

S U S A N

C O M B S

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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



September 16, 2013

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

Dear Superintendent Clore:

On June 27, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 299) 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 voestalpine Texas, 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 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 (\$630 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 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 June 27, 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	voestalpine Texas 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	\$630,000,000
Qualified Investment	\$630,000,000
Limitation Amount	\$30,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	85
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	68
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$983
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.021(5)(B)	\$983
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$51,138
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$9,264,706
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$68,567,546
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$44,405,209
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):	\$37,458,881
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$959,400
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$31,108,665
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	54.6%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	97.8%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit	2.2%

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of voestalpine Texas 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 85 new jobs when fully operational. Sixty-eight jobs will meet the criteria for qualifying jobs as specified in Tax Code Section 313.021(5)(B). 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 \$46,489 in 2011. The annual average manufacturing wage for 2011-12 for San Patricio County is \$69,420. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$42,068. In addition to a salary of \$51,138, each qualifying position will receive benefits such as medical coverage (company pays 80% of employee only health insurance premiums), dental plan, paid holidays, paid vacation, and 401(k) retirement savings plan. The project's total investment is \$630 million, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$9.3 million.

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

According to voestalpine Texas LLC's application, "The voestalpine Group is a steelmaking, processing, and technology group that operates worldwide and manufactures, processes, and develops high quality steel products. With 500 production and sales companies in more than 50 countries on five continents, the Group has been listed on the Vienna Stock Exchange since 1995. With its top quality flat steel products, the Group is one of the leading partners to the automotive and domestic appliance industries in Europe and to the oil and gas industries worldwide. The voestalpine Group is also the world market leader in railway switch technology, special rails, tool steel and special sections. It staffs roughly 46,500 employees worldwide. The voestalpine Group has the ability to locate investments in many locations around the world."

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

During the past two years, 9 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 voestalpine Texas LLC project requires appear to be in line with the focus and themes of the plan. Texas identified manufacturing as one of six target clusters in the Texas Cluster Initiative. The plan stresses the importance of technology in all sectors of the manufacturing industry.

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

Table 1 depicts voestalpine Texas 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 voestalpine Texas LLC**

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2013	100	132	232	\$7,400,000	\$7,600,000	\$15,000,000
2014	300	387	687	\$22,200,000	\$25,800,000	\$48,000,000
2015	500	646	1146	\$37,000,000	\$46,000,000	\$83,000,000
2016	350	509	859	\$24,756,900	\$42,243,100	\$67,000,000
2017	85	233	318	\$4,346,730	\$24,653,270	\$29,000,000
2018	85	210	295	\$4,346,730	\$22,653,270	\$27,000,000
2019	85	196	281	\$4,346,730	\$21,653,270	\$26,000,000
2020	85	190	275	\$4,346,730	\$21,653,270	\$26,000,000
2021	85	194	279	\$4,346,730	\$22,653,270	\$27,000,000
2022	85	192	277	\$4,346,730	\$22,653,270	\$27,000,000
2023	85	204	289	\$4,346,730	\$24,653,270	\$29,000,000
2024	85	188	273	\$4,346,730	\$23,653,270	\$28,000,000
2025	85	185	270	\$4,346,730	\$23,653,270	\$28,000,000
2026	85	181	266	\$4,346,730	\$25,653,270	\$30,000,000
2027	85	181	266	\$4,346,730	\$25,653,270	\$30,000,000
2028	85	185	270	\$4,346,730	\$26,653,270	\$31,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, voestalpine Texas 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. Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the district superintendent, Dr. Walter Clore, TEA has found that voestalpine Texas LLC project could have a significant impact on the number and size of school facilities in the district.

Table 2 examines the estimated direct impact on ad valorem taxes to the school district, San Patricio County, San Patricio County Drainage District, and City of Corpus Christi ETJ, with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from voestalpine Texas LLC's application. voestalpine Texas LLC has applied for both a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code, and a tax abatement with the drainage district. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the voestalpine Texas LLC project on the region if all taxes are assessed.



