Attachment E

Summary of Financial Impact

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED INEOS USA LLC PROJECT ON THE FINANCES OF THE DEER PARK INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY VALUE LIMITATION

November 20, 2012 | **Final Report-REVISED**

PREPARED BY

MOAK, CASEY & ASSOCIATES
TEXAS SCHOOL FINANCE EXPERTS

Estimated Impact of the Proposed INEOS USA LLC Project on the Finances of the Deer Park Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

Introduction

INEOS USA LLC (INEOS) has requested that the Deer Park Independent School District (DPISD) 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 DPISD on July 16, 2012, INEOS proposes to make a qualified investment of $750 million in the first two years to construct a new chemical production facility in DPISD, which will result in more than $1.0 billion in taxable value in the 2016-17 school year under the schedules presented in the application.

The INEOS 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, DPISD may offer a minimum value limitation of $80 million. The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2013-14 and 2014-15 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 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. Beginning in the 2015-16 school year, the project would go on the local tax roll at $80 million and remain at that level of taxable value for eight years for maintenance and operations (M&O) taxes.

The full taxable value of the project would be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period and after, with DPISD currently levying a $0.29 per $100 I&S tax rate. The full taxable value of the investment is expected to reach $1.035 billion in the 2016-17 school year, with depreciation expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement.

In the case of the INEOS 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. DPISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2015-16 school year (-$148,881), which would climb to $3.0 million in the 2016-17 school and lesser amounts in the subsequent years. The total revenue loss amounts are expected to reach $3.2 million over the eight years the value limitation is in effect.

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated $65.6 million over the course of the agreement. This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses paid to the District.

School Finance Mechanics

Under the current school finance system, the property values established by the Comptroller's Office that are used to calculate state aid and recapture lag by one year, a practical consequence of the fact that the Comptroller's Office needs this time to conduct its property value study and now the 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 property values are aligned at the minimum value established by the Board on both the local tax roll and the corresponding state property value study, assuming a similar deduction is made in the state property values. In the case of the INEOS project, the $661 million value increase in the 2016-17 school year results in a larger hold-harmless amount for that year, now estimated to be $3.0 million.

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 moderate the impact of the reduced M&O collections as a result of the limitation, in contrast with the earlier formula-driven finance system.

House Bill 3646 as enacted in 2009 created more "formula" school districts that were less dependent on ASATR state aid than had been the case previously. The formula reductions enacted under Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) as approved in the First Called Session in 2011 are designed to make $4 billion in reductions to the existing school funding formulas for the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. For the 2011-12 school year, across-the-board reductions were made that reduced each district's WADA count and resulted in an estimated 786 school districts still receiving ASATR to maintain their target revenue funding levels, while an estimated 2241districts operated directly on the state formulas.

For the 2012-13 school year, the SB 1 changes called for smaller across-the-board reductions and funding ASATR-receiving target revenue districts at 92.35 percent of the level provided for under the existing funding formulas. In the case of the 2012-13 school year, the ASATR districts are expected to total 403, while 624 are estimated to be formula districts. For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, the ASATR reduction percentage will be set in the General Appropriations Act. The recent legislative session also saw the adoption of a statement of legislative intent to no longer fund target revenue (through ASATR) by the 2017-18 school year.

One key element in any analysis of the school finance implications is the provision for revenue protection in the agreement between the school district and the applicant. In the case of the INEOS project, the agreement calls for a calculation of the revenue impact of the value limitation

in years 3-10 of the agreement, under whatever school finance and property tax laws are in effect in each of those years. This meets the statutory requirement under Section 313.027(f)(1) of the Tax Code to provide school district revenue protection language in the agreement.

Underlying Assumptions

There are several approaches that can be used to analyze the future revenue stream of a school district under a value limitation. Whatever method is used, a reasonable analysis requires the use of a multi-year forecasting model that covers the years in which the agreement is in effect. The Chapter 313 application now requires 15 years of data and analysis on the project being considered for a property value limitation.

