SUSAN COMBS

TEXAS COMPTROLLER *of* PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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

June 26, 2013

David Carr
Superintendent
Stanton Independent School District
200 N. College
Stanton, Texas 79782

Dear Superintendent Carr:

On April 1, 2013, the Comptroller received the completed application (Application # 275) for a limitation on appraised value under the provisions of Tax Code Chapter 313[1]. This application was originally submitted in November 2012 to the Stanton Independent School District (the school district) by DCP Midstream, LP (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 2 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 ($100 million) is consistent with the proposed appraised value limitation sought ($20 million). The property value limitation amount noted in this recommendation is based on property values available at the time of application and may change prior to the execution of any final agreement.

The applicant is an active franchise taxpayer in good standing, as required by Section 313.024(a), and is proposing the construction of a manufacturing facility in Martin County, an eligible property use under Section 313.024(b). The Comptroller has determined that the property, as described in the application, meets the requirements of Section 313.024 for eligibility for a limitation on appraised value under Chapter 313, Subchapter C.

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

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

[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. As stated above, the Comptroller's recommendation is prepared by generally reviewing the application and supporting documentation in light of the Section 313.026 criteria.

Note that any new building or other improvement existing as of the application review start date of April 1, 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	DCP Midstream, LP
Tax Code, 313.024 Eligibility Category	Manufacturing
School District	Stanton ISD
2011- 2012 Enrollment in School District	787
County	Martin
Total Investment in District	$100,000,000
Qualified Investment	$100,000,000
Limitation Amount	$20,000,000
Number of total jobs committed to by applicant	10
Number of qualifying jobs committed to by applicant	10
Average Weekly Wage of Qualifying Jobs committed to by applicant	$942
Minimum Weekly Wage Required Tax Code, 313.051(b)	$938
Minimum Annual Wage committed to by applicant for qualified jobs	$49,000
Investment per Qualifying Job	$10,000,000
Estimated 15 year M&O levy without any limit or credit:	$9,235,030
Estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit	$5,053,641
Estimated 15 year M&O tax benefit (after deductions for estimated school district revenue protection--but not including any deduction for supplemental payments or extraordinary educational expenses):	$5,053,603
Tax Credits (estimated - part of total tax benefit in the two lines above - appropriated through Foundation School Program)	$1,281,339
Net M&O Tax (15 years) After Limitation, Credits and Revenue Protection:	$4,181,427
Tax benefit as a percentage of what applicant would have paid without value limitation agreement (percentage exempted)	54.7%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the limitation	74.6%
Percentage of tax benefit due to the credit.	25.4%

This presents the Comptroller's economic impact evaluation of DCP Midstream, LP (the project) applying to Stanton 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 10 new jobs when fully operational. All 10 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 Commission Region, where Martin County is located was $44,349 in 2011. There is no annual average manufacturing wage for 2011-2012 for Martin County. That same year, the county annual average wage for all industries was $41,145. In addition to a salary of $49,000, each qualifying position will receive medical, dental and vision plans, 401(k) and retirement plans, life insurance, short and long term disability insurance, education assistance, scholarship program, holidays and vacation, wellness program, matching gifts and a short term incentive plan. The project's total investment is $100 million, resulting in a relative level of investment per qualifying job of $10 million.

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

According to DCP Midstream, LP's application, "DCP Midstream is the largest producer of natural gas liquids in North America and has significant pipeline infrastructure throughout Texas. This infrastructure provides DCP Midstream with the flexibility and opportunity to invest in a variety of regions in Texas and neighboring states. Currently, DCP Midstream owns and operates 61 gas plants in 18 states. Capital investment is granted to projects that generate the best economic return for DCP Midstream. Currently, several projects in Louisiana, New Mexico and Colorado are competing with Texas projects for company investment."

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

During the past two years, six projects in the Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission Region applied for value limitation agreements under Tax Code, Chapter 313.

Relationship of applicant's industry and jobs and Texas's economic growth plans [313.026(5)]

The Texas Economic Development Plan focuses on attracting and developing industries using technology. It also identifies opportunities for existing Texas industries. The plan centers on promoting economic prosperity throughout Texas and the skilled workers that the DCP Midstream, LP project requires appear to be in line with the focus and themes of the plan. Texas identified manufacturing as one of six target clusters in the Texas Cluster Initiative. The plan stresses the importance of technology in all sectors of the manufacturing industry.