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

Attachment 2, provided by the district and reviewed by the Texas Education Agency, contains information relating to the financial impact of the proposed project on the finances of the district as well as the tax benefit of the value limitation. "Table 5" in this attachment shows the estimated 15 year M&O tax levy without the value limitation agreement would be \$68,567,546. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$44,405,209.

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**

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Y in usual tax year below)	Column A: Tangible Personal Property (original cost) placed in service during this year	Column B: Building or permanent improvements component of building (annual amount only)	Column C: Start of A and B Qualifying Investment (during the qualifying time period)	Column D: Other investments 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 after filing complete application with district, but before final board approval of application (eligible to become qualified property)  Investment made after final board approval of application and before Jan. 1 of first complete tax year of qualifying time period (qualified investment and eligible to become qualified property)  Complete tax years of qualifying time period 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15  Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)  Credit Settle-Up Period  Post-Settle-Up Period  Post-Settle-Up Period	2013-2014	2013					0
	2014-2015	2014	236,000,000	16,000,000	252,000,000	0	252,000,000
	2015-2016	2015	354,000,000	24,000,000	378,000,000	0	378,000,000
	2016-2017	2016	0	0	0	0	0
	2017-2018	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	0	0	0	0	0
	2022-2023	2022	0	0	0	0	0
	2023-2024	2023	0	0	0	0	0
	2024-2025	2024	0	0	0	0	0
	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	

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 for 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.  
 (For the years outside the qualifying time period, this number should simply represent the planned investment in tangible personal property)  
 Column B: Include estimates of investment for "replacement" property-property that is part of original agreement but scheduled for probable replacement during limitation period.  
 The total dollar amount of planned investment each year in buildings or nonremovable component of buildings that the applicant considers qualified investment under Tax Code §313.021(1)(E).

Column C: 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.

Column D: 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 approved project 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: *[Handwritten Signature]*  
 Title: *Senior Vice President*  
 Date: **13, MAI 2013**

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE  
 DATE

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Qualified Property			Estimated Taxable Value	
				Estimated Market Value of Land	Estimated Total Market Value of tangible personal property in the new building or "in or on the new improvement"	Estimated Value	Final taxable value for M&C - after all reductions	Final taxable value for M&C - after all reductions
	pre-year 1	2013-2014	2013	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	2	2015-2016	2015	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	3	2016-2017	2016	\$ -	\$8,000,000	\$118,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$112,000,000
	4	2017-2018	2017	\$ -	\$40,000,000	\$590,000,000	\$70,000,000	\$560,000,000
	5	2018-2019	2018	\$ -	\$40,000,000	\$590,000,000	\$70,000,000	\$560,000,000
Value Limitation Period	6	2019-2020	2019	\$ -	\$38,800,000	\$560,500,000	\$66,500,000	\$532,800,000
	7	2020-2021	2020	\$ -	\$37,636,000	\$532,475,000	\$63,175,000	\$506,936,000
	8	2021-2022	2021	\$ -	\$36,507,000	\$505,851,000	\$60,016,000	\$482,342,000
	9	2022-2023	2022	\$ -	\$35,412,000	\$480,558,000	\$57,015,000	\$458,955,000
	10	2023-2024	2023	\$ -	\$34,350,000	\$456,530,000	\$54,164,000	\$436,716,000
Credit Settle-Up Period	11	2024-2025	2024	\$ -	\$33,320,000	\$433,704,000	\$51,456,000	\$415,568,000
	12	2025-2026	2025	\$ -	\$32,320,000	\$412,019,000	\$48,883,000	\$395,456,000
	13	2026-2027	2026	\$ -	\$31,350,000	\$391,418,000	\$46,439,000	\$376,329,000
Post-Settle-Up Period	14	2027-2028	2027	\$ -	\$30,410,000	\$371,847,000	\$44,117,000	\$358,140,000
	15	2028-2029	2028	\$ -	\$29,498,000	\$353,255,000	\$41,911,000	\$340,842,000
				\$ -	\$28,613,000	\$335,592,000	\$39,815,000	\$324,390,000

Notes: Market value in future years is good faith estimate of future taxable value for the purposes of property taxation. This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