The general approach used here is to maintain static enrollment and property values in order to isolate the effects of the value limitation under the school finance system. The current SB 1 reductions are reflected in the underlying models. With regard to ASATR funding, the 92.35 percent reduction enacted for the 2012-13 school year is maintained until the 2017-18 school year. A statement of legislative intent was adopted in 2011 to no longer fund target revenue by the 2017-18 school year, so that change is reflected in the estimates presented below. The projected taxable values of the INEOS project are factored into the base model used here. The impact of the limitation value for the proposed INEOS project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts are held constant at 11,726 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the INEOS project on the finances of DPISD. The District's local tax base reached $7.1 billion for the 2011 tax year and is maintained for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. An M&O tax rate of $1.1067 is used throughout this analysis. DPISD has estimated state property wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately $476,959 for the 2011-12 school year. The enrollment and property value assumptions for the 15 years that are the subject of this analysis are summarized in Table 1.

School Finance Impact

School finance models were prepared for DPISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2027-28 school year. Beyond the 2012-13 school year, no attempt was made to forecast the 88th percentile or Austin yield that influence future state funding beyond the projected level for that school year. In the analyses for other districts and applicants on earlier projects, these changes appeared to have little impact on the revenue associated with the implementation of the property value limitation, since the baseline and other models incorporate the same underlying assumptions.

Under the proposed agreement, a model is established to make a calculation of the "Baseline Revenue" by adding the value of the proposed INEOS 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 INEOS value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2015-16 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. The model results show annual net General Fund revenue in the mid-$80 million range, after recapture (if appropriate)

and other adjustments have been made. In the absence of ASATR funding, this amount will be reduced unless offset by other funding adjustments.

Under these assumptions, DPISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2015-16 school year (-$148,881). The revenue reduction results from the mechanics of the up to six cents beyond the compressed M&O tax rate equalized to the Austin yield or not subject to recapture, which reflect the one-year lag in value associated with the property value study. Given the large value increase expected for the 2016-17 school year, the fourth year revenue loss is about $3.0 million. The cumulative revenue loss over the eight years the value limitation is in effect is expected to total $3.2 million.

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

One risk factor under the estimates presented here relates to the implementation of the value limitation in the 2015-16 school year. The formula loss of $148,881 cited above between the base and the limitation models is based on an assumption that INEOS would receive tax savings of $3.24 million when the $80 million limitation is implemented. Under the estimates presented here and as highlighted in Table 4, an increase of $3.1 million in ASATR funding would offset most of the reduction in M&O taxes in the first year the value limitation is in effect.

The 2016-17 school year is a more extreme case, with $10.6 million in tax savings offset by $3.0 million in ASATR funding. The resulting revenue loss is estimated to be $3.0 million for the 2016-17 school year.

In general, the ASATR offset poses little financial risk to the school district as a result of the adoption of the value limitation agreement. But a significant reduction of ASATR funding prior to the assumed 2017-18 school year elimination of these funds could reduce the residual tax savings in the first years that the $80 million value limitation is in effect.

The Comptroller's state property value study influences these calculations, as noted previously. At the school-district level, a taxpayer benefiting from a property value limitation has two property values assigned by the local appraisal district for their property covered by the limitation: (1) a reduced value for M&O taxes, and (2) the full taxable value for I&S taxes. This situation exists for the eight years that the value limitation is in effect. The Comptroller's Property Tax Assistance Division makes two value determinations 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 $1.1067 per $100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed in the 2012-13 school year and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total $68.8 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, INEOS 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 $275,00 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 DPISD revenue losses are expected to total approximately $3.2 million. The potential net tax benefits (inclusive of tax credits, but after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to total $65.6 million over the life of the agreement. While legislative changes to ASATR funding could increase the hold-harmless amount owed in the initial years of the agreement, there would still be a substantial tax benefit to INEOS under the value limitation agreement for the remaining years that the limitation is in effect.