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

Table 1 depicts DCP Midstream, LP's estimated economic impact to Texas. It depicts the direct, indirect and induced effects to employment and personal income within the state. The Comptroller's office calculated the economic impact based on 16 years of annual investment and employment levels using software from Regional Economic Models, Inc. (REMI). The impact includes the construction period and the operating period of the project.

Table 1: Estimated Statewide Economic Impact of Investment and Employment in DCP Midstream, LP

	Employment			Personal Income		
Year	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect + Induced	Total
2013	11	24	35	$563,125	$1,436,875	$2,000,000
2014	120	149	269	$6,216,250	$9,783,750	$16,000,000
2015	16	48	64	$808,125	$4,191,875	$5,000,000
2016	10	37	47	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2017	10	33	43	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2018	10	31	41	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2019	10	29	39	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2020	10	35	45	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2021	10	37	47	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2022	10	33	43	$490,000	$3,510,000	$4,000,000
2023	10	35	45	$490,000	$4,510,000	$5,000,000
2024	10	37	47	$490,000	$4,510,000	$5,000,000
2025	10	37	47	$490,000	$4,510,000	$5,000,000
2026	10	37	47	$490,000	$5,510,000	$6,000,000
2027	10	37	47	$490,000	$5,510,000	$6,000,000
2028	10	37	47	$490,000	$5,510,000	$6,000,000

Source: CPA, REMI, DCP Midstream, LP

The statewide average ad valorem tax base for school districts in Texas was $1.72 billion in 2011-2012. Stanton ISD's ad valorem tax base in 2011-2012 was $1.06 billion. The statewide average wealth per WADA was estimated at $347,943 for fiscal 2011-2012. During that same year, Stanton ISD's estimated wealth per WADA was $845,948. 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, Martin County, City of Stanton, Martin County Hospital District, and Permian Basin Underground Water District with all property tax incentives sought being granted using estimated market value from DCP Midstream, LP's application. DCP Midstream, LP has applied only for a value limitation under Chapter 313, Tax Code. Table 3 illustrates the estimated tax impact of the DCP Midstream, LP project on the region if all taxes are assessed.

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

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O		Stanton ISD I&S Levy	Stanton ISD M&O Levy	Stanton ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (Before Credit Credited)	Stanton ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies (After Credit Credited)	Martin County Tax Levy	City of Stanton Tax Levy	Martin County Hospital District Tax Levy	Permian Basin Underground Water District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
			Tax Rate[1]	0.0490	0.9133			0.2177	1.1700	0.1419	0.0070	
2014	$90,023,850	$90,023,850		$44,112	$822,188	$866,300	$866,300	$196,003	$1,053,279	$127,744	$6,322	$1,062,302
2015	$90,273,850	$90,273,850		$44,234	$824,471	$868,705	$868,705	$196,547	$1,056,204	$128,099	$6,340	$1,065,252
2016	$85,523,850	$20,000,000		$41,907	$182,660	$224,567	$224,567	$186,205	$1,000,629	$121,358	$6,006	$410,772
2017	$80,773,850	$20,000,000		$39,579	$182,660	$222,239	$111,321	$175,863	$945,054	$114,618	$5,673	$287,184
2018	$76,023,850	$20,000,000		$37,252	$182,660	$219,912	$110,146	$165,521	$889,479	$107,878	$5,339	$275,667
2019	$74,123,850	$20,000,000		$36,321	$182,660	$218,981	$109,676	$161,385	$867,249	$105,182	$5,206	$271,060
2020	$71,273,850	$20,000,000		$34,924	$182,660	$217,584	$108,970	$155,180	$833,904	$101,138	$5,006	$264,150
2021	$66,523,850	$20,000,000		$32,597	$182,660	$215,257	$107,795	$144,838	$778,329	$94,397	$4,672	$252,632
2022	$61,773,850	$20,000,000		$30,269	$182,660	$212,929	$106,619	$134,496	$722,754	$87,657	$4,338	$241,115
2023	$57,023,850	$20,000,000		$27,942	$182,660	$210,602	$105,444	$124,154	$667,179	$80,917	$4,005	$229,598
2024	$57,023,850	$57,023,850		$27,942	$520,799	$548,741	$24,935	$124,154	$667,179	$80,917	$4,005	$149,089
2025	$54,173,850	$54,173,850		$26,545	$494,770	$521,315	$521,315	$117,949	$633,834	$76,873	$3,805	$639,264
2026	$50,373,850	$50,373,850		$24,683	$460,064	$484,748	$484,748	$109,675	$589,374	$71,480	$3,538	$594,423
2027	$48,863,350	$48,863,350		$23,943	$446,269	$470,212	$470,212	$106,387	$571,701	$69,337	$3,432	$576,599
2028	$47,398,165	$47,398,165		$23,225	$432,887	$456,113	$456,113	$103,197	$554,559	$67,258	$3,329	$559,309
						Total	$4,676,863	$2,201,553	$11,830,707	$1,434,852	$71,015	$6,878,416
Assumes School Value Limitation.												

