • Other Beef
- 2011 oil and gas production in Jefferson County: 568,759.0 barrels of oil and 38.6 million Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 175 producing oil wells and 145 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 Jefferson County during the fourth quarter 2010: \$840.90 million, up 7.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Beaumont:	\$561.42 million, up 6.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Port Arthur:	\$161.68 million, up 6.1 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Nederland:	\$36.71 million, down 9.8 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Groves:	\$18.33 million, up 3.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Port Neches:	\$10.90 million, up 7.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Bevil Oaks:	\$328,690.00, up 28.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
China:	\$476,378.00, up 11.0 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Nome:	\$589,066.00, down 41.1 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 Jefferson County through the fourth quarter of 2010: \$3.07 billion, down 3.6 percent from the same period in 2009.
- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:

Beaumont:	\$2.05 billion, down 3.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
Port Arthur:	\$576.60 million, down 4.2 percent from the same period in 2009.

<b>Nederland:</b>	\$151.56 million, down 8.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$73.47 million, down 2.4 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$42.85 million, down 2.4 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$982,394.00, up 10.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>China:</b>	\$1.63 million, up 0.1 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$2.40 million, down 31.3 percent from the same period in 2009.

**Annual (2010)**

- Taxable sales in Jefferson County during 2010: \$3.07 billion, down 3.6 percent from 2009.
- Jefferson County sent an estimated \$191.61 million (or 1.12 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.
- Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:
 

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$2.05 billion, down 3.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$576.60 million, down 4.2 percent from 2009.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$151.56 million, down 8.1 percent from 2009.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$73.47 million, down 2.4 percent from 2009.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$42.85 million, down 2.4 percent from 2009.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$982,394.00, up 10.1 percent from 2009.
<b>China:</b>	\$1.63 million, up 0.1 percent from 2009.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$2.40 million, down 31.3 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 Jefferson County based on the sales activity month of August 2011: \$4.92 million, up 28.6 percent from August 2010.
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:
 

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$2.86 million, up 14.7 percent from August 2010.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$1.52 million, up 75.1 percent from August 2010.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$328,832.49, up 25.1 percent from August 2010.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$120,684.08, up 6.6 percent from August 2010.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$85,567.84, up 3.5 percent from August 2010.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$1,447.39, down 20.4 percent from August 2010.
<b>China:</b>	\$3,609.75, down 4.3 percent from August 2010.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$4,512.68, down 4.5 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 Jefferson County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: \$53.88 million, up 4.8 percent from fiscal 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:
 

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$34.13 million, up 3.7 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$13.08 million, up 8.4 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$3.62 million, up 3.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$1.66 million, up 1.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$1.25 million, up 6.6 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$21,324.67, up 29.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>China:</b>	\$59,742.82, down 12.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$53,336.94, down 3.9 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 Jefferson County based on sales activity months through August 2011: \$34.25 million, up 3.4 percent from the same period in 2010.

- Payments based on sales activity months through August 2011 to the city of:

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$21.39 million, down 0.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$8.55 million, up 13.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$2.40 million, up 7.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$1.05 million, unchanged 0.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$777,953.02, up 6.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$13,829.51, up 28.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>China:</b>	\$36,072.52, down 15.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$34,192.72, down 5.8 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 Jefferson County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: \$53.88 million, up 4.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$34.13 million, up 3.7 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$13.08 million, up 8.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$3.62 million, up 3.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$1.66 million, up 1.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$1.25 million, up 6.6 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$21,324.67, up 29.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>China:</b>	\$59,742.82, down 12.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$53,336.94, down 3.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.

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

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

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$28.00 million, up 2.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$10.95 million, up 11.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$3.01 million, up 5.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$1.35 million, down 0.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$1.00 million, up 4.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$17,539.35, up 24.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>China:</b>	\$49,163.51, down 12.1 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$43,857.48, down 8.6 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 Jefferson County based on sales activity months in 2010: \$52.76 million, down 5.8 percent from 2009.
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:

<b>Beaumont:</b>	\$34.24 million, down 4.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Port Arthur:</b>	\$12.06 million, down 11.1 percent from 2009.
<b>Nederland:</b>	\$3.46 million, down 5.1 percent from 2009.
<b>Groves:</b>	\$1.66 million, down 5.1 percent from 2009.
<b>Port Neches:</b>	\$1.20 million, down 3.8 percent from 2009.
<b>Bevil Oaks:</b>	\$18,225.09, up 24.3 percent from 2009.
<b>China:</b>	\$66,583.42, down 18.2 percent from 2009.
<b>Nome:</b>	\$55,457.98, up 10.2 percent from 2009.

## *Property Tax*

- As of January 2009, property values in Jefferson County: \$25.13 billion, down 3.8 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in Jefferson County is \$103,315, above the statewide average of \$85,809. About 2.8 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

## State Expenditures

- Jefferson County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 17th. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: \$1.14 billion, up 0.3 percent from FY2009.

- In Jefferson County, 31 state agencies provide a total of 4,852 jobs and \$52.56 million in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):
  - Lamar University
  - Lamar Institute of Technology
  - Lamar University
  - Department of Criminal Justice
  - Texas Youth Commission

### Higher Education

- Community colleges in Jefferson County fall 2010 enrollment:
  - None.
- Jefferson 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
- Institutions of higher education in Jefferson County fall 2010 enrollment:
  - Lamar University, a Public University (part of Texas State University System), had 13,969 students.
  - Lamar State College-Port Arthur, a Public State College (part of Texas State University System), had 2,374 students.
  - Lamar Institute of Technology, a Public State College (part of Texas State University System), had 3,243 students.

### School Districts

- Jefferson County had 6 school districts with 69 schools and 40,215 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.)
  - Beaumont ISD had 19,505 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,118. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 76 percent.
  - Hamshire-Fannett ISD had 1,752 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$41,481. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 86 percent.
  - Nederland ISD had 5,022 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,598. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 81 percent.
  - Port Arthur ISD had 9,047 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$45,029. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 58 percent.
  - Port Neches-Groves ISD had 4,586 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,318. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 81 percent.
  - Sabine Pass ISD had 303 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,538. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 90 percent.