

S U S A N

C O M B S

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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



October 18, 2013

Dr. Paul Clore  
Superintendent  
Gregory-Portland ISD  
608 College St.  
Portland, Texas 78374

Dear Superintendent Clore:

On August 26, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 298) for a limitation on appraised value under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313<sup>1</sup>. This application was originally submitted in May 2013 to the Gregory-Portland Independent School District (the school district) by Corpus Christi Liquefaction, 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 (\$2.09 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 San Patricio 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

<sup>1</sup> 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 August 26, 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](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	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Manufacturing
School District	Gregory-Portland ISD
2011-12 Enrollment in School District	4,433
County	San Patricio
Total Investment in District	\$2,090,000,000
Qualified Investment	\$2,090,000,000
Limitation Amount	\$30,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	35
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	28
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$1,250
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	\$1,011
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$65,000
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$74,642,857
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$263,671,200
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$175,219,200
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):	\$152,981,008
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$13,338,000
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$110,690,192
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	58.0%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	92.4%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit	7.6%

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (the project) applying to Gregory-Portland 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 35 new jobs when fully operational. 28 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 Coastal Bend Council of Governments Region, where San Patricio County is located was \$47,786 in 2012. The annual average manufacturing wage for 2012 for San Patricio County is \$73,684. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$47,788. In addition to a salary of \$65,000, each qualifying position will receive benefits such as medical coverage, (company pays more than 80% of employee only health insurance premiums), dental plan, group life insurance, paid holidays, paid vacation, and 401(k) retirement savings plan. The project's total investment is \$2.09 billion, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$74.6 million.

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

According to Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC's application, "Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC is a subsidiary of Cheniere Energy, Inc. ("Cheniere") which is a Houston based energy company primarily engaged in LNG related businesses. In addition to Houston, TX, Cheniere has offices in Cameron Parish, Louisiana; Corpus Christi, Texas; London, U.K.; and Santiago, Chile. Cheniere owns and operates the Sabine Pass LNG import terminal ("Sabine Pass") in Cameron Parish, Louisiana through its partial ownership interest in and management agreements with Cheniere Energy Partners, L.P. Cheniere is currently constructing two LNG liquefaction trains and associated export facilities at Sabine Pass and anticipates commencing construction of two additional trains in mid 2013. Cheniere has completed commercialization of the fifth train at Sabine Pass and is currently seeking to commercialize the sixth train, with permitting underway for both the fifth and sixth trains. Cheniere controls property elsewhere in Cameron Parish that is suitable for development as an LNG export facility. As a leading global LNG player, Cheniere has the ability to invest in new LNG Liquefaction facilities elsewhere in the U.S. and around the world. Major LNG industry developments are ongoing currently in Australia, British Columbia and East Africa that provide significantly shorter shipping distances to major Asian markets."

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

During the past two years, 8 projects in the Coastal Bend 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 Corpus Christi Liquefaction, 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 I depicts Corpus Christi Liquefaction, 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 Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC**

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2020	1250	1195	2445	\$74,100,000	\$100,900,000	\$175,000,000
2021	1000	1,020	2020	\$59,280,000	\$100,720,000	\$160,000,000
2022	800	813	1613	\$47,424,000	\$93,576,000	\$141,000,000
2023	510	519	1029	\$30,290,000	\$71,710,000	\$102,000,000
2024	35	172	207	\$2,275,000	\$37,725,000	\$40,000,000
2025	35	170	205	\$2,275,000	\$32,725,000	\$35,000,000
2026	35	174	209	\$2,275,000	\$30,725,000	\$33,000,000
2027	35	199	234	\$2,275,000	\$31,725,000	\$34,000,000
2028	35	225	260	\$2,275,000	\$33,725,000	\$36,000,000
2029	35	258	293	\$2,275,000	\$35,725,000	\$38,000,000
2030	35	281	316	\$2,275,000	\$38,725,000	\$41,000,000
2031	35	254	289	\$2,275,000	\$37,725,000	\$40,000,000
2032	35	223	258	\$2,275,000	\$34,725,000	\$37,000,000
2033	35	217	252	\$2,275,000	\$34,725,000	\$37,000,000
2034	35	219	254	\$2,275,000	\$35,725,000	\$38,000,000
2035	35	221	256	\$2,275,000	\$36,725,000	\$39,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was \$1.74 billion in 2011. Gregory-Portland ISD’s ad valorem tax base in 2011 was \$1.12 billion. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at \$347,943 for fiscal 2011-2012. During that same year, Gregory-Portland ISD’s estimated wealth per WADA was \$229,824. 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, San Patricio County, and San Patricio County Drainage District, with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC’s application. Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC has applied for a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code, as well as a tax rebate with the county and a tax abatement with the drainage district. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate <sup>1</sup>	Gregory-Portland CISD I&S Levy	Gregory-Portland CISD M&O Levy	Gregory-Portland CISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (Before Credit Credited)	Gregory-Portland CISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (After Credit Credited)	San Patricio County Tax Levy	San Patricio County Drainage District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
				0.1800	1.1700			0.5500	0.0669	
2021	\$350,000,000	\$350,000,000		\$630,000	\$4,095,000	\$4,725,000	\$4,725,000	\$96,250	\$0	\$4,821,250
2022	\$850,000,000	\$850,000,000		\$1,530,000	\$9,945,000	\$11,475,000	\$11,475,000	\$233,750	\$0	\$11,708,750
2023	\$1,450,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$2,610,000	\$351,000	\$2,961,000	\$2,961,000	\$398,750	\$0	\$3,359,750
2024	\$2,000,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,600,000	\$351,000	\$3,951,000	\$3,075,500	\$550,000	\$0	\$3,625,500
2025	\$1,930,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,474,000	\$351,000	\$3,825,000	\$2,974,000	\$530,750	\$0	\$3,504,750
2026	\$1,860,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,348,000	\$351,000	\$3,699,000	\$2,853,900	\$511,500	\$186,665	\$3,552,065
2027	\$1,800,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,240,000	\$351,000	\$3,591,000	\$2,767,500	\$990,000	\$361,287	\$4,118,787
2028	\$1,736,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,124,800	\$351,000	\$3,475,800	\$2,657,980	\$1,432,200	\$522,662	\$4,612,842
2029	\$1,680,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$3,024,000	\$351,000	\$3,375,000	\$2,577,900	\$1,848,000	\$674,402	\$5,100,302
2030	\$1,620,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$2,916,000	\$351,000	\$3,267,000	\$2,484,000	\$2,227,500	\$812,896	\$5,524,396
2031	\$1,560,000,000	\$1,560,000,000		\$2,808,000	\$18,252,000	\$21,060,000	\$13,515,020	\$2,574,000	\$1,043,718	\$17,132,738
2032	\$1,500,000,000	\$1,500,000,000		\$2,700,000	\$17,550,000	\$20,250,000	\$20,250,000	\$2,887,500	\$1,003,575	\$24,141,075
2033	\$1,450,000,000	\$1,450,000,000		\$2,610,000	\$16,965,000	\$19,575,000	\$19,575,000	\$3,190,000	\$970,123	\$23,735,123
2034	\$1,400,000,000	\$1,400,000,000		\$2,520,000	\$16,380,000	\$18,900,000	\$18,900,000	\$3,465,000	\$936,670	\$23,301,670
2035	\$1,350,000,000	\$1,350,000,000		\$2,430,000	\$15,795,000	\$18,225,000	\$18,225,000	\$3,712,500	\$903,218	\$22,840,718
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$129,016,800</b>	<b>\$24,647,700</b>	<b>\$7,415,215</b>	<b>\$161,079,715</b>