*S.H. [Signature]*  
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

Linz, am 13. MAI 2013

DATE

*authorised signatory not rec*

Schedule C- Application: Employment Information

vossipina Thuzas, LLC  
Gregory-Portland ISD

Applicant Name  
ISD Henry

Form 50-206

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Construction		New Jobs		Qualifying Jobs	
				Column A: Number of Construction FTEs 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	100 FTEs	\$74,000	0	\$0	0	\$0
	1	2014-2015	2014	300 FTEs	\$74,000	0	\$0	0	\$0
	2	2015-2016	2015	500 FTEs	\$74,000	0	\$0	0	\$0
	3	2016-2017	2016	300 FTEs	\$74,000	50	\$51,138	40	\$51,138
	4	2017-2018	2017			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	5	2018-2019	2018			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	6	2019-2020	2019			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	7	2020-2021	2020			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	8	2021-2022	2021			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	9	2022-2023	2022			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	10	2023-2024	2023			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	11	2024-2025	2024			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	12	2025-2026	2025			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	13	2026-2027	2026			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	14	2027-2028	2027			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
	15	2028-2029	2028			85	\$51,138	68	\$51,138
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)									
Value Limitation Period									
Credit Settle-Up Period									
Post-Settle-Up Period									
Post-Settle-Up Period									

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]*  
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE  
*[Signature]*  
 AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Linz, am 13. MAI 2013

DATE

		Sales Tax Information			Franchise Tax			Other Property Tax Abatement Sought		
		Sales Taxable Expenditures			Franchise Tax			Other (Drainage 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	County	City	Hospital	Other (Drainage District)
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)	2013-2014	2013	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	50,400,000	201,600,000	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	2015-2016	75,600,000	302,400,000	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	3	2016-2017	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	4	2017-2018	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	5	2018-2019	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	6	2019-2020	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	7	2020-2021	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
	8	2021-2022	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85%
	9	2022-2023	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70%
	10	2023-2024	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	55%
	11	2024-2025	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40%
	12	2025-2026	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%
	13	2026-2027	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
	14	2027-2028	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
	15	2028-2029	9,000,000	600,000,000	100,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-

\*For planning, construction and operation of the facility.

  
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE  
 Linz, am  
 DATE 13. MAI 2013

# Attachment 2

August 20, 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 voestalpine Texas LLC project 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, Dr. Walter Clore, the TEA has found that the voestalpine Texas LLC project could have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in GPISD.

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

August 20, 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 voestalpine Texas LLC project for the Gregory-Portland Independent School District (GPISD). 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 voestalpine Texas LLC project 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 regarding this issue.

Sincerely,



Al McKenzie, Manager  
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED  
VOESTALPINE TEXAS LLC PROJECT (APP #299) 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 voestalpine Texas LLC Project (App #299) on the Finances of the Gregory-Portland Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

## Introduction

The voestalpine Texas, LLC company (voestalpine) 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, voestalpine proposes to invest \$630 million to construct new iron and steel processing and production facilities in G-PISD.

The voestalpine 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 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, unless the District and the Company agree to an extension of the start of the two-year qualifying time period. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the qualifying time period will be the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years. Beginning with the 2016-17 school year, the project would go on the local tax roll at \$30 million and remain at that level of taxable value for eight years for maintenance and operations (M&O) taxes.

The full taxable value of the project would be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period, with G-PISD currently levying a \$0.18 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The full value of the investment is expected to reach \$560 million in the 2016-17 school year. Depreciation is expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement, although the value increase for the voestalpine is expected to reduce the District's current I&S tax rate by nearly five cents in the 2016-17 school year, under the assumptions outlined below and G-PISD's current debt service schedule.

In the case of the voestalpine project, the agreement will call 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. G-PISD would experience a revenue loss of \$6.9 million as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year. No out-year revenue losses are anticipated in these estimates.

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential total tax benefits under a Chapter 313 property value limitation could reach an estimated \$37.5 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 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 92.65 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. Even though school districts could be eligible for state support through ASATR for the 2016-17 school year, the estimates below do not assume that G-PISD would receive offsetting ASATR state aid when the value limitation for the voestalpine 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 voestalpine 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 current 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 is maintained 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. Given the voestalpine project and G-PISD's funding characteristics, no ASATR funding to offset the reduction in M&O taxes is associated with the 2016-17 value limitation, as noted previously.

