



February 20, 2014

Tom Weeks
Superintendent
Glasscock County Independent School District
P.O. Box 9
Garden City, Texas 79739

Dear Superintendent Weeks:

On November 22, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 383) for a limitation on appraised value under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313¹. This application was originally submitted in November 2013 to the Glasscock County Independent School District (the school district) by Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC (the applicant). This letter presents the results of the Comptroller's review of the application:

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

The school district is currently classified as a rural school district in Category 1 according to the provisions of Chapter 313. Therefore, the applicant properly applied under the provisions of Subchapter C, applicable to rural school districts. The amount of proposed qualified investment (\$360 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 renewable energy facility in Glasscock County, an eligible property use under Section 313.024(b). The Comptroller has determined that the property, as described by the application, meets the requirements of Section 313.024 for eligibility for a limitation on appraised value under Chapter 313, Subchapter C.

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

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

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

correct, finds that the applicant is eligible for a limitation and determines that granting the application is in the best interest of the school district and this state. When approving a job waiver requested under Section 313.025(f-1), the school district must also find that the statutory jobs creation requirement exceeds the industry standard for the number of employees reasonably necessary for the operation of the facility. 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 and a cursory review of the industry standard evidence necessary to support the waiver of the required number of jobs.

Note that any new building or other improvement existing as of the application review start date of November 22, 2013, or any tangible personal property placed in service prior to that date may not become "Qualified Property" as defined by 313.021(2).

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

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

Should you have any questions, please contact Robert Wood, director of Economic Development & Analysis Division, by email at robert.wood@cpa.state.tx.us or by phone at 1-800-531-5441, ext. 3-3973, or direct in Austin at 512-463-3973.

Sincerely,



Martin A. Hubert
Deputy Comptroller

Enclosure

cc: Robert Wood

Economic Impact for Chapter 313 Project

Applicant	Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Renewable Energy
School District	Glasscock County ISD
2012-13 Enrollment in School District	289
County	Glasscock County
Total Investment in District	\$360,000,000
Qualified Investment	\$360,000,000
Limitation Amount	\$30,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	8*
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	8
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	\$966
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	\$965
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	\$50,250
Investment per Qualifying Job	\$45,000,000
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	\$33,675,822
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	\$20,265,526
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):	\$18,715,007
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	\$0
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	\$14,960,815
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	55.6%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	100.0%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit	0.0%
* Applicant is requesting district to waive requirement to create minimum number of qualifying jobs pursuant to Tax Code, 313.025 (f-1).	

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of Bearkat Renewable Energy (the project) applying to Glasscock County 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 eight new jobs when fully operational. All eight jobs will meet the criteria for qualifying jobs as specified in Tax Code Section 313.021(3). According to the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), the regional manufacturing wage for the Permian Basin Regional Planning Council, where Glasscock County is located was \$45,614 in 2013. The annual average manufacturing wage data for 2012-2013 for Glasscock County is not available. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was \$32,201. In addition to an annual average salary of \$52,250 each qualifying position will receive benefits in compliance with the Affordable Care Act, 401(k) retirement savings plan, vacation time, sick leave and skills training. The project's total investment is \$360 million, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of \$45 million.

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

According to Bearkat Renewable Energy's application, they are registered to do business in Texas formed by Tri Global Energy to develop, build, own and operate the Bearkat Renewable Energy Project. Tri Global's management team has a combined 4,100 MW of prior wind turbine purchases and is uniquely qualified to develop and construct wind projects throughout the United States. As such, the development resources necessary to advance the subject 300 MW Bearkat Renewable Energy Project could be redeployed to other renewable energy development projects in other power markets in the United States.

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

During the past two years, seventeen projects in the Permian Basin Regional Planning Council 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 Bearkat Renewable Energy project requires appear to be in line with the focus and themes of the plan. Texas identified renewable energy as one of six target clusters in the Texas Cluster Initiative. The plan stresses the importance of technology in all sectors of the renewable energy industry.

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

Table 1 depicts Bearkat Renewable Energy'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 fifteen 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 Bearkat Renewable Energy

Year	Employment			Personal Income		
	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2015	20	21	41	\$1,005,000	\$995,000	\$2,000,000
2016	188	179	367	\$9,447,000	\$13,553,000	\$23,000,000
2017	8	23	31	\$402,000	\$3,598,000	\$4,000,000
2018	8	15	23	\$402,000	\$2,598,000	\$3,000,000
2019	8	12	20	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2020	8	12	20	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2021	8	15	23	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2022	8	10	18	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2023	8	13	21	\$402,000	\$2,598,000	\$3,000,000
2024	8	12	20	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2025	8	13	21	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2026	8	6	14	\$402,000	\$598,000	\$1,000,000
2027	8	6	14	\$402,000	\$1,598,000	\$2,000,000
2028	8	8	16	\$402,000	\$598,000	\$1,000,000
2029	8	4	12	\$402,000	\$598,000	\$1,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, Bearkat Renewable Energy

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was \$1.65 billion in 2012-2013. Glasscock County ISD's ad valorem tax base in 2012-2013 was \$1.4 billion. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at \$343,155 for fiscal 2012-2013. During that same year, Glasscock County ISD's estimated wealth per WADA was \$2.6 million. The impact on the facilities and finances of the district are presented in Attachment 2.