Facilities Funding Impact

The INEOS project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with DPISD currently levying a $0.29 per $100 I&S rate. While the value of the INEOS project is expected to depreciate over the life of the agreement, full access to the additional value is expected to increase the District's projected wealth per ADA to $770,349 in the peak year of I&S taxable project value. At its peak taxable value, the project should permit DPISD to reduce its I&S tax rate by an estimated seven cents.

The INEOS project is not expected to affect DPISD in terms of enrollment. Continued expansion of the project and related development could result in additional employment in the area and an increase in the school-age population, but this project is unlikely to have much impact on a stand-alone basis.

Conclusion

The proposed INEOS chemical production facility project enhances the tax base of DPISD. 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 $64.2 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District.) The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of DPISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

Table 1 – Base District Information with INEOS USA LLC Project Value and Limitation Values

Year of Agreement	School Year	ADA	WADA	M&O Tax Rate	I&S Tax Rate	CAD Value with Project	CAD Value with Limitation	CPTD with Project	CPTD With Limitation	CPTD Value with Project per WADA	CPTD Value with Limitation per WADA
Pre-Year 1	2012-13	11,725.53	14,973.78	$1.1067	$0.2900	$7,068,149,122	$7,068,149,122	$7,068,149,122	$7,068,149,122	$472,035	$472,035
1	2013-14	11,725.53	14,973.78	$1.1067	$0.2900	$7,070,458,739	$7,070,458,739	$7,068,149,122	$7,068,149,122	$472,035	$472,035
2	2014-15	11,725.53	14,973.78	$1.1067	$0.2900	$7,173,058,754	$7,173,058,754	$7,070,458,739	$7,070,458,739	$472,189	$472,189
3	2015-16	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.2150	$7,441,101,184	$7,148,149,122	$7,173,058,754	$7,173,058,754	$471,773	$471,773
4	2016-17	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$8,102,871,239	$7,148,149,122	$7,441,101,184	$7,148,149,122	$489,402	$470,135
5	2017-18	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$8,071,661,439	$7,148,149,122	$8,102,871,239	$7,148,149,122	$532,927	$470,135
6	2018-19	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$8,041,396,239	$7,148,149,122	$8,071,661,439	$7,148,149,122	$530,874	$470,135
7	2019-20	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$8,012,046,939	$7,148,149,122	$8,041,396,239	$7,148,149,122	$528,884	$470,135
8	2020-21	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,956,618,639	$7,148,149,122	$8,012,046,939	$7,148,149,122	$526,954	$470,135
9	2021-22	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,904,478,639	$7,148,149,122	$7,956,618,639	$7,148,149,122	$523,308	$470,135
10	2022-23	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,855,430,939	$7,148,149,122	$7,904,478,639	$7,148,149,122	$519,879	$470,135
11	2023-24	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,809,291,439	$7,809,291,439	$7,855,430,939	$7,148,149,122	$516,653	$470,135
12	2024-25	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,765,886,639	$7,765,886,639	$7,809,291,439	$7,809,291,439	$513,618	$513,618
13	2025-26	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,725,053,839	$7,725,053,839	$7,765,886,639	$7,765,886,639	$510,764	$510,764
14	2026-27	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,686,639,739	$7,686,639,739	$7,725,053,839	$7,725,053,839	$508,078	$508,078
15	2027-28	11,725.53	15,204.47	$1.1067	$0.1970	$7,650,500,439	$7,650,500,439	$7,686,639,739	$7,686,639,739	$505,551	$505,551