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 voestalpine 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 voestalpine 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 ADA for the 2012-13 school year, in analyzing the effects of the voestalpine 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 to grow 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 is not expected to become a Tier I recapture district with the addition of the voestalpine project only, with or without the adoption of a value limitation agreement. It is expected to be recaptured at the \$319,500 per WADA for the last 11 cents of tax effort under both scenarios in Tier II, beginning with the 2023-24 school year.

It needs to be emphasized that this analysis focuses on the voestalpine 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 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 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 voestalpine 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 voestalpine 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" (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 \$6.9 million as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year. The revenue reduction results largely from the \$6.2 million reduction in M&O tax collections, a loss of \$745,000 in Tier II state aid, and no state aid offset as a result of the one-year lag associated with the state M&O property value study. Once the state property value study recognizes the \$30 million M&O value limitation, no revenue losses anticipated for the out-years.

Table 4 highlights the differences between the baseline and value limitation models. For example, the column relating to recapture on the last 11 cents of tax effort indicates that G-PISD taxpayers would pay \$821,914 less in recapture under a value limitation agreement. Additional state aid offsets nearly all of the reduction in M&O taxes attributable to the value limitation.

The Comptroller's state property value study influences these calculations, as noted previously. At the school-district level, a taxpayer benefiting from a property value limitation has two property values assigned by the local appraisal district for their property covered by the limitation: (1) a reduced value for M&O taxes, and (2) the full taxable value for I&S taxes. This situation exists for the eight years that the value limitation is in effect. Two state value determinations are 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 throughout the forecast period.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total \$43.4 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, voestalpine 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 \$1.0 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 \$6.9 million over the course of the agreement, limited to the first limitation year. In total, the potential net tax benefits (inclusive of tax credits but after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to reach \$37.5 million over the life of the agreement.

## Facilities Funding Impact

The voestalpine project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with G-PISD currently levying an \$0.18 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The value of the voestalpine project is expected to depreciate over the life of the agreement and beyond, but full access to the additional value is expected to reduce its current I&S tax rate by nearly five cents when the peak project value appears on the I&S tax base.

The voestalpine project is not expected to have a significant impact on school facilities once the plant begins operation, with 85 permanent jobs expected. During the construction phase, however, up to 500 FTEs are expected to be working on the voestalpine 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 for extraordinary education-related expenses faced by G-PISD during the construction phase are needed as part of the value limitation agreement.

## Conclusion

The proposed voestalpine manufacturing project 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 \$37.5 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.