Assumes School Value Limitation, a Tax Rebate from the County, and a Tax Abatement from the Drainage District.

Source: CPA, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC

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

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate <sup>1</sup>	Gregory-Portland CISD I&S Levy	Gregory-Portland CISD M&O Levy	Gregory-Portland CISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies	San Patricio County Tax Levy	San Patricio County Drainage District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes	
				0.1800	1.1700		0.5500	0.0669		
2021	\$350,000,000	\$350,000,000		\$630,000	\$4,095,000	\$4,725,000	\$1,925,000	\$234,168	\$6,884,168	
2022	\$850,000,000	\$850,000,000		\$1,530,000	\$9,945,000	\$11,475,000	\$4,675,000	\$568,693	\$16,718,693	
2023	\$1,450,000,000	\$1,450,000,000		\$2,610,000	\$16,965,000	\$19,575,000	\$7,975,000	\$970,123	\$28,520,123	
2024	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000		\$3,600,000	\$23,400,000	\$27,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$1,338,100	\$39,338,100	
2025	\$1,930,000,000	\$1,930,000,000		\$3,474,000	\$22,581,000	\$26,055,000	\$10,615,000	\$1,291,267	\$37,961,267	
2026	\$1,860,000,000	\$1,860,000,000		\$3,348,000	\$21,762,000	\$25,110,000	\$10,230,000	\$1,244,433	\$36,584,433	
2027	\$1,800,000,000	\$1,800,000,000		\$3,240,000	\$21,060,000	\$24,300,000	\$9,900,000	\$1,204,290	\$35,404,290	
2028	\$1,736,000,000	\$1,736,000,000		\$3,124,800	\$20,311,200	\$23,436,000	\$9,548,000	\$1,161,471	\$34,145,471	
2029	\$1,680,000,000	\$1,680,000,000		\$3,024,000	\$19,656,000	\$22,680,000	\$9,240,000	\$1,124,004	\$33,044,004	
2030	\$1,620,000,000	\$1,620,000,000		\$2,916,000	\$18,954,000	\$21,870,000	\$8,910,000	\$1,083,861	\$31,863,861	
2031	\$1,560,000,000	\$1,560,000,000		\$2,808,000	\$18,252,000	\$21,060,000	\$8,580,000	\$1,043,718	\$30,683,718	
2032	\$1,500,000,000	\$1,500,000,000		\$2,700,000	\$17,550,000	\$20,250,000	\$8,250,000	\$1,003,575	\$29,503,575	
2033	\$1,450,000,000	\$1,450,000,000		\$2,610,000	\$16,965,000	\$19,575,000	\$7,975,000	\$970,123	\$28,520,123	
2034	\$1,400,000,000	\$1,400,000,000		\$2,520,000	\$16,380,000	\$18,900,000	\$7,700,000	\$936,670	\$27,536,670	
2035	\$1,350,000,000	\$1,350,000,000		\$2,430,000	\$15,795,000	\$18,225,000	\$7,425,000	\$903,218	\$26,553,218	
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$304,236,000</b>	<b>\$123,948,000</b>	<b>\$15,077,711</b>	<b>\$443,261,711</b>

Source: CPA, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC

<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 \$263,671,200. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$175,219,200.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of San Patricio 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 A (Rev. January 2013): Investment

Form 50-296

Applicant Name: Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (Train 3 Application)  
 ISD Name: Gregory-Portland ISD