*Tier II Yield: $47.65; AISD Yield: $59.97; Equalized Wealth: $476,500 per WADA

Table 2– "Baseline Revenue Model"--Project Value Added with No Value Limitation

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
Pre-Year 1	2012-13	$72,951,172	$6,052,764	$3,993,932	$0	$0	$2,734,164	$739,471	$0	$86,471,505
1	2013-14	$72,975,317	$6,052,764	$3,969,787	$0	$0	$2,735,069	$739,716	$0	$86,472,654
2	2014-15	$74,047,883	$6,029,656	$2,920,330	$0	$0	$2,775,268	$749,437	$0	$86,522,574
3	2015-16	$76,964,361	$6,161,429	$1,145,535	$0	$0	$2,884,576	$782,187	$0	$87,938,088
4	2016-17	$84,036,940	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$2,104,733	$3,149,652	$709,844	$0	$90,844,117
5	2017-18	$83,704,019	$4,231,627	$0	$0	-$8,419,566	$3,137,174	$393,071	$0	$83,046,325
6	2018-19	$83,381,174	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$8,113,241	$3,125,074	$405,153	$0	$83,850,575
7	2019-20	$83,068,100	$4,231,627	$0	$0	-$7,816,189	$3,113,341	$416,868	$0	$83,013,746
8	2020-21	$82,476,835	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$7,501,964	$3,091,180	$426,740	$0	$83,545,206
9	2021-22	$81,920,647	$4,231,627	$0	$0	-$6,961,132	$3,070,335	$448,204	$0	$82,709,680
10	2022-23	$81,397,445	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$6,452,225	$3,050,725	$468,403	$0	$83,516,763
11	2023-24	$80,764,215	$4,231,627	$0	$0	-$5,962,942	$3,026,992	$486,561	$0	$82,546,453
12	2024-25	$80,310,467	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$5,513,702	$3,009,986	$504,469	$0	$83,363,636
13	2025-26	$79,883,607	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$5,090,890	$2,993,988	$521,327	$0	$83,360,446
14	2026-27	$79,482,032	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$4,692,955	$2,978,937	$537,194	$0	$83,357,622
15	2027-28	$79,104,237	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$4,318,432	$2,964,777	$552,129	$0	$83,355,125

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	2012-13	$72,951,172	$6,052,764	$3,993,932	$0	$0	$2,734,164	$739,471	$0	$86,471,505
1	2013-14	$72,975,317	$6,052,764	$3,969,787	$0	$0	$2,735,069	$739,716	$0	$86,472,654
2	2014-15	$74,047,883	$6,029,656	$2,920,330	$0	$0	$2,775,268	$749,437	$0	$86,522,574
3	2015-16	$73,839,383	$6,161,429	$4,270,513	$0	$0	$2,767,454	$750,428	$0	$87,789,207
4	2016-17	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$4,007,947	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$87,802,104
5	2017-18	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
6	2018-19	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
7	2019-20	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
8	2020-21	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
9	2021-22	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
10	2022-23	$73,852,728	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$2,767,954	$762,824	$0	$83,794,157
11	2023-24	$80,764,215	$6,410,650	$0	$0	$0	$3,026,992	$834,213	$0	$91,036,070
12	2024-25	$80,310,467	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$5,513,702	$3,009,986	$504,469	$0	$83,363,636
13	2025-26	$79,883,607	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$5,090,890	$2,993,988	$521,327	$0	$83,360,446
14	2026-27	$79,482,032	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$4,692,955	$2,978,937	$537,194	$0	$83,357,622
15	2027-28	$79,104,237	$5,052,415	$0	$0	-$4,318,432	$2,964,777	$552,129	$0	$83,355,125