**Table 1 – Base District Information with voestalpine 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	4,285.35	5,443.53	\$1.1700	\$0.1800	\$1,489,304,848	\$1,489,304,848	\$1,109,975,281	\$1,109,975,281	\$203,907	\$203,907
1	2014-15	4,328.20	5,492.70	\$1.1700	\$0.1650	\$1,269,062,407	\$1,269,062,407	\$1,395,858,859	\$1,395,858,859	\$254,130	\$254,130
2	2015-16	4,371.48	5,541.56	\$1.1700	\$0.1600	\$1,405,643,655	\$1,405,643,655	\$1,173,747,498	\$1,173,747,498	\$211,808	\$211,808
3	2016-17	4,415.20	5,591.87	\$1.1700	\$0.1325	\$1,878,716,528	\$1,348,716,528	\$1,308,422,448	\$1,308,422,448	\$233,986	\$233,986
4	2017-18	4,459.35	5,641.61	\$1.1700	\$0.1325	\$1,904,290,859	\$1,374,290,859	\$1,779,550,897	\$1,249,550,897	\$315,433	\$221,489
5	2018-19	4,503.94	5,692.82	\$1.1700	\$0.1350	\$1,903,176,676	\$1,400,376,676	\$1,803,141,915	\$1,273,141,915	\$316,740	\$223,640
6	2019-20	4,548.98	5,743.43	\$1.1700	\$0.1360	\$1,903,920,210	\$1,426,984,210	\$1,800,004,753	\$1,297,204,753	\$313,402	\$225,859
7	2020-21	4,594.47	5,795.55	\$1.1700	\$0.1120	\$1,971,089,158	\$1,518,747,158	\$1,798,684,848	\$1,321,748,848	\$310,356	\$228,063
8	2021-22	4,640.42	5,847.06	\$1.1700	\$0.1120	\$1,973,692,171	\$1,544,737,171	\$1,863,749,089	\$1,411,407,089	\$318,750	\$241,387
9	2022-23	4,686.82	5,899.03	\$1.1700	\$0.1125	\$2,520,027,263	\$2,113,311,263	\$1,864,205,301	\$1,435,250,301	\$316,019	\$243,303
10	2023-24	4,733.69	5,951.44	\$1.1700	\$0.1150	\$2,504,585,979	\$2,119,017,979	\$2,408,350,655	\$2,001,634,655	\$404,667	\$336,328
11	2024-25	4,781.03	6,004.32	\$1.1700	\$0.1150	\$2,491,640,982	\$2,491,640,982	\$2,390,675,840	\$2,005,107,840	\$398,159	\$333,944
12	2025-26	4,828.84	6,057.66	\$1.1700	\$0.1150	\$2,481,117,310	\$2,481,117,310	\$2,375,452,640	\$2,375,452,640	\$392,140	\$392,140
13	2026-27	4,877.12	6,111.46	\$1.1700	\$0.1150	\$2,472,945,689	\$2,472,945,689	\$2,362,605,201	\$2,362,605,201	\$386,586	\$386,586
14	2027-28	4,925.90	6,165.74	\$1.1700	\$0.1155	\$2,467,030,029	\$2,467,030,029	\$2,352,063,337	\$2,352,063,337	\$381,473	\$381,473
15	2028-29	4,975.16	6,220.49	\$1.1700	\$0.1155	\$2,463,309,449	\$2,463,309,449	\$2,343,730,030	\$2,343,730,030	\$376,776	\$376,776

\*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	\$14,549,940	\$17,234,318	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,472,639	\$2,601,284	\$0	\$36,858,181
1	2014-15	\$12,374,543	\$15,140,045	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,102,948	\$1,414,757	\$0	\$31,032,293
2	2015-16	\$13,706,279	\$17,618,725	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,329,266	\$2,373,101	\$0	\$36,027,370
3	2016-17	\$18,441,667	\$16,536,926	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,134,005	\$2,593,282	\$0	\$40,705,880
4	2017-18	\$18,685,205	\$12,087,455	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,175,392	\$1,129,178	\$0	\$35,077,230
5	2018-19	\$18,661,601	\$12,121,288	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,171,380	\$1,110,018	\$0	\$35,064,287
6	2019-20	\$18,656,325	\$12,419,381	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,170,484	\$1,155,289	\$0	\$35,401,479
7	2020-21	\$19,302,157	\$12,707,121	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,280,238	\$1,239,207	\$0	\$36,528,723
8	2021-22	\$19,315,303	\$12,327,883	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,282,472	\$1,120,962	\$0	\$36,046,619
9	2022-23	\$24,657,364	\$12,597,138	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,190,310	\$1,479,557	\$0	\$42,924,368
10	2023-24	\$24,493,803	\$7,431,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,162,514	\$802,687	-\$538,425	\$36,352,209
11	2024-25	\$24,281,660	\$7,887,024	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,126,462	\$832,550	-\$501,036	\$36,626,660
12	2025-26	\$24,170,201	\$8,320,346	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,107,520	\$863,706	-\$467,642	\$36,994,130
13	2026-27	\$24,081,626	\$8,732,369	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,092,468	\$893,665	-\$436,483	\$37,363,646
14	2027-28	\$24,014,992	\$9,123,821	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,081,144	\$922,448	-\$407,491	\$37,734,913
15	2028-29	\$23,969,697	\$9,495,691	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,073,446	\$950,115	-\$380,581	\$38,108,368