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS

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

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (fill in actual tax year below) YYYY	Column A: Tangible Personal Property (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)	2013-2017	2017	0	0	0	0	0
	2018-2019	2018	0	0	0	0	0
	2019-2020	2019	0	0	0	0	0
	2020-2021	2020	0	0	0	0	0
	2021-2022	2021	\$ 860,000,000	\$ -	\$ 860,000,000	\$ -	\$ 860,000,000
	2022-2023	2022	\$ 740,000,000	\$ -	\$ 740,000,000	\$ -	\$ 740,000,000
	2023-2024	2023	\$ 490,000,000	\$ -	\$ 490,000,000	\$ -	\$ 490,000,000
	2024-2025	2024	\$ 370,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 370,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 370,000,000
	2025-2026	2025	0	0	0	0	0
	2026-2027	2026	0	0	0	0	0
	2027-2028	2027	0	0	0	0	0
	2028-2029	2028	0	0	0	0	0
	2029-2030	2029	0	0	0	0	0
	2030-2031	2030	0	0	0	0	0
	2031-2032	2031	0	0	0	0	0
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	2032-2033	2032	0	0	0	0	0
	2033-2034	2033	0	0	0	0	0
	2034-2035	2034	0	0	0	0	0
Credit Settle-Up Period	2035-2036	2035	0	0	0	0	0
	2036-2037	2036	0	0	0	0	0
Post-Settle-Up Period	2037-2038	2037	0	0	0	0	0
	2038-2039	2038	0	0	0	0	0

Qualifying Time Period usually begins with the final board approval of the application and extends generally for the following two complete tax years.  
 Column A: This represents the total dollar amount of planned investment in tangible personal property the applicant considers qualified investment - as defined in Tax Code §313.021(1)(A)-(D).  
 For the purposes of investment, please list amount invested each year, not cumulative totals.

Column B: [For the years outside the qualifying time period, this number should simply represent the planned investment in tangible personal property].  
 The total dollar amount of planned investment each year in buildings or nonremovable component of buildings that the applicant considers qualified investment under Tax Code §313.021(1)(E).

Column D: For the years outside the qualifying time period, this number should simply represent the planned investment in new buildings or nonremovable components of buildings.  
 Dollar value of other investment that may not be qualified investment but that may affect economic impact and total value for planning, construction and operation of the facility.  
 The most significant example for many projects would be land. Other examples may be items such as professional services, etc.  
 Note: Land can be listed as part of investment during the "pre-year 1" time period. It cannot be part of qualifying investment.

Notes: For advanced clean energy projects, nuclear projects, projects with deferred qualifying time periods, and projects with lengthy application review periods, insert additional rows as needed.  
 This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with 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: David Rob DATE: 5/17/13

**Schedule B (Rev. January 2013): Estimated Market And Taxable Value**  
**Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (Train 3 Application)**  
 Gregory-Portland ISD

Applicant Name  
 ISD Name

Form 50-295

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (File in actual tax year) YYYY	Qualified Property			Reductions from Market Value		Estimated Taxable Value	Final taxable value for M&D—after all reductions	
			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"	Exempted Value	Final taxable value for M&D—after all reductions			
pre-year 1	2019-2020	2019	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
pre-year 2	2020-2021	2020	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2021-2022	\$ -	\$ -	\$350,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350,000,000	\$ 350,000,000	
	2	2022-2023	\$ -	\$ -	\$850,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 850,000,000	\$ 850,000,000	
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	3	2023-2024	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,450,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,450,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	4	2024-2025	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,000,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	5	2025-2026	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,930,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,930,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	6	2026-2027	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,860,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,860,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	7	2027-2028	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,800,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,800,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	8	2028-2029	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,736,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,736,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	9	2029-2030	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,680,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,680,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	10	2030-2031	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,620,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,620,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
	11	2031-2032	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,560,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,560,000,000	\$ 1,560,000,000	
	12	2032-2033	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,500,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000,000	\$ 1,500,000,000	
	13	2033-2034	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,450,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,450,000,000	\$ 1,450,000,000	
	14	2034-2035	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,400,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000,000	\$ 1,400,000,000	
	15	2035-2036	\$ -	\$ -	\$1,350,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000,000	\$ 1,350,000,000	
	Credit Settle-Up Period									
	Post-Settle-Up Period									
Post-Settle-Up Period										

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.

*David Bobb*  
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

5/17/13  
 DATE

**Schedule C- Application: Employment Information**

Applicant Name: Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (Train 3 Application)  
 ISD Name: Gregory-Portland ISD

Form 50-296

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fit 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	2019-2020	2019			0	\$0	0	\$0
	pre-year 2	2020-2021	2020	1250 FTEs	\$59,280	0	\$0	0	\$0
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2021-2022	2021	1000 FTEs	\$59,280	0	\$0	0	\$0
	2	2022-2023	2022	800 FTEs	\$59,280	0	\$0	0	\$0
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	3	2023-2024	2023	500 FTEs	\$59,280	10	\$65,000	8	\$65,000
	4	2024-2025	2024			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	5	2025-2026	2025			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	6	2026-2027	2026			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	7	2027-2028	2027			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	8	2028-2029	2028			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	9	2029-2030	2029			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	10	2030-2031	2030			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	11	2031-2032	2031			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	12	2032-2033	2032			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
Credit Settle-Up Period	13	2033-2034	2033			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	14	2034-2035	2034			35	\$65,000	28	\$65,000
	15	2035-2036	2035			35	\$65,000	28	\$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.