Source: CPA, DCP Midstream, LP
[1]Tax Rate per $100 Valuation

Table 3 Estimated Direct Ad Valorem Taxes without property tax incentives

Year	Estimated Taxable Value for I&S	Estimated Taxable Value for M&O		Stanton ISD I&S Levy	Stanton ISD M&O Levy		Stanton ISD M&O and I&S Tax Levies	Martin County Tax Levy	City of Stanton Tax Levy	Martin County Hospital District Tax Levy	Permian Basin Underground Water District Tax Levy	Estimated Total Property Taxes
			Tax Rate[1]	0.0490	0.9133			0.2177	1.1700	0.1419	0.0070	
2014	$90,023,850	$90,023,850		$44,112	$822,188		$866,300	$196,003	$1,053,279	$127,744	$6,322	$1,062,302
2015	$90,273,850	$90,273,850		$44,234	$824,471		$868,705	$196,547	$1,056,204	$128,099	$6,340	$1,065,252
2016	$85,523,850	$85,523,850		$41,907	$781,089		$822,996	$186,205	$1,000,629	$121,358	$6,006	$1,009,201
2017	$80,773,850	$80,773,850		$39,579	$737,708		$777,287	$175,863	$945,054	$114,618	$5,673	$953,150
2018	$76,023,850	$76,023,850		$37,252	$694,326		$731,578	$165,521	$889,479	$107,878	$5,339	$897,099
2019	$74,123,850	$74,123,850		$36,321	$676,973		$713,294	$161,385	$867,249	$105,182	$5,206	$874,678
2020	$71,273,850	$71,273,850		$34,924	$650,944		$685,868	$155,180	$833,904	$101,138	$5,006	$841,048
2021	$66,523,850	$66,523,850		$32,597	$607,562		$640,159	$144,838	$778,329	$94,397	$4,672	$784,997
2022	$61,773,850	$61,773,850		$30,269	$564,181		$594,450	$134,496	$722,754	$87,657	$4,338	$728,946
2023	$57,023,850	$57,023,850		$27,942	$520,799		$548,741	$124,154	$667,179	$80,917	$4,005	$672,895
2024	$57,023,850	$57,023,850		$27,942	$520,799		$548,741	$124,154	$667,179	$80,917	$4,005	$672,895
2025	$54,173,850	$54,173,850		$26,545	$494,770		$521,315	$117,949	$633,834	$76,873	$3,805	$639,264
2026	$50,373,850	$50,373,850		$24,683	$460,064		$484,748	$109,675	$589,374	$71,480	$3,538	$594,423
2027	$48,863,350	$48,863,350		$23,943	$446,269		$470,212	$106,387	$571,701	$69,337	$3,432	$576,599
2028	$47,398,165	$47,398,165		$23,225	$432,887		$456,113	$103,197	$554,559	$67,258	$3,329	$559,309
						Total	$9,730,504	$2,201,553	$11,830,707	$1,434,852	$71,015	$11,932,057

Source: CPA, DCP Midstream, LP
[1]Tax Rate per $100 Valuation

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

Attachment 2, provided by the district and reviewed by the Texas Education Agency, contains information relating to the financial impact of the proposed project on the finances of the district as well as the tax benefit of the value limitation. "Table 5" in this attachment shows the estimated 15 year M&O tax levy without the value limitation agreement would be $9,235,030. The estimated gross 15 year M&O tax benefit, or levy loss, is $5,053,641.