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	\$14,549,940	\$17,234,318	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,472,639	\$2,601,284	\$0	\$36,858,181
1	2014-15	\$12,374,543	\$15,140,045	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,102,948	\$1,414,757	\$0	\$31,032,293
2	2015-16	\$13,706,279	\$17,618,725	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,329,266	\$2,373,101	\$0	\$36,027,370
3	2016-17	\$13,141,402	\$16,536,926	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,233,270	\$1,847,955	\$0	\$33,759,553
4	2017-18	\$13,384,940	\$17,387,720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,274,657	\$2,116,761	\$0	\$35,164,078
5	2018-19	\$13,633,349	\$17,421,553	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,316,872	\$2,113,013	\$0	\$35,484,787
6	2019-20	\$13,886,727	\$17,447,633	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,359,931	\$2,107,960	\$0	\$35,802,251
7	2020-21	\$14,778,511	\$17,476,720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,511,482	\$2,197,381	\$0	\$36,964,094
8	2021-22	\$15,025,538	\$16,851,529	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,553,462	\$1,969,835	\$0	\$36,400,364
9	2022-23	\$20,590,001	\$16,886,902	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,499,096	\$2,650,529	\$0	\$43,626,527
10	2023-24	\$20,637,930	\$11,498,994	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,507,241	\$1,055,345	-\$107,850	\$36,601,660
11	2024-25	\$24,281,660	\$11,742,897	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,126,462	\$1,272,781	-\$109,697	\$41,314,102
12	2025-26	\$24,170,201	\$8,320,346	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,107,520	\$863,706	-\$467,642	\$36,994,130
13	2026-27	\$24,081,626	\$8,732,369	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,092,468	\$893,665	-\$436,483	\$37,363,646
14	2027-28	\$24,014,992	\$9,123,821	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,081,144	\$922,448	-\$407,491	\$37,734,913
15	2028-29	\$23,969,697	\$9,495,691	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,073,446	\$950,115	-\$380,581	\$38,108,368

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	-\$5,300,265	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$900,735	-\$745,328	\$0	-\$6,946,328
4	2017-18	-\$5,300,265	\$5,300,265	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$900,735	\$987,583	\$0	\$86,848
5	2018-19	-\$5,028,251	\$5,300,265	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$854,509	\$1,002,995	\$0	\$420,500
6	2019-20	-\$4,769,598	\$5,028,252	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$810,553	\$952,671	\$0	\$400,772
7	2020-21	-\$4,523,646	\$4,769,599	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$768,755	\$958,173	\$0	\$435,371
8	2021-22	-\$4,289,765	\$4,523,646	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$729,009	\$848,873	\$0	\$353,745
9	2022-23	-\$4,067,364	\$4,289,764	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$691,214	\$1,170,972	\$0	\$702,159
10	2023-24	-\$3,855,873	\$4,067,364	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$655,273	\$262,658	\$430,575	\$249,451
11	2024-25	\$0	\$3,855,873	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$440,231	\$391,339	\$4,687,443
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 voestalpine Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to G-PISD at \$1.17 M&O Tax Rate**

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
2013-14	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.170	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2014-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.170	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2015-16	\$112,000,000	\$112,000,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$1,310,400	\$1,310,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2016-17	\$560,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$530,000,000	\$1.170	\$6,552,000	\$351,000	\$6,201,000	\$0	\$6,201,000	-\$6,946,328	-\$745,328
2017-18	\$560,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$530,000,000	\$1.170	\$6,552,000	\$351,000	\$6,201,000	\$137,057	\$6,338,057	\$0	\$6,338,057
2018-19	\$532,800,000	\$30,000,000	\$502,800,000	\$1.170	\$6,233,760	\$351,000	\$5,882,760	\$137,057	\$6,019,817	\$0	\$6,019,817
2019-20	\$506,936,000	\$30,000,000	\$476,936,000	\$1.170	\$5,931,151	\$351,000	\$5,580,151	\$137,057	\$5,717,208	\$0	\$5,717,208
2020-21	\$482,342,000	\$30,000,000	\$452,342,000	\$1.170	\$5,643,401	\$351,000	\$5,292,401	\$137,057	\$5,429,459	\$0	\$5,429,459
2021-22	\$458,955,000	\$30,000,000	\$428,955,000	\$1.170	\$5,369,774	\$351,000	\$5,018,774	\$137,057	\$5,155,831	\$0	\$5,155,831
2022-23	\$436,716,000	\$30,000,000	\$406,716,000	\$1.170	\$5,109,577	\$351,000	\$4,758,577	\$137,057	\$4,895,634	\$0	\$4,895,634
2023-24	\$415,568,000	\$30,000,000	\$385,568,000	\$1.170	\$4,862,146	\$351,000	\$4,511,146	\$137,057	\$4,648,203	\$0	\$4,648,203
2024-25	\$395,456,000	\$395,456,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$4,626,835	\$4,626,835	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2025-26	\$376,329,000	\$376,329,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$4,403,049	\$4,403,049	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2026-27	\$358,140,000	\$358,140,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$4,190,238	\$4,190,238	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2027-28	\$340,842,000	\$340,842,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$3,987,851	\$3,987,851	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2028-29	\$324,390,000	\$324,390,000	\$0	\$1.170	\$3,795,363	\$3,795,363	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>					<b>\$68,567,546</b>	<b>\$25,121,737</b>	<b>\$43,445,809</b>	<b>\$959,400</b>	<b>\$44,405,209</b>	<b>-\$6,946,328</b>	<b>\$37,458,881</b>
Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years								Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits	
								\$0	\$959,400	\$959,400	
								Credits Earned		\$959,400	
								Credits Paid		\$959,400	
								Excess Credits Unpaid		\$0	