*David Pugh*

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

5/17/13  
DATE

AMENDED

Schedule D: (Rev. January 2013): Other Tax Information

Applicant Name

Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (Train 3 Application)

ISD Name

Gregory-Portland 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 (Drainage District)
				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					
		2019-2020	2019	0	0	0	0%	n/a	n/a	0%
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)		2020-2021	2020	\$ 110,000,000	\$ 780,000,000	0	0%	n/a	n/a	0%
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2021-2022	\$ 90,000,000	\$ 670,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	100%
		2	2022-2023	\$ 80,000,000	\$ 560,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	100%
		3	2023-2024	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 220,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	100%
		4	2024-2025	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	100%
		5	2025-2026	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	100%
		6	2026-2027	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	95%	n/a	n/a	85%
		7	2027-2028	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	90%	n/a	n/a	70%
		8	2028-2029	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	85%	n/a	n/a	55%
		9	2029-2030	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	80%	n/a	n/a	40%
		10	2030-2031	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	75%	n/a	n/a	25%
		11	2031-2032	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	70%	n/a	n/a	0%
		12	2032-2033	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	65%	n/a	n/a	0%
		13	2033-2034	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	0	60%	n/a	n/a	0%
		14	2034-2035	\$ 18,750,000	\$ 18,750,000	0	55%	n/a	n/a	0%
		15	2035-2036	\$ 18,750,000	\$ 18,750,000	0	50%	n/a	n/a	0%

\*For planning, construction and operation of the facility

*[Signature]*

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

10/17/13  
DATE

Note: County tax rebate percentages are for a proposed Chapter 381 agreement

# Attachment 2

October 11, 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 Corpus Christi Liquefaction LLC Train 3 on the number and size of school facilities in Gregory Portland Independent School District (GPISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the GPISD superintendent, Walter Clore, the TEA has found that the operations of Corpus Christi Liquefaction LLC Train 3 would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in GPISD. However, as many as 1,250 FTEs are anticipated during the construction phase of this project, so provisions related to extraordinary expenses that may be incurred by GPISD should be included in the agreement.

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 about this issue.

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager  
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

October 11, 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 Corpus Christi Liquefaction LLC Train 3 for the Gregory Portland Independent School District (GPGISD). 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 their assumptions regarding the potential revenue gain are valid, and their estimates of the impact of the Corpus Christi Liquefaction LLC Train 3 on GPISD 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 about this issue.

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager  
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED CORPUS  
CHRISTI LIQUEFACTION, LLC TRAIN 3 (APP# 298) PROJECT  
ON THE FINANCES OF THE GREGORY PORTLAND INDEPENDENT  
SCHOOL DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313  
PROPERTY VALUE LIMITATION**

**July 9, 2013**

**Final Report**

**PREPARED BY**



# Estimated Impact of the Proposed Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC Train 3 Project on the Finances of the Gregory Portland Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

## Introduction

Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (CC Liquefaction) has requested that the Gregory-Portland Independent School District (G-PISD) 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 G-PISD on May 21, 2013, CC Liquefaction proposes to invest \$2.1 billion to construct a new natural gas liquefaction project in G-PISD, known as the Train 3 project. This is the third application filed by CC Liquefaction with G-PISD and would represent an expansion of its Train 1 and Infrastructure project, as well as the Train 2 addition.

The CC Liquefaction Train 3 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, G-PISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$30 million. The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, reflecting the requested extension of the start of the two-year qualifying time period for the Train 3 project. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the qualifying time period will be the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years. Beginning in the 2023-24 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 G-PISD currently levying a \$0.18 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The full taxable value of the investment is expected to reach \$2 billion in the 2024-25 school year. While depreciation is expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement, the addition of this project alone would be sufficient to reduce the District's I&S tax rate to \$0.07 per \$100 in the 2024-25 school year, based on G-PISD's current debt service schedule.

In the case of the CC Liquefaction Train 3 project, the agreement will 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, G-PISD would experience a \$16.4 million revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2023-24 school year. For the 2024-25 school year, the revenue loss is estimated to be \$5.8 million, with no out-year losses expected.

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$153.0 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 as a result of the one-year lag in state-assigned 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, although a significant increase in project value during the limitation period could result in a larger hold-harmless loss in specific years.

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 in the 2014-15 school year. Current state policy calls for ASATR funding to be eliminated by the 2017-18 school year. Given the proposed delay in the start of the qualifying time period and the value limitation, the

estimates below do not assume that G-PISD would receive offsetting ASATR state aid when the value limitation for the Train 3 project takes effect.

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 CC Liquefaction Train 3 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.

Based on District estimates, the general approach used here is to project a one percent annual increase in enrollment (as measured by students in average daily attendance or ADA) and a two percent annual increase in underlying base property values in order to estimate 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 thereafter, until the 2017-18 school year. A statement of legislative intent adopted in 2011 to no longer fund target revenue by the 2017-18 school year remains in effect, so the estimates presented below do not assume any offsetting ASATR funding when the limitation takes effect, barring future legislative changes that would restore a variant of ASATR or make similar adjustments.

Two Chapter 313 limitations approved previously by the G-PISD Board of Trustees are incorporated into the base estimates—those awarded to the Papalote Creek II wind project and the TPCO pipe factory. The projected taxable values of the CC Liquefaction Train 3 project are later factored into the base model to portray the scenario that assumes the project is constructed in the absence of a value limitation agreement. The impact of the limitation value for the proposed CC Liquefaction project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts are projected to increase one percent annually, from the 4,192 students in average daily attendance (ADA) for the 2012-13 school year, in analyzing the effects of the CC Liquefaction Train 3 project on the finances of G-PISD. The District's local tax base reached \$1.19 billion for the 2012 tax year and is projected at two percent annually for the forecast period, as noted above. An M&O tax rate of \$1.17 per \$100 is used throughout this analysis.

Under the assumptions outlined in Table 1, G-PISD would become a Tier 1 recapture district in the 2024-25 school year if the project is constructed in the absence of a value limitation agreement. With the agreement in place, under the assumptions outlined here, recapture would not become a factor at the \$504,000 per WADA Tier 1 recapture level assumed here until the 2032-33 school year. Tier II recapture at the \$319,500 per WADA level for the last 11 cents of M&O tax effort remains at relatively minor amounts under the value limitation scenario.

It needs to be emphasized that this analysis focuses on the CC Liquefaction Train 3 project only. Although four Chapter 313 applications were recently submitted to G-PISD for the Board's consideration, each project must be evaluated separately in order to isolate the impact of the value limitation for each applicant's project.