Attachment 3 is an economic overview of Martin 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

Applicant Name DCP MIDSTREAM LP

ISD Name STANTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Form 50-296

PROPERTY INVESTMENT AMOUNTS

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

		Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year below) YYYY	Column A: Tangible Personal Property 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)	Investment made before filing complete application with district (neither qualified property nor eligible to become qualified investment)								$ -
	Investment made after filing complete application with district, but before final board approval of application (eligible to become qualified property)								$ -
	Investment made after final board approval of application and before Jan. 1 of first complete tax year of qualifying time period (qualified investment and eligible to become qualified property)		2013-2014	2013	$ 5,000,000.00		$ 5,000,000.00		$ 5,000,000.00
	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	$ 90,000,000.00		$ 90,000,000.00		$ 90,000,000.00
		2	2015-2016	2015	$ 5,000,000.00		$ 5,000,000.00		$ 5,000,000.00
	Value Limitation Period	3	2016-2017	2016	$ -				$ -
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)		4	2017-2018	2017	$ -				$ -
		5	2018-2019	2018	$ -				$ -
		6	2019-2020	2019	$ -				$ -
		7	2020-2021	2020	$ -				$ -
		8	2021-2022	2021	$ -				$ -
		9	2022-2023	2022	$ -				$ -
		10	2023-2024	2023	$ -				$ -
Credit Settle-Up Period	Continue to Maintain Viable Presence	11	2024-2025	2024	$ -				$ -
		12	2025-2026	2025	$ -				$ -
		13	2026-2027	2026	$ -				$ -
Post- Settle-Up Period		14	2027-2028	2027	$ -				$ -
Post- Settle-Up Period		15	2028-2029	2028	$ -				$ -

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

Column A: This represents the total dollar amount of planned investment in tangible personal property the applicant considers qualified investment - as defined in Tax Code §313.021(1)(A)-(D).
For the purposes of investment, please list amount invested each year, not cumulative totals.
[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 B: The total dollar amount of planned investment each year in buildings or nonremovable component of buildings that the applicant considers qualified investment under Tax Code §313.021(1)(E).
For the years outside the qualifying time period, this number should simply represent the planned investment in new buildings or nonremovable components of buildings.

Column D: Dollar value of other investment that may not be qualified investment but that may affect economic impact and total value-for planning, construction and operation of the facility.
The most significant example for many projects would be land. Other examples may be items such as professional services, etc.
Note: Land can be listed as part of investment during the "pre-year 1" time period. It cannot be part of qualifying investment.

Notes: For advanced clean energy projects, nuclear projects, projects with deferred qualifying time periods, and projects with lengthy application review periods, insert additional rows as needed.

This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

[signature] 2-22-13

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE DATE

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

Applicant Name DCP MIDSTREAM LP
ISD Name STANTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Form 50-296

					Qualified Property			Reductions from Market Value	Estimated Taxable Value	
		Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Estimated Market Value of Land	Estimated Total Market Value of new buildings or other new improvements	Estimated Total Market Value of tangible personal property in the new building or "in or on the new improvement"	Exempted Value	Final taxable value for I&S - after all reductions	Final taxable value for M&O—after all reductions
		pre- year 1	2013-2014	2013	$ 23,850	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 23,850	$ 23,850
	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 90,000,000	$ -	$ 90,023,850	$ 90,023,850
		2	2015-2016	2015	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 95,000,000	$ 4,750,000	$ 90,273,850	$ 90,273,850
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)	Value Limitation Period	3	2016-2017	2016	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 90,000,000	$ 4,500,000	$ 85,523,850	$ 20,000,000
		4	2017-2018	2017	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 85,000,000	$ 4,250,000	$ 80,773,850	$ 20,000,000
		5	2018-2019	2018	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 80,000,000	$ 4,000,000	$ 76,023,850	$ 20,000,000
		6	2019-2020	2019	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 78,000,000	$ 3,900,000	$ 74,123,850	$ 20,000,000
		7	2020-2021	2020	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 75,000,000	$ 3,750,000	$ 71,273,850	$ 20,000,000
		8	2021-2022	2021	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 70,000,000	$ 3,500,000	$ 66,523,850	$ 20,000,000
		9	2022-2023	2022	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 65,000,000	$ 3,250,000	$ 61,773,850	$ 20,000,000
		10	2023-2024	2023	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 60,000,000	$ 3,000,000	$ 57,023,850	$ 20,000,000
Credit Settle-Up Period	Continue to Maintain Viable Presence	11	2024-2025	2024	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 60,000,000	$ 3,000,000	$ 57,023,850	$ 57,023,850
		12	2025-2026	2025	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 57,000,000	$ 2,850,000	$ 54,173,850	$ 54,173,850
		13	2026-2027	2026	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 53,000,000	$ 2,650,000	$ 50,373,850	$ 50,373,850
Post- Settle-Up Period		14	2027-2028	2027	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 51,410,000	$ 2,570,500	$ 48,863,350	$ 48,863,350
Post- Settle-Up Period		15	2028-2029	2028	$ 23,850	$ -	$ 49,867,700	$ 2,493,385	$ 47,398,165	$ 47,398,165