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	2012-13	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
1	2013-14	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
2	2014-15	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
3	2015-16	-$3,124,978	$0	$3,124,978	$0	$0	-$117,122	-$31,759	$0	-$148,881
4	2016-17	-$10,184,212	$1,358,235	$4,007,947	$0	$2,104,733	-$381,698	$52,981	$0	-$3,042,014
5	2017-18	-$9,851,290	$2,179,023	$0	$0	$8,419,566	-$369,220	$369,753	$0	$747,832
6	2018-19	-$9,528,445	$1,358,235	$0	$0	$8,113,241	-$357,120	$357,672	$0	-$56,418
7	2019-20	-$9,215,372	$2,179,023	$0	$0	$7,816,189	-$345,386	$345,956	$0	$780,411
8	2020-21	-$8,624,106	$1,358,235	$0	$0	$7,501,964	-$323,226	$336,084	$0	$248,951
9	2021-22	-$8,067,918	$2,179,023	$0	$0	$6,961,132	-$302,381	$314,620	$0	$1,084,477
10	2022-23	-$7,544,717	$1,358,235	$0	$0	$6,452,225	-$282,771	$294,422	$0	$277,394
11	2023-24	$0	$2,179,023	$0	$0	$5,962,942	$0	$347,653	$0	$8,489,617
12	2024-25	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
13	2025-26	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
14	2026-27	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
15	2027-28	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the INEOS USA LLC Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to DPISD at $1.1067 M&O Tax Rate

Year of Agreement	School Year	Project Value	Estimated Taxable Value	Value Savings	Assumed M&O Tax Rate	Taxes Before Value Limit	Taxes after Value Limit	Tax Savings @ Projected M&O Rate	Tax Credits for First Two Years Above Limit	Tax Benefit to Company Before Revenue Protection	School District Revenue Losses	Estimated Net Tax Benefits
Pre-Year 1	2012-13	$0	$0	$0	$1.107	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
1	2013-14	$2,309,617	$2,309,617	$0	$1.107	$25,561	$25,561	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
2	2014-15	$104,909,632	$104,909,632	$0	$1.107	$1,161,035	$1,161,035	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
3	2015-16	$372,952,062	$80,000,000	$292,952,062	$1.107	$4,127,460	$885,360	$3,242,100	$0	$3,242,100	-$148,881	$3,093,219
4	2016-17	$1,034,722,117	$80,000,000	$954,722,117	$1.107	$11,451,270	$885,360	$10,565,910	$39,382	$10,605,292	-$3,042,014	$7,563,278
5	2017-18	$1,003,512,317	$80,000,000	$923,512,317	$1.107	$11,105,871	$885,360	$10,220,511	$39,382	$10,259,893	$0	$10,259,893
6	2018-19	$973,247,117	$80,000,000	$893,247,117	$1.107	$10,770,926	$885,360	$9,885,566	$39,382	$9,924,948	-$56,418	$9,868,530
7	2019-20	$943,897,817	$80,000,000	$863,897,817	$1.107	$10,446,117	$885,360	$9,560,757	$39,382	$9,600,139	$0	$9,600,139
8	2020-21	$888,469,517	$80,000,000	$808,469,517	$1.107	$9,832,692	$885,360	$8,947,332	$39,382	$8,986,714	$0	$8,986,714
9	2021-22	$836,329,517	$80,000,000	$756,329,517	$1.107	$9,255,659	$885,360	$8,370,299	$39,382	$8,409,681	$0	$8,409,681
10	2022-23	$787,281,817	$80,000,000	$707,281,817	$1.107	$8,712,848	$885,360	$7,827,488	$39,382	$7,866,870	$0	$7,866,870
11	2023-24	$741,142,317	$741,142,317	$0	$1.107	$8,202,222	$8,202,222	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
12	2024-25	$697,737,517	$697,737,517	$0	$1.107	$7,721,861	$7,721,861	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
13	2025-26	$656,904,717	$656,904,717	$0	$1.107	$7,269,965	$7,269,965	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
14	2026-27	$618,490,617	$618,490,617	$0	$1.107	$6,844,836	$6,844,836	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
15	2027-28	$582,351,317	$582,351,317	$0	$1.107	$6,444,882	$6,444,882	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
					Totals	$113,373,203	$44,753,241	$68,619,963	$275,675	$68,895,638	-$3,247,313	$65,648,325

Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years	Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits
	$0	$275,675	$275,675
	Credits Earned		$275,675
	Credits Paid		$275,675
	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.**