### **School Finance Impact**

School finance models were prepared for G-PISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2035-36 school year. Beyond the 2014-15 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88<sup>th</sup> percentile or Austin yield that influences 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 both the baseline and limitation 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 CC Liquefaction Train 3 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 CC Liquefaction Train 3 value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2023-24 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.

It should be noted that the revenue-loss methodology used here is the same approach that has been used to calculate hold-harmless losses for school districts since the first property value limitations were approved in 2002. Comparing the limitation model with one assuming that the project is fully taxed has been the accepted approach for more than a decade, with very few exceptions.

Under these assumptions, G-PISD would experience a revenue loss of \$16.4 million as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2023-24 school year. The revenue reduction results largely from the more than \$16 million reduction in M&O tax collections and no state aid offset as a result of the one-year lag in value associated with the state M&O property value study. Once the state property value study recognizes the value limitation, a \$5.8 million revenue loss is expected for the 2024-25 school year, in response to a \$550 million increase in project value. No additional revenue losses are anticipated for the out-years under current law.

Table 4 includes a great deal of data highlighting the differences between the baseline and value limitation models. For example, the two columns related to recapture indicate that G-PISD taxpayers would pay \$61 million less in recapture under a value limitation agreement, compared

with the project being built in the absence of a value limitation agreement. Additional state aid offset \$96 million of the reduction in M&O taxes.

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 value determinations are 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 \$1.17 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 \$161.9 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, CC Liquefaction 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 \$13.3 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 G-PISD revenue losses are expected to total approximately \$22.2 million in the first two limitation years. In total, the potential net tax benefits (inclusive of tax credits but after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to reach \$153.0 million over the life of the agreement.

### **Facilities Funding Impact**

The CC Liquefaction Train 3 project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with G-PISD currently levying a \$0.18 per \$100 I&S rate. With the substantial increase in taxable value with the addition of the Train 3 project to G-PISD's tax base, the I&S tax rate could decrease to as low as \$0.07 per \$100 in the 2024-25 school year, using the District's current debt service schedule.

The CC Liquefaction Train 3 project is not expected to have a significant impact on school facilities once the plant begins operation, with 35 permanent jobs anticipated. During the construction phase, however, up to 1,250 FTEs are expected to be working on the project, which could have a significant impact on the operations and facilities of G-PISD. While housing availability and family-location decisions will obviously affect enrollment, provisions to offset extraordinary education-related expenses that might be faced by G-PISD during the construction phase are needed as part of the agreement.

---

## Conclusion

The proposed CC Liquefaction Train 3 project significantly enhances the tax base of G-PISD. 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 \$153.0 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District.) The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of G-PISD in meeting its future debt service obligations, with a substantial I&S tax benefit expected.

**Table 1 – Base District Information with Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC Project Value and Limitation Values—Train 3**

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	2020-21	4,594.47	5,795.54	\$1.1700	\$0.1370	\$1,488,747,158	\$1,488,747,158	\$1,291,748,848	\$1,291,748,848	\$222,887	\$222,887
1	2021-22	4,640.42	5,847.06	\$1.1700	\$0.1180	\$1,864,737,171	\$1,864,737,171	\$1,381,407,089	\$1,381,407,089	\$236,257	\$236,257
2	2022-23	4,686.82	5,899.02	\$1.1700	\$0.0970	\$2,933,311,263	\$2,933,311,263	\$1,755,250,301	\$1,755,250,301	\$297,550	\$297,550
3	2023-24	4,733.69	5,951.44	\$1.1700	\$0.0800	\$3,539,017,979	\$2,119,017,979	\$2,821,634,655	\$2,821,634,655	\$474,110	\$474,110
4	2024-25	4,781.03	6,004.31	\$1.1700	\$0.0700	\$4,096,184,982	\$2,126,184,982	\$3,425,107,840	\$2,005,107,840	\$570,441	\$333,945
5	2025-26	4,828.84	6,057.65	\$1.1700	\$0.0700	\$4,034,788,310	\$2,134,788,310	\$3,979,996,640	\$2,009,996,640	\$657,020	\$331,811
6	2026-27	4,877.12	6,111.46	\$1.1700	\$0.0720	\$3,974,805,689	\$2,144,805,689	\$3,916,276,201	\$2,016,276,201	\$640,809	\$329,917
7	2027-28	4,925.90	6,165.73	\$1.1700	\$0.0720	\$3,926,188,029	\$2,156,188,029	\$3,853,923,337	\$2,023,923,337	\$625,055	\$328,253
8	2028-29	4,975.16	6,220.48	\$1.1700	\$0.0740	\$3,878,919,449	\$2,168,919,449	\$3,802,888,030	\$2,032,888,030	\$611,349	\$326,805
9	2029-30	5,024.91	6,275.71	\$1.1700	\$0.0740	\$3,832,985,370	\$2,182,985,370	\$3,753,153,451	\$2,043,153,451	\$598,044	\$325,565
10	2030-31	5,075.16	6,330.25	\$1.1700	\$0.0750	\$3,788,372,481	\$2,198,372,481	\$3,704,704,052	\$2,054,704,052	\$585,238	\$324,585
11	2031-32	5,125.91	6,386.44	\$1.1700	\$0.0800	\$3,745,068,701	\$3,745,068,701	\$3,657,525,536	\$2,067,525,536	\$572,702	\$323,737
12	2032-33	5,177.17	6,443.11	\$1.1700	\$0.0840	\$3,703,063,154	\$3,703,063,154	\$3,611,604,817	\$3,611,604,817	\$560,537	\$560,537
13	2033-34	5,177.17	6,443.11	\$1.1700	\$0.0840	3,703,063,153.96	3,703,063,153.96	3,611,604,817.13	3,611,604,817.13	\$560,537	\$560,537
14	2034-35	5,177.17	6,443.11	\$1.1700	\$0.0840	3,703,063,153.96	3,703,063,153.96	3,611,604,817.13	3,611,604,817.13	\$560,537	\$560,537
15	2035-36	5,177.17	6,443.11	\$1.1700	\$0.0840	3,703,063,153.96	3,703,063,153.96	3,611,604,817.13	3,611,604,817.13	\$560,537	\$560,537