Table 2 examines the estimated direct impact on ad valorem taxes to the school district, Glasscock County, and Glasscock County Groundwater Conservation District with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from Bearkat Renewable Energy's application. Bearkat Renewable Energy has applied for both a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code and tax abatement with the county. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the Bearkat Renewable Energy project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate ¹	Glasscock County ISD I&S Levy	Glasscock County ISD M&O Levy	Glasscock County ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (Before Credit Credited)	Glasscock County ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (After Credit Credited)	Glasscock County Tax Levy	Glasscock Co. Groundwater Conservation District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
				0.054900	1.037100			0.220000	0.006221	
2015	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2016	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000		\$2,306	\$43,558	\$45,864	\$45,864	\$0	\$0	\$45,864
2017	\$315,000,000	\$30,000,000		\$172,935	\$311,130	\$484,065	\$484,065	\$0	\$0	\$484,065
2018	\$302,400,000	\$30,000,000		\$166,018	\$311,130	\$477,148	\$477,148	\$0	\$0	\$477,148
2019	\$290,304,000	\$30,000,000		\$159,377	\$311,130	\$470,507	\$470,507	\$0	\$0	\$470,507
2020	\$278,691,840	\$30,000,000		\$153,002	\$311,130	\$464,132	\$464,132	\$0	\$0	\$464,132
2021	\$267,544,166	\$30,000,000		\$146,882	\$311,130	\$458,012	\$458,012	\$0	\$0	\$458,012
2022	\$256,842,400	\$30,000,000		\$141,006	\$311,130	\$452,136	\$452,136	\$0	\$0	\$452,136
2023	\$246,568,704	\$30,000,000		\$135,366	\$311,130	\$446,496	\$446,496	\$0	\$0	\$446,496
2024	\$236,705,956	\$30,000,000		\$129,952	\$311,130	\$441,082	\$441,082	\$0	\$0	\$441,082
2025	\$227,237,717	\$227,237,717		\$124,754	\$2,356,682	\$2,481,436	\$2,481,436	\$0	\$0	\$2,481,436
2026	\$218,148,209	\$218,148,209		\$119,763	\$2,262,415	\$2,382,178	\$2,382,178	\$479,926	\$13,571	\$2,862,105
2027	\$209,422,280	\$209,422,280		\$114,973	\$2,171,918	\$2,286,891	\$2,286,891	\$460,729	\$13,028	\$2,747,620
2028	\$201,045,389	\$201,045,389		\$110,374	\$2,085,042	\$2,195,416	\$2,195,416	\$442,300	\$12,507	\$2,637,716
2029	\$193,003,574	\$193,003,574		\$105,959	\$2,001,640	\$2,107,599	\$2,107,599	\$424,608	\$12,007	\$2,532,207
						Total	\$15,192,962	\$1,807,563	\$51,113	\$17,000,524

Assumes School Value Limitation and tax abatement with the County.

Source: CPA, Bearkat Renewable Energy

¹Tax Rate per \$100 Valuation

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O	Tax Rate ¹	Glasscock County ISD I&S Levy	Glasscock County ISD M&O Levy	Glasscock County ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies	Glasscock County Tax Levy	Glasscock Co. Groundwater Conservation District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes	
				0.054900	1.037100		0.220000	0.006221		
2015	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2016	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000		\$2,306	\$43,558	\$45,864	\$9,240	\$261	\$55,104	
2017	\$315,000,000	\$315,000,000		\$172,935	\$3,266,865	\$3,439,800	\$693,000	\$19,596	\$4,132,800	
2018	\$302,400,000	\$302,400,000		\$166,018	\$3,136,190	\$3,302,208	\$665,280	\$18,812	\$3,967,488	
2019	\$290,304,000	\$290,304,000		\$159,377	\$3,010,743	\$3,170,120	\$638,669	\$18,060	\$3,808,788	
2020	\$278,691,840	\$278,691,840		\$153,002	\$2,890,313	\$3,043,315	\$613,122	\$17,337	\$3,656,437	
2021	\$267,544,166	\$267,544,166		\$146,882	\$2,774,701	\$2,921,582	\$588,597	\$16,644	\$3,510,179	
2022	\$256,842,400	\$256,842,400		\$141,006	\$2,663,713	\$2,804,719	\$565,053	\$15,978	\$3,369,772	
2023	\$246,568,704	\$246,568,704		\$135,366	\$2,557,164	\$2,692,530	\$542,451	\$15,339	\$3,234,981	
2024	\$236,705,956	\$236,705,956		\$129,952	\$2,454,877	\$2,584,829	\$520,753	\$14,725	\$3,105,582	
2025	\$227,237,717	\$227,237,717		\$124,754	\$2,356,682	\$2,481,436	\$499,923	\$14,136	\$2,981,359	
2026	\$218,148,209	\$218,148,209		\$119,763	\$2,262,415	\$2,382,178	\$479,926	\$13,571	\$2,862,105	
2027	\$209,422,280	\$209,422,280		\$114,973	\$2,171,918	\$2,286,891	\$460,729	\$13,028	\$2,747,620	
2028	\$201,045,389	\$201,045,389		\$110,374	\$2,085,042	\$2,195,416	\$442,300	\$12,507	\$2,637,716	
2029	\$193,003,574	\$193,003,574		\$105,959	\$2,001,640	\$2,107,599	\$424,608	\$12,007	\$2,532,207	
						Total	\$35,458,487	\$7,143,651	\$202,003	\$42,602,139