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

# Attachment 3

## 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:

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

Portland:	\$132.69 million, up 4.8 percent from 2009.
Ingleside:	\$24.69 million, down 7.6 percent from 2009.
Aransas Pass:	\$124.82 million, down 2.9 percent from 2009.
Sinton:	\$30.92 million, up 5.9 percent from 2009.
Mathis:	\$28.32 million, up 19.3 percent from 2009.
Taft:	\$8.86 million, up 1.0 percent from 2009.
Odem:	\$8.12 million, down 1.5 percent from 2009.
Gregory:	\$4.51 million, up 5.3 percent from 2009.
Ingleside on the Bay:	\$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:

Portland:	\$332,100.64, down 2.0 percent from August 2010.
Ingleside:	\$93,660.72, up 30.0 percent from August 2010.
Aransas Pass:	\$146,691.43, up 10.2 percent from August 2010.
Sinton:	\$83,841.11, up 26.5 percent from August 2010.
Mathis:	\$81,051.48, up 35.3 percent from August 2010.
Taft:	\$31,985.58, up 15.0 percent from August 2010.
Odem:	\$21,105.20, up 19.6 percent from August 2010.
Gregory:	\$12,307.24, up 64.8 percent from August 2010.
Ingleside on the Bay:	\$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:

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

<b>Portland:</b>	\$2.17 million, up 9.1 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$694,331.12, up 5.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$1.15 million, up 11.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$563,427.14, up 7.6 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$544,407.61, up 12.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$181,508.07, up 1.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$173,061.85, up 35.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$78,367.01, up 47.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$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:
 

<b>Portland:</b>	\$3.35 million, up 10.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$1.01 million, down 0.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$1.69 million, up 8.8 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$845,990.38, up 5.3 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$794,400.33, up 12.4 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$277,461.20, up 5.9 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$248,728.18, up 30.2 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$117,253.68, up 38.5 percent from the previous 12-month period.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$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:
 

<b>Portland:</b>	\$2.80 million, up 10.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$848,542.25, up 3.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$1.43 million, up 10.8 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$716,509.71, up 7.9 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$669,630.71, up 13.2 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$228,053.50, up 4.4 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$210,417.51, up 31.5 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$96,586.67, up 42.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
<b>Ingleside on the Bay:</b>	\$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:
 

<b>Portland:</b>	\$3.17 million, up 4.6 percent from 2009.
<b>Ingleside:</b>	\$968,613.57, down 13.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Aransas Pass:</b>	\$1.57 million, up 0.4 percent from 2009.
<b>Sinton:</b>	\$806,279.08, up 1.5 percent from 2009.
<b>Mathis:</b>	\$732,091.45, up 7.8 percent from 2009.
<b>Taft:</b>	\$275,339.14, up 9.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Odem:</b>	\$203,873.79, up 3.0 percent from 2009.
<b>Gregory:</b>	\$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.