\*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—Train 3**

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	2020-21	\$14,503,809	\$17,776,698	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,464,799	\$2,263,857	\$0	\$37,009,163
1	2021-22	\$18,190,516	\$17,151,507	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,091,324	\$2,503,678	\$0	\$40,937,025
2	2022-23	\$28,666,410	\$13,686,705	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,871,613	\$2,129,284	\$0	\$49,354,012
3	2023-24	\$34,888,475	\$3,298,547	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,929,000	\$669,274	-\$1,188,330	\$43,596,966
4	2024-25	\$40,457,362	\$1,623,903	\$0	\$0	-\$4,476,595	\$6,875,385	\$235,135	-\$1,858,899	\$42,856,291
5	2025-26	\$39,834,450	\$1,640,143	\$0	\$0	-\$8,813,558	\$6,769,526	\$0	-\$2,137,355	\$37,293,205
6	2026-27	\$39,224,092	\$1,656,543	\$0	\$0	-\$7,955,405	\$6,665,801	\$0	-\$2,054,207	\$37,636,825
7	2027-28	\$38,728,107	\$1,673,109	\$0	\$0	-\$7,125,492	\$6,581,513	\$2,397	-\$1,977,401	\$37,882,232
8	2028-29	\$38,243,990	\$1,689,840	\$0	\$0	-\$6,379,646	\$6,499,241	\$53,861	-\$1,906,907	\$38,200,380
9	2029-30	\$37,773,977	\$1,706,739	\$0	\$0	-\$5,643,069	\$6,419,366	\$104,803	-\$1,837,599	\$38,524,218
10	2030-31	\$37,316,132	\$1,723,807	\$0	\$0	-\$4,920,939	\$6,341,560	\$154,788	-\$1,769,763	\$38,845,585
11	2031-32	\$36,562,388	\$1,741,044	\$0	\$0	-\$4,166,772	\$6,213,467	\$202,999	-\$1,688,380	\$38,864,745
12	2032-33	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
13	2033-34	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
14	2034-35	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
15	2035-36	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862

**Table 3—“Value Limitation Revenue Model”—Project Value Added with Value Limit—Train 3**

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	2020-21	\$14,503,809	\$17,776,698	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,464,799	\$2,263,857	\$0	\$37,009,163
1	2021-22	\$18,190,516	\$17,151,507	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,091,324	\$2,503,678	\$0	\$40,937,025
2	2022-23	\$28,666,410	\$13,686,705	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,871,613	\$2,129,284	\$0	\$49,354,012
3	2023-24	\$20,687,765	\$3,298,547	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,515,710	\$396,858	-\$704,642	\$27,194,238
4	2024-25	\$20,756,377	\$11,742,860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,527,370	\$1,087,992	-\$93,773	\$37,020,827
5	2025-26	\$20,833,500	\$11,975,052	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,540,476	\$1,107,092	-\$80,736	\$37,375,384
6	2026-27	\$20,923,177	\$12,195,796	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,555,716	\$1,125,446	-\$69,005	\$37,731,130
7	2027-28	\$21,027,222	\$12,405,348	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,573,398	\$1,143,170	-\$58,567	\$38,090,571
8	2028-29	\$21,143,135	\$12,604,230	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,593,096	\$1,160,186	-\$49,366	\$38,451,281
9	2029-30	\$21,273,152	\$12,792,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,615,191	\$1,176,629	-\$41,394	\$38,816,209
10	2030-31	\$21,415,337	\$12,964,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,639,355	\$1,191,951	-\$35,042	\$39,176,231
11	2031-32	\$36,562,388	\$13,132,526	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,213,467	\$2,046,094	-\$49,980	\$57,904,494
12	2032-33	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
13	2033-34	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
14	2034-35	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862
15	2035-36	\$36,139,756	\$1,758,455	\$0	\$0	-\$3,462,894	\$6,141,645	\$252,063	-\$1,623,163	\$39,205,862

**Table 4 – Value Limit less Project Value with No Limit—Train 3**

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	2020-21	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2021-22	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2022-23	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2023-24	-\$14,200,710	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$2,413,290	-\$272,416	\$483,688	-\$16,402,728
4	2024-25	-\$19,700,985	\$10,118,957	\$0	\$0	\$4,476,595	-\$3,348,015	\$852,857	\$1,765,126	-\$5,835,465
5	2025-26	-\$19,000,950	\$10,334,909	\$0	\$0	\$8,813,558	-\$3,229,050	\$1,107,092	\$2,056,619	\$82,179
6	2026-27	-\$18,300,915	\$10,539,252	\$0	\$0	\$7,955,405	-\$3,110,085	\$1,125,446	\$1,985,202	\$194,305
7	2027-28	-\$17,700,885	\$10,732,239	\$0	\$0	\$7,125,492	-\$3,008,115	\$1,140,773	\$1,918,834	\$208,339
8	2028-29	-\$17,100,855	\$10,914,389	\$0	\$0	\$6,379,646	-\$2,906,145	\$1,106,325	\$1,857,541	\$250,901
9	2029-30	-\$16,500,825	\$11,085,891	\$0	\$0	\$5,643,069	-\$2,804,175	\$1,071,826	\$1,796,205	\$291,991
10	2030-31	-\$15,900,795	\$11,240,823	\$0	\$0	\$4,920,939	-\$2,702,205	\$1,037,163	\$1,734,721	\$330,646
11	2031-32	\$0	\$11,391,482	\$0	\$0	\$4,166,772	\$0	\$1,843,095	\$1,638,400	\$19,039,749
12	2032-33	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2033-34	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2034-35	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2035-36	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to G-PISD at \$1.17 M&O Tax Rate—Train 3**