Source: CPA, Bearkat Renewable Energy

¹Tax Rate per \$100 Valuation

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

Attachment 2, provided by the district and reviewed by the Texas Education Agency, contains information relating to the financial impact of the proposed project on the finances of the district as well as the tax benefit of the value limitation. "Table 5" in this attachment shows the estimated 15 year M&O tax levy without the value limitation agreement would be \$33,675,822. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is \$20,265,526.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of Glasscock County.

Disclaimer: This examination is based on information from the application submitted to the school district and forwarded to the comptroller. It is intended to meet the statutory requirement of Chapter 313 of the Tax Code and is not intended for any other purpose.

Attachments

1. Schedules A, B, C, and D provided by applicant in application
2. School finance and tax benefit provided by district
3. County Economic Overview

Attachment 1

Schedule A (Rev. May 2010): Investment

Form 50-295

Applicant Name: **Boerkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC**
 ISD Name: **Glascock County ISD**

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS										
(Estimated investment in each year. Do not put cumulative totals.)										
	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year below)	Column A: Tangible Personal Property The amount of new investment (original cost) placed in service during this year	Column B: Building or permanent nonremovable component of building (annual amount only)	Column C: Sum of A and B Qualifying investment (during the qualifying time period)	Column D: Other investment that is not qualified investment but investment affecting economic impact and total value	Column E: Total Investment (A+B+D)			
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)	Year	2014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			
	Investment made before filing complete application with district (neither qualified property nor eligible to become qualified investment)	1	2015-2016	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000		
		2	2016-2017	\$ 349,000,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 350,000,000	\$ -	\$ 350,000,000		
		3	2017-2018	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
	Investment made after filing complete application with district, but before final board approval of application (eligible to become qualified property)	4	2018-2019	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		5	2019-2020	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		6	2020-2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
	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)	7	2021-2022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		8	2022-2023	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		9	2023-2024	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	10	2024-2025	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		11	2025-2026	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		12	2026-2027	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
	Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	13	2027-2028	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
		14	2028-2029	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
15		2029-2030	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			
Credit Settle-Up Period	Post-Settle-Up Period		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			
	Post-Settle-Up Period		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			

Qualifying Time Period usually begins with the final board approval of the application and extends generally for the following two complete tax years.

Column A: This represents the total dollar amount of planned investment in tangible personal property the applicant considers qualified investment - as defined in Tax Code §13.02(1)(A)-(D). For the purposes of investment, please list amount invested each year, not cumulative totals.

Column B: For the years outside the qualifying time period, this number should simply represent the planned investment in tangible personal property. Include estimates of investment for "replacement" property-property that is part of original agreement but scheduled for probable replacement during limitation period.

Column C: 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 §13.02(1)(E).

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

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

Notes: For advanced clean energy projects, nuclear projects, projects with deferred qualifying time periods, and projects with lengthy application review periods, insert additional rows as needed. This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

Carl D. Hirschler 11-22-2013

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE DATE

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

Form 50-296

Applicant Name: Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC
 ISD Name: Glasscock County ISD

Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Qualified Property			Reductions from Market Value	Estimated Taxable Value	
			Estimated Market Value of Land	Estimated Total Market Value of new buildings or other new improvements	Estimated Total Market Value of tangible personal property in the new building or "in or on the new improvement"		Final taxable value for I&S - after all reductions	Final taxable value for M&O - after all reductions
pre-year 1	2014-2015	2014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
1	2015-2016	2015	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	2016-2017	2016	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 4,200,000
3	2017-2018	2017	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ 314,200,000	\$ -	\$ 315,000,000	\$ 30,000,000
4	2018-2019	2018	\$ -	\$ 768,000	\$ 301,632,000	\$ -	\$ 302,400,000	\$ 30,000,000
5	2019-2020	2019	\$ -	\$ 737,280	\$ 289,566,720	\$ -	\$ 290,304,000	\$ 30,000,000
6	2020-2021	2020	\$ -	\$ 707,789	\$ 277,984,051	\$ -	\$ 278,691,840	\$ 30,000,000
7	2021-2022	2021	\$ -	\$ 679,477	\$ 266,864,689	\$ -	\$ 267,544,166	\$ 30,000,000
8	2022-2023	2022	\$ -	\$ 652,298	\$ 256,190,102	\$ -	\$ 256,842,400	\$ 30,000,000
9	2023-2024	2023	\$ -	\$ 626,206	\$ 245,942,498	\$ -	\$ 246,568,704	\$ 30,000,000
10	2024-2025	2024	\$ -	\$ 601,158	\$ 236,104,798	\$ -	\$ 236,705,956	\$ 30,000,000
11	2025-2026	2025	\$ -	\$ 577,112	\$ 226,660,606	\$ -	\$ 227,237,717	\$ 227,237,717
12	2026-2027	2026	\$ -	\$ 554,027	\$ 217,594,181	\$ -	\$ 218,148,209	\$ 218,148,209
13	2027-2028	2027	\$ -	\$ 531,866	\$ 208,990,414	\$ -	\$ 209,422,280	\$ 209,422,280
14	2028-2029	2028	\$ -	\$ 510,591	\$ 200,534,798	\$ -	\$ 201,045,389	\$ 201,045,389
15	2029-2030	2029	\$ -	\$ 490,168	\$ 192,513,406	\$ -	\$ 193,003,574	\$ 193,003,574

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.

Carl P. Heilbrunn

11-22-2013

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE

Schedule C- Application: Employment Information

Form 60-296

Applicant Name: Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC
 ISD Name: Glasscock County ISD

	Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Construction		New Jobs		Qualifying Jobs	
				Column A: Number of Construction FTE's or man-hours (specify)	Column B: Average annual wage rates for construction workers	Column C: Number of new jobs applicant commits to create (cumulative)	Column D: Average annual wage rate for all new jobs.	Column E: Number of qualifying jobs applicant commits to create meeting all criteria of Sec. 313.021(3) (cumulative)	Column F: Average annual wage of qualifying jobs
	pre-year 1	2014-2015	2014			0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	1	2015-2016	2015	20 FTE	\$ 50,250	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
	2	2016-2017	2016	180 FTE	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	3	2017-2018	2017	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	4	2018-2019	2018	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	5	2019-2020	2019	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	6	2020-2021	2020	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	7	2021-2022	2021	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	8	2022-2023	2022	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	9	2023-2024	2023	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	10	2024-2025	2024	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	11	2025-2026	2025	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	12	2026-2027	2026	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	13	2027-2028	2027	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	14	2028-2029	2028	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250
	15	2029-2030	2029	0	N/A	8	\$ 50,250	8	\$ 50,250

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.

Carl D. Heisch
 SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

11-22-2013
 DATE

Attachment 2



1701 North Congress Ave. • Austin, Texas 78701-1494 • 512 463-9734 • 512 463-9838 FAX • www.tea.state.tx.us

Michael Williams
Commissioner

February 14, 2014

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 Bearkat Renewable Energy LLC project on the number and size of school facilities in Glasscock County Independent School District (GCISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and a conversation with the GCISD business manager, Kathy Wheat, the TEA has found that the Bearkat Renewable Energy LLC project would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in GCISD.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Al McKenzie", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk



1701 North Congress Ave. • Austin, Texas 78701-1494 • 512 463-9734 • 512 463-9838 FAX • www.tea.state.tx.us

Michael Williams
Commissioner

February 14, 2014

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 Bearkat Renewable Energy LLC project for the Glasscock County Independent School District (GCISD). Projections prepared by the TEA State Funding Division confirm the analysis that was prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates and provided to us by your division. We believe their assumptions regarding the potential revenue gain are valid, and their estimates of the impact of the Bearkat Renewable Energy LLC project on GCISD are correct.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Al McKenzie".

Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED BEARKAT
RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT, LLC PROJECT ON THE
FINANCES OF THE GLASSCOCK COUNTY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL
DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY
VALUE LIMITATION**

December 11, 2013

Final Report

PREPARED BY



Estimated Impact of the Proposed Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC Project on the Finances of the Glasscock County Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

Introduction

Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC (Bearkat) has requested that the Glasscock County Independent School District (GCISD) 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 GCISD on November 22, 2013, Bearkat proposes to invest \$360 million to construct a new renewable wind energy electric generation project in GCISD.