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.

K [signature]

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

2-22-13

DATE

Schedule C- Application: Employment Information

Applicant Name DCP MIDSTREAM LP
ISD Name STANTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Form 50-296

		Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax Year (Fill in actual tax year) YYYY	Construction: Column A: Number of Construction FTE's or man-hours (specify)	Construction: Column B: Average annual wage rates for construction workers	New Jobs: Column C: Number of new jobs applicant commits to create (cumulative)	New Jobs: Column D: Average annual wage rate for all new jobs.	Qualifying Jobs: Column E: Number of qualifying jobs applicant commits to create meeting all criteria of Sec. 313.021(3) (cumulative)	Qualifying Jobs: Column F: Average annual wage of qualifying jobs
		pre- year 1	2013-2014	2013	12,725 hrs	$25/hr	5	$ 49,000.00	5	$ 49,000.00
	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	229,050 hrs	$25/hr	10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		2	2015-2016	2015	12,725 hrs	$25/hr	10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
	Value Limitation Period	3	2016-2017	2016			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)		4	2017-2018	2017			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		5	2018-2019	2018			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		6	2019-2020	2019			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		7	2020-2021	2020			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		8	2021-2022	2021			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		9	2022-2023	2022			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		10	2023-2024	2023			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
Credit Settle-Up Period	Continue to Maintain Viable Presence	11	2024-2025	2024			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		12	2025-2026	2025			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
		13	2026-2027	2026			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
Post- Settle-Up Period		14	2027-2028	2027			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00
Post- Settle-Up Period		15	2028-2029	2028			10	$ 49,000.00	10	$ 49,000.00

Notes: For job definitions see TAC §9.1051(14) and Tax Code §313.021(3).

This schedule must be submitted with the original application and any application for tax credit. When using this schedule for any purpose other than the original application, replace original estimates with actual appraisal district data for past years and update estimates for current and future years. If original estimates have not changed, enter those amounts for future years.

R. [signature]

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

2-22-13

DATE

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

Applicant Name DCP MIDSTREAM LP

ISD Name STANTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTR Form 50-296

					Sales Tax Information		Franchise Tax	Other Property Tax Abatements Sought			
					Sales Taxable Expenditures		Franchise Tax	County	City	Hospital	Other
		Year	School Year (YYYY-YYYY)	Tax/ Calendar Year YYYY	Column F: Estimate of total annual expenditures* subject to state sales tax	Column G: Estimate of total annual expenditures* made in Texas NOT subject to sales tax	Column H: Estimate of Franchise tax due from (or attributable to) the applicant	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement	Fill in percentage exemption requested or granted in each year of the Agreement
The year preceding the first complete tax year of the qualifying time period (assuming no deferrals)			2013-2014	2013	$ 50,000	$ 100,050,000	$ 5,300,000				
	Complete tax years of qualifying time period	1	2014-2015	2014	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		2	2015-2016	2015	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
	Value Limitation Period	3	2016-2017	2016	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
Tax Credit Period (with 50% cap on credit)		4	2017-2018	2017	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		5	2018-2019	2018	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		6	2019-2020	2019	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		7	2020-2021	2020	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		8	2021-2022	2021	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		9	2022-2023	2022	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		10	2023-2024	2023	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
Credit Settle-Up Period	Continue to Maintain Viable Presence	11	2024-2025	2024	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		12	2025-2026	2025	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
		13	2026-2027	2026	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
Post- Settle-Up Period		14	2027-2028	2027	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				
Post- Settle-Up Period		15	2028-2029	2028	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 5,300,000				

*For planning, construction and operation of the facility.