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
2020-21	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.170	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2021-22	\$350,000,000	\$350,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$4,095,000	\$4,095,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2022-23	\$850,000,000	\$850,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$9,945,000	\$9,945,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2023-24	\$1,450,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,420,000,000	\$1.170	\$16,965,000	\$351,000	\$16,614,000	\$0	\$16,614,000	-\$16,402,728	\$211,272
2024-25	\$2,000,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,970,000,000	\$1.170	\$23,400,000	\$351,000	\$23,049,000	\$875,500	\$23,924,500	-\$5,835,465	\$18,089,035
2025-26	\$1,930,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,900,000,000	\$1.170	\$22,581,000	\$351,000	\$22,230,000	\$851,000	\$23,081,000	\$0	\$23,081,000
2026-27	\$1,860,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,830,000,000	\$1.170	\$21,762,000	\$351,000	\$21,411,000	\$845,100	\$22,256,100	\$0	\$22,256,100
2027-28	\$1,800,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,770,000,000	\$1.170	\$21,060,000	\$351,000	\$20,709,000	\$823,500	\$21,532,500	\$0	\$21,532,500
2028-29	\$1,736,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,706,000,000	\$1.170	\$20,311,200	\$351,000	\$19,960,200	\$817,820	\$20,778,020	\$0	\$20,778,020
2029-30	\$1,680,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,650,000,000	\$1.170	\$19,656,000	\$351,000	\$19,305,000	\$797,100	\$20,102,100	\$0	\$20,102,100
2030-31	\$1,620,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,590,000,000	\$1.170	\$18,954,000	\$351,000	\$18,603,000	\$783,000	\$19,386,000	\$0	\$19,386,000
2031-32	\$1,560,000,000	\$1,560,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$18,252,000	\$18,252,000	\$0	\$7,544,980	\$7,544,980	\$0	\$7,544,980
2032-33	\$1,500,000,000	\$1,500,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$17,550,000	\$17,550,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2033-34	\$1,450,000,000	\$1,450,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$16,965,000	\$16,965,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2034-35	\$1,400,000,000	\$1,400,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$16,380,000	\$16,380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2035-36	\$1,350,000,000	\$1,350,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$15,795,000	\$15,795,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>					<b>\$263,671,200</b>	<b>\$101,790,000</b>	<b>\$161,881,200</b>	<b>\$13,338,000</b>	<b>\$175,219,200</b>	<b>-\$22,238,192</b>	<b>\$152,981,008</b>
Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years							Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits		
							\$3,744,000	\$9,594,000	\$13,338,000		
							Credits Earned		\$13,338,000		
							Credits Paid		<u>\$13,338,000</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. For the purposes of these estimates, expiration of ASATR on the current timetable is assumed, so no ASATR offset is assumed in these estimates. Additional information on the assumptions used in preparing these estimates is provided in the narrative of this Report.

# Attachment 3

## San Patricio County

### Population

- Total county population in 2010 for San Patricio County: 66,476 , down 1.4 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- San Patricio County was the state's 50th largest county in population in 2010 and the 246 th fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- San Patricio County's population in 2009 was 42.4 percent Anglo (below the state average of 46.7 percent), 1.9 percent African-American (below the state average of 11.3 percent) and 53.6 percent Hispanic (above the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in San Patricio County:

Portland:	16,450	Ingleside:	8,992
Aransas Pass:	8,754	Sinton:	5,303
Mathis:	5,246	Taft:	3,303
Odem:	2,495	Gregory:	2,177
Ingleside on the Bay:	681	Lake City:	512

### Economy and Income

#### *Employment*

- September 2011 total employment in San Patricio County: 28,928 , up 2.7 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 San Patricio County unemployment rate: 9.3 percent, down from 9.9 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:

*(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*

- San Patricio County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 121st with an average per capita income of \$33,068, down 1.3 percent from 2008. Statewide average per capita personal income was \$38,609 in 2009, down 3.1 percent from 2008.

#### *Industry*

- Agricultural cash values in San Patricio County averaged \$87.49 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were up 1001.5 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in San Patricio County during 2010 included:
  - Other Crop
  - Hay
  - Cotton
  - Other Beef
  - Fishing
- 2011 oil and gas production in San Patricio County: 279,704.0 barrels of oil and 7.0 million Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 149 producing oil wells and 203 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 San Patricio County during the fourth quarter 2010: \$118.56 million, up 15.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Portland:	\$39.92 million, up 19.4 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Ingleside:	\$6.06 million, down 4.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Aransas Pass:	\$31.93 million, up 2.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Sinton:	\$7.65 million, up 1.1 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Mathis:	\$7.90 million, up 36.6 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Taft:	\$2.16 million, up 6.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Odem:	\$2.12 million, up 12.2 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Gregory:	\$1.27 million, up 11.7 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
Ingleside on the Bay:	\$183,119.00, up 44.7 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 San Patricio County through the fourth quarter of 2010: \$430.99 million, down 0.6 percent from the same period in 2009.

- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:

<b>Portland:</b>	\$132.69 million, up 4.8 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$24.69 million, down 7.6 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$124.82 million, down 2.9 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$30.92 million, up 5.9 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$28.32 million, up 19.3 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$8.86 million, up 1.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$8.12 million, down 1.5 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$4.51 million, up 5.3 percent from the same period in 2009.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$743,516.00, up 19.8 percent from the same period in 2009.