The Bearkat 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, GCISD may offer a minimum value limitation of \$30 million. The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 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 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. Beginning with the 2017-18 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 could be assessed for debt service taxes on voter-approved bond issues throughout the limitation period, with GCISD currently levying a \$0.0549 per \$100 I&S tax rate. The full taxable value of the investment is expected to reach \$315 million in 2017-18, with depreciation expected to reduce the taxable value of the project over the course of the value limitation agreement.

In the case of the Bearkat 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. GCISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2017-18 school year (-\$414,169), with smaller out-year losses expected during the limitation years.

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated \$18.7 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 audits of appraisal district operations in alternating years. A taxpayer receiving a value limitation pays M&O taxes on the reduced value for the project in years 3-10 and receives a tax bill for I&S taxes based on the full project value throughout the qualifying and value limitation period (and thereafter). The school funding formulas use the Comptroller's property values that reflect a reduction due to the property value limitation in years 4-11 as a result of the one-year lag in property values.

The third year is often problematical financially for a school district that approves a Chapter 313 value limitation. The implementation of the value limitation 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 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 83rd Legislature made significant increases to the basic allotment and other formula changes by appropriation. The ASATR reduction percentage is increased slightly to 92.63 percent, while the basic allotment is increased by \$325 and \$365, respectively, for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. A slight increase in the guaranteed yield for the 6 cents above compressed—known as the Austin yield—is also included. With the basic allotment increase, it is estimated that approximately 300 school districts will still receive ASATR in the 2013-14 school year and 273 districts would do so in the 2014-15 school year. Current state policy calls for ASATR funding to be eliminated by the 2017-18 school year.

GCISD is classified as a formula district under the estimates presented below, indicating that it is not expected to receive ASATR funds under current law. As a formula district, the finances of

GCISD are more susceptible to changes in property values and M&O tax collections like those associated with the implementation of property value limitation agreements.

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

Underlying Assumptions

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

The general approach used here is to maintain static enrollment and property values in order to isolate the effects of the value limitation under the school finance system. The SB 1 basic allotment increases are reflected in the underlying models. The projected taxable values of the Bearkat project are factored into the base model used here in order to simulate the financial impact of constructing the project in the absence of a value limitation agreement. . The impact of the limitation value for the proposed Bearkat project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts are held constant at 276 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the Bearkat project on the finances of GCISD. The District's local tax base reached \$3.2 billion for the 2013 tax year and is maintained at that level for the forecast period in order to isolate the effects of the property value limitation. Previously-approved Chapter 313 agreements are factored into both models presented below. An M&O tax rate of \$1.0371 per \$100 is used throughout this analysis. GCISD has estimated state property wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately \$5.7 million for the 2013-14 school year. The enrollment and property value assumptions for the 15 years that are the subject of this analysis are summarized in Table 1.

School Finance Impact

School finance models were prepared for GCISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2029-30 school year. Beyond the 2014-15 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 Bearkat 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 Bearkat value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2017-18 school year. The results of this model are identified as “Value Limitation Revenue Model” under the revenue protection provisions of the proposed agreement (see Table 3). A summary of the differences between these models is shown in Table 4.

Under these assumptions, GCISD would experience a revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2017-18 school year (-\$414,169). Smaller revenue losses would be expected for the remaining limitation years. The revenue reduction results chiefly from the mechanics of the state property value study—it lags by one year—and the six cents of local tax effort beyond the compressed M&O tax rate that are not subject to recapture.

An examination of Tables 4 and 5 shows that the reductions in M&O taxes associated with the value limitation are largely accomplished through reduced recapture costs for GCISD. These tables show nearly a dollar-for-dollar offset between recapture and net tax savings under 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 property 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 \$1.0371 per \$100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed in 2013-14 and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total \$20.3 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, Bearkat 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, although the current investment schedule included in the application indicates that no tax credits would be earned in the first two qualifying years. .

The key GCISD revenue losses are expected to total approximately \$1.55 million over the course of the agreement. The total potential net tax benefits (after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to reach \$18.7 million over the life of the agreement.

Facilities Funding Impact

The Bearkat project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with GCISD currently levying a \$0.0549 per \$100 I&S rate. While the value of the Bearkat project is expected to depreciate over the life of the agreement and beyond, full access to the additional value is expected to increase the District's projected I&S taxable values to a level that provides a benefit to GCISD and its taxpayers.