K [signature]

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE

2-22-13

DATE

Attachment 2

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

Michael L. Williams
Commissioner

June 12, 2013

Mr. Robert Wood
Director, Economic Development and Analysis
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Lyndon B. Johnson State Office Building
111 East 17th Street
Austin, Texas 78774

Dear Mr. Wood:

As required by the Tax Code, §313.025 (b-1), the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has evaluated the impact of the proposed DCP Midstream LP project on the number and size of school facilities in Stanton Independent School District (SISD). Based on the analysis prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates for the school district and conversations with the SISD Superintendent David Carr and Business Manager Brad Holland, the TEA has found that the DCP Midstream LP project would not have a significant impact on the number or size of school facilities in SISD.

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 regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

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

Michael L. Williams
Commissioner

June 12, 2013

Mr. Robert Wood
Director, Economic Development and Analysis
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Lyndon B. Johnson State Office Building
111 East 17th Street
Austin, Texas 78774

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has analyzed the revenue gains that would be realized by the proposed DCP Midstream LP project for the Stanton Independent School District (SISD). Projections prepared by the TEA State Funding Division confirm the analysis that was prepared by Moak, Casey and Associates and provided to us by your division. We believe the firm's assumptions regarding the potential revenue gain are valid, and its estimates of the impact of the DCP Midstream LP project on SISD 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 regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Al McKenzie, Manager
Foundation School Program Support

AM/rk

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DCP MIDSTREAM LP PROJECT ON THE FINANCES OF THE STANTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT UNDER A REQUESTED CHAPTER 313 PROPERTY VALUE LIMITATION

April 1, 2013 | Final Report

PREPARED BY

MOAK, CASEY & ASSOCIATES

TEXAS SCHOOL FINANCE EXPERTS

Estimated Impact of the Proposed DCP Midstream LP Project on the Finances of the Stanton Independent School District under a Requested Chapter 313 Property Value Limitation

Introduction

DCP Midstream LP (DCP Midstream) has requested that the Stanton Independent School District (SISD) 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 SISD on November 12, 2012, DCP Midstream proposes to invest $100 million to construct a new natural gas plant project in SISD.

The DCP Midstream 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, SISD may offer a minimum value limitation of $20 million. The provisions of Chapter 313 call for the project to be fully taxable in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, unless the District and the Company agree to an extension of the start of the two-year qualifying time period. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the qualifying time period will be the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years. Beginning with the 2016-17 school year, the project would go on the local tax roll at $20 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 SISD currently levying a $0.049 I&S tax rate. The full value of the investment is expected to reach $90 million 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 DCP Midstream 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. SISD would experience a very minor revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year, under what is now current law.

Under the assumptions outlined below, the potential tax benefits under a Chapter 313 agreement could reach an estimated $5.1 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 now the planned audits of appraisal district operations in alternating years. A taxpayer receiving a value limitation pays M&O taxes on the reduced value for the project in years 3-10 and receives a tax bill for I&S taxes based on the full project value throughout the qualifying and value limitation 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 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.

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 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 815 school districts still receiving ASATR to maintain their target revenue funding levels, while an estimated 209 districts operating 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. As a result of these changes, the number of ASATR districts fell to 421, with an estimated 603 formula districts in operation.

For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, the ASATR reduction percentage will be set in the General Appropriations Act. The 2011 legislative session saw the adoption of a statement of legislative intent to no longer fund target revenue (through ASATR) by the 2017-18 school year. It is likely that ASATR state funding will be reduced in future years and eliminated by the 2017-18 school year, based on current state policy.

Based on the information presented below, SISD would receive ASATR funding through the 2016-17 school year under both models that are presented—with and without the value limitation—using current law as the basis for these calculations. As previously noted, ASATR is currently scheduled to expire in 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 DCP Midstream 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 use moderate enrollment growth assumptions and maintain the current base property value 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 and thereafter, 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 DCP Midstream LP