*Annual (2010)*

- Taxable sales in San Patricio County during 2010: \$430.99 million, down 0.6 percent from 2009.
- San Patricio County sent an estimated \$26.94 million (or 0.16 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.
- Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:

<b>Portland:</b>	\$132.69 million, up 4.8 percent from 2009.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$24.69 million, down 7.6 percent from 2009.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$124.82 million, down 2.9 percent from 2009.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$30.92 million, up 5.9 percent from 2009.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$28.32 million, up 19.3 percent from 2009.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$8.86 million, up 1.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$8.12 million, down 1.5 percent from 2009.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$4.51 million, up 5.3 percent from 2009.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$743,516.00, up 19.8 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 San Patricio County based on the sales activity month of August 2011: \$803,385.69, up 11.0 percent from August 2010.
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:

<b>Portland:</b>	\$332,100.64, down 2.0 percent from August 2010.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$93,660.72, up 30.0 percent from August 2010.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$146,691.43, up 10.2 percent from August 2010.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$83,841.11, up 26.5 percent from August 2010.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$81,051.48, up 35.3 percent from August 2010.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$31,985.58, up 15.0 percent from August 2010.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$21,105.20, up 19.6 percent from August 2010.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$12,307.24, up 64.8 percent from August 2010.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$642.29, down 6.5 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 San Patricio County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: \$8.35 million, up 9.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:

<b>Portland:</b>	\$3.35 million, up 10.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$1.01 million, down 0.2 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$1.69 million, up 8.8 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$845,990.38, up 5.3 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$794,400.33, up 12.4 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$277,461.20, up 5.9 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$248,728.18, up 30.2 percent from fiscal 2010.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$117,253.68, up 38.5 percent from fiscal 2010.

**Ingleside on the Bay:** \$13,280.83, up 122.1 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 San Patricio County based on sales activity months through August 2011: \$5.57 million, up 10.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months through August 2011 to the city of:
  - Portland:** \$2.17 million, up 9.1 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Ingleside:** \$694,331.12, up 5.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Aransas Pass:** \$1.15 million, up 11.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Sinton:** \$563,427.14, up 7.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Mathis:** \$544,407.61, up 12.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Taft:** \$181,508.07, up 1.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Odem:** \$173,061.85, up 35.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Gregory:** \$78,367.01, up 47.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Ingleside on the Bay:** \$9,704.91, up 127.2 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 San Patricio County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: \$8.35 million, up 9.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:
  - Portland:** \$3.35 million, up 10.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Ingleside:** \$1.01 million, down 0.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Aransas Pass:** \$1.69 million, up 8.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Sinton:** \$845,990.38, up 5.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Mathis:** \$794,400.33, up 12.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Taft:** \$277,461.20, up 5.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Odem:** \$248,728.18, up 30.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Gregory:** \$117,253.68, up 38.5 percent from the previous 12-month period.
  - Ingleside on the Bay:** \$13,280.83, up 122.1 percent from the previous 12-month period.

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

- Payment to the cities from January 2011 through October 2011:
  - Portland:** \$2.80 million, up 10.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Ingleside:** \$848,542.25, up 3.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Aransas Pass:** \$1.43 million, up 10.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Sinton:** \$716,509.71, up 7.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Mathis:** \$669,630.71, up 13.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Taft:** \$228,053.50, up 4.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Odem:** \$210,417.51, up 31.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Gregory:** \$96,586.67, up 42.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
  - Ingleside on the Bay:** \$11,583.88, up 150.4 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 San Patricio County based on sales activity months in 2010: \$7.83 million, up 1.2 percent from 2009.
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:
  - Portland:** \$3.17 million, up 4.6 percent from 2009.
  - Ingleside:** \$968,613.57, down 13.0 percent from 2009.
  - Aransas Pass:** \$1.57 million, up 0.4 percent from 2009.
  - Sinton:** \$806,279.08, up 1.5 percent from 2009.
  - Mathis:** \$732,091.45, up 7.8 percent from 2009.
  - Taft:** \$275,339.14, up 9.0 percent from 2009.
  - Odem:** \$203,873.79, up 3.0 percent from 2009.
  - Gregory:** \$92,187.93, up 1.7 percent from 2009.

**Ingleside on the Bay:** \$7,847.30, down 39.8 percent from 2009.

### ***Property Tax***

- As of January 2009, property values in San Patricio County: \$4.51 billion, up 0.2 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in San Patricio County is \$66,150, below the statewide average of \$85,809. About 3.8 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

### **State Expenditures**

- San Patricio County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 57th. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: \$222.49 million, down 0.1 percent from FY2009.
- In San Patricio County, 10 state agencies provide a total of 168 jobs and \$1.69 million in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):
  - Department of Family and Protective Services
  - Department of Transportation
  - Department of Aging and Disability Services
  - Parks & Wildlife Department
  - Health & Human Services Commission

### **Higher Education**

- Community colleges in San Patricio County fall 2010 enrollment:
  - None.
- San Patricio County is in the service area of the following:
  - Del Mar College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 12,236. Counties in the service area include:
    - Aransas County
    - Kenedy County
    - Kleberg County
    - Nueces County
    - San Patricio County
- Institutions of higher education in San Patricio County fall 2010 enrollment:
  - None.

### **School Districts**

- San Patricio County had 7 school districts with 34 schools and 14,338 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.)
  - Aransas Pass ISD had 1,879 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$44,821. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 63 percent.
  - Gregory-Portland ISD had 4,193 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$45,281. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 83 percent.
  - Ingleside ISD had 2,150 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$46,053. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 72 percent.
  - Mathis ISD had 1,736 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$43,744. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 60 percent.
  - Odem-Edroy ISD had 1,129 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$45,781. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 75 percent.
  - Sinton ISD had 2,108 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$44,070. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 70 percent.
  - Taft ISD had 1,143 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$42,880. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 55 percent.