The Bearkat project is not expected to affect GCISD 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 Bearkat renewable energy electric generation project enhances the tax base of GCISD. 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 \$18.7 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District.) The additional taxable value also enhances the I& S tax base of GCISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

Table 1 – Base District Information with Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, 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	2014-15	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,284,444,742	\$3,284,444,742	\$3,018,169,660	\$3,018,169,660	\$5,619,758	\$5,619,758
1	2015-16	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,568,904,742	\$3,568,904,742	\$3,091,123,641	\$3,091,123,641	\$5,755,596	\$5,755,596
2	2016-17	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,293,104,742	\$3,293,104,742	\$3,375,583,641	\$3,375,583,641	\$6,285,254	\$6,285,254
3	2017-18	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,603,904,742	\$3,318,904,742	\$3,099,783,641	\$3,099,783,641	\$5,771,721	\$5,771,721
4	2018-19	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,591,304,742	\$3,318,904,742	\$3,410,583,641	\$3,125,583,641	\$6,350,423	\$5,819,760
5	2019-20	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,763,788,666	\$3,503,484,666	\$3,397,983,641	\$3,125,583,641	\$6,326,962	\$5,819,760
6	2020-21	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,748,284,908	\$3,499,593,068	\$3,570,467,565	\$3,310,163,565	\$6,648,123	\$6,163,443
7	2021-22	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,733,323,467	\$3,495,779,301	\$3,554,963,806	\$3,306,271,966	\$6,619,255	\$6,156,197
8	2022-23	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,734,839,210	\$3,507,996,810	\$3,540,002,366	\$3,302,458,200	\$6,591,398	\$6,149,096
9	2023-24	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,731,003,773	\$3,514,435,069	\$3,541,518,109	\$3,314,675,709	\$6,594,220	\$6,171,845
10	2024-25	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,856,330,158	\$3,649,624,202	\$3,537,682,671	\$3,321,113,967	\$6,587,078	\$6,183,833
11	2025-26	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,826,159,334	\$3,826,159,334	\$3,663,009,057	\$3,456,303,101	\$6,820,433	\$6,435,552
12	2026-27	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,796,472,991	\$3,796,472,991	\$3,632,838,232	\$3,632,838,232	\$6,764,256	\$6,764,256
13	2027-28	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,767,259,247	\$3,767,259,247	\$3,603,151,889	\$3,603,151,889	\$6,708,980	\$6,708,980
14	2028-29	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,738,501,034	\$3,738,501,034	\$3,573,938,146	\$3,573,938,146	\$6,654,585	\$6,654,585
15	2029-30	275.57	537.06	\$1.0371	\$0.0549	\$3,712,119,477	\$3,712,119,477	\$3,545,179,933	\$3,545,179,933	\$6,601,038	\$6,601,038

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	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	2014-15	\$32,077,528	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,488,427	\$1,969,759	\$0	\$0	\$5,655,238
1	2015-16	\$34,801,397	\$96,379	\$0	-\$31,029,450	\$2,137,022	\$0	\$0	\$6,005,348
2	2016-17	\$32,160,452	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,809,693	\$1,974,851	\$0	\$0	\$5,421,988
3	2017-18	\$35,192,237	\$96,379	\$0	-\$31,393,226	\$2,161,022	\$0	\$0	\$6,056,412
4	2018-19	\$35,069,122	\$96,379	\$0	-\$31,508,177	\$2,153,462	\$0	\$0	\$5,810,786
5	2019-20	\$36,718,392	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,017,836	\$2,254,737	\$0	\$0	\$6,051,671
6	2020-21	\$36,567,666	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,991,291	\$2,245,481	\$0	\$0	\$5,918,234
7	2021-22	\$36,422,223	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,847,394	\$2,236,550	\$0	\$0	\$5,907,758
8	2022-23	\$36,434,646	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,849,618	\$2,237,313	\$0	\$0	\$5,918,719
9	2023-24	\$36,395,911	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,814,786	\$2,234,935	\$0	\$0	\$5,912,439
10	2024-25	\$37,594,057	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,918,876	\$2,308,508	\$0	\$0	\$6,080,068
11	2025-26	\$37,264,759	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,691,639	\$2,288,287	\$0	\$0	\$5,957,786
12	2026-27	\$36,980,495	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,410,661	\$2,270,832	\$0	\$0	\$5,937,045
13	2027-28	\$36,700,756	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,134,134	\$2,253,654	\$0	\$0	\$5,916,655
14	2028-29	\$36,425,380	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,861,901	\$2,236,744	\$0	\$0	\$5,896,602
15	2029-30	\$36,172,761	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,610,942	\$2,221,232	\$0	\$0	\$5,879,430

*Basic Allotment: \$5,040; AISD Yield: \$61.86; Equalized Wealth: \$504,000 per WADA

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	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	2014-15	\$32,077,528	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,488,427	\$1,969,759	\$0	\$0	\$5,655,238
1	2015-16	\$34,801,397	\$96,379	\$0	-\$31,029,450	\$2,137,022	\$0	\$0	\$6,005,348
2	2016-17	\$32,160,452	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,809,693	\$1,974,851	\$0	\$0	\$5,421,988
3	2017-18	\$32,407,502	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,851,660	\$1,990,022	\$0	\$0	\$5,642,243
4	2018-19	\$32,407,502	\$96,379	\$0	-\$28,870,705	\$1,990,022	\$0	\$0	\$5,623,197
5	2019-20	\$34,174,962	\$96,379	\$0	-\$30,485,101	\$2,098,555	\$0	\$0	\$5,884,795
6	2020-21	\$34,137,698	\$96,379	\$0	-\$30,585,153	\$2,096,266	\$0	\$0	\$5,745,190
7	2021-22	\$34,101,179	\$96,379	\$0	-\$30,548,985	\$2,094,024	\$0	\$0	\$5,742,597
8	2022-23	\$34,218,168	\$96,379	\$0	-\$30,653,795	\$2,101,208	\$0	\$0	\$5,761,960
9	2023-24	\$34,279,818	\$96,379	\$0	-\$30,718,717	\$2,104,993	\$0	\$0	\$5,762,473
10	2024-25	\$35,574,333	\$96,379	\$0	-\$31,912,082	\$2,184,485	\$0	\$0	\$5,943,115
11	2025-26	\$37,264,759	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,561,104	\$2,288,287	\$0	\$0	\$6,088,321
12	2026-27	\$36,980,495	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,410,661	\$2,270,832	\$0	\$0	\$5,937,045
13	2027-28	\$36,700,756	\$96,379	\$0	-\$33,134,134	\$2,253,654	\$0	\$0	\$5,916,655
14	2028-29	\$36,425,380	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,861,901	\$2,236,744	\$0	\$0	\$5,896,602
15	2029-30	\$36,172,761	\$96,379	\$0	-\$32,610,942	\$2,221,232	\$0	\$0	\$5,879,430

*Basic Allotment: \$5,040; AISD Yield: \$61.86; Equalized Wealth: \$504,000 per WADA

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	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	2014-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2015-16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2016-17	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2017-18	-\$2,784,735	\$0	\$0	\$2,541,566	-\$171,000	\$0	\$0	-\$414,169
4	2018-19	-\$2,661,620	\$0	\$0	\$2,637,472	-\$163,440	\$0	\$0	-\$187,588
5	2019-20	-\$2,543,430	\$0	\$0	\$2,532,736	-\$156,182	\$0	\$0	-\$166,876
6	2020-21	-\$2,429,968	\$0	\$0	\$2,406,139	-\$149,215	\$0	\$0	-\$173,044
7	2021-22	-\$2,321,044	\$0	\$0	\$2,298,409	-\$142,526	\$0	\$0	-\$165,161
8	2022-23	-\$2,216,478	\$0	\$0	\$2,195,824	-\$136,105	\$0	\$0	-\$156,759
9	2023-24	-\$2,116,093	\$0	\$0	\$2,096,069	-\$129,942	\$0	\$0	-\$149,966
10	2024-25	-\$2,019,724	\$0	\$0	\$2,006,793	-\$124,023	\$0	\$0	-\$136,954
11	2025-26	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,535	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,535
12	2026-27	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2027-28	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2028-29	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2029-30	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 5 - Estimated Financial Impact of the Bearkat Renewable Energy Project, LLC Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to GCISD at \$1.0371 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	2014-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.037	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1	2015-16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.037	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	2016-17	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$0	\$1.037	\$43,558	\$43,558	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	2017-18	\$315,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$285,000,000	\$1.037	\$3,266,865	\$311,130	\$2,955,735	\$0	\$2,955,735	-\$414,169	\$2,541,566
4	2018-19	\$302,400,000	\$30,000,000	\$272,400,000	\$1.037	\$3,136,190	\$311,130	\$2,825,060	\$0	\$2,825,060	-\$187,588	\$2,637,472
5	2019-20	\$290,304,000	\$30,000,000	\$260,304,000	\$1.037	\$3,010,743	\$311,130	\$2,699,613	\$0	\$2,699,613	-\$166,876	\$2,532,736
6	2020-21	\$278,691,840	\$30,000,000	\$248,691,840	\$1.037	\$2,890,313	\$311,130	\$2,579,183	\$0	\$2,579,183	-\$173,044	\$2,406,139
7	2021-22	\$267,544,166	\$30,000,000	\$237,544,166	\$1.037	\$2,774,701	\$311,130	\$2,463,571	\$0	\$2,463,571	-\$165,161	\$2,298,410
8	2022-23	\$256,842,400	\$30,000,000	\$226,842,400	\$1.037	\$2,663,713	\$311,130	\$2,352,583	\$0	\$2,352,583	-\$156,759	\$2,195,823
9	2023-24	\$246,568,704	\$30,000,000	\$216,568,704	\$1.037	\$2,557,164	\$311,130	\$2,246,034	\$0	\$2,246,034	-\$149,966	\$2,096,068
10	2024-25	\$236,705,956	\$30,000,000	\$206,705,956	\$1.037	\$2,454,877	\$311,130	\$2,143,747	\$0	\$2,143,747	-\$136,954	\$2,006,794
11	2025-26	\$227,237,717	\$227,237,717	\$0	\$1.037	\$2,356,682	\$2,356,682	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	2026-27	\$218,148,209	\$218,148,209	\$0	\$1.037	\$2,262,415	\$2,262,415	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	2027-28	\$209,422,280	\$209,422,280	\$0	\$1.037	\$2,171,918	\$2,171,918	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	2028-29	\$201,045,389	\$201,045,389	\$0	\$1.037	\$2,085,042	\$2,085,042	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	2029-30	\$193,003,574	\$193,003,574	\$0	\$1.037	\$2,001,640	\$2,001,640	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
						\$33,675,822	\$13,410,296	\$20,265,526	\$0	\$20,265,526	-\$1,550,519	\$18,715,007

Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years

	Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits
	\$0	\$0	\$0
Credits Earned			\$0
Credits Paid			\$0
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, the same year the value limitation would take effect under this application. Additional information on the assumptions used in preparing these estimates is provided in the narrative of this Report.

Attachment 3

Glasscock County

Population

- Total county population in 2010 for Glasscock County: 1,236 , up 0.4 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- Glasscock County was the state's 245th largest county in population in 2010 and the 158 th fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- Glasscock County's population in 2009 was 64.9 percent Anglo (above the state average of 46.7 percent), 0.7 percent African-American (below the state average of 11.3 percent) and 34.1 percent Hispanic (below the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in Glasscock County:

Economy and Income

Employment

- September 2011 total employment in Glasscock County: 601 , unchanged 0.0 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 Glasscock County unemployment rate: 5.7 percent, up from 5.4 percent in September 2010. The statewide unemployment rate for September 2011 was 8.5 percent, up from 8.2 percent in September 2010.
- September 2011 unemployment rate in the city of:

(Note: County and state unemployment rates are adjusted for seasonal fluctuations, but the Texas Workforce Commission city unemployment rates are not. Seasonally-adjusted unemployment rates are not comparable with unadjusted rates).

Income

- Glasscock County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 45th with an average per capita income of \$38,371, up 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 Glasscock County averaged \$39.39 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were up 62.0 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in Glasscock County during 2010 included:
 - Pecans
 - Other Beef
 - Hunting
 - Cottonseed
 - Cotton
- 2011 oil and gas production in Glasscock County: 3.7 million barrels of oil and 12.1 million Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 1338 producing oil wells and 113 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 Glasscock County during the fourth quarter 2010: \$1.26 million, up 107.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Taxable Sales through the end of 4th quarter 2010 (January 2010 through December 30, 2010)

- Taxable sales in Glasscock County through the fourth quarter of 2010: \$3.03 million, up 49.0 percent from the same period in 2009.
- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:

Annual (2010)

- Taxable sales in Glasscock County during 2010: \$3.03 million, up 49.0 percent from 2009.
- Glasscock County sent an estimated \$189,309.13 (or 0.00 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.
- Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:

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 Glasscock County based on the sales activity month of August 2011:
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:

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 Glasscock County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011:
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:

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

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 Glasscock County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011:
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:

City Calendar Year-To-Date (RJ 2011)

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

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 Glasscock County based on sales activity months in 2010:
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:

Property Tax

- As of January 2009, property values in Glasscock County: \$1.23 billion, down 2.0 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in Glasscock County is \$1,009,745, above the statewide average of \$85,809. About 75.2 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

State Expenditures

- Glasscock County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 252nd. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: \$1.53 million, down 0.5 percent from FY2009.
- In Glasscock County, 5 state agencies provide a total of 12 jobs and \$98,486.00 in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):
 - AgriLife Extension Service
 - Department of State Health Services
 - Department of Transportation
 - Texas A & M University

Higher Education

- Community colleges in Glasscock County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - None.

- Glasscock County is in the service area of the following:
 - Howard County Junior College with a fall 2010 enrollment of 4,685 . Counties in the service area include:
 - Coke County
 - Concho County
 - Dawson County
 - Glasscock County
 - Howard County
 - Irion County
 - Kimble County
 - Martin County
 - Menard County
 - Schleicher County
 - Sterling County
 - Sutton County
 - Tom Green County

- Institutions of higher education in Glasscock County fall 2010 enrollment:
 - None.

School Districts

- Glasscock County had 1 school districts with 2 schools and 274 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.)
 - Glasscock County ISD had 274 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was \$47,905. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 87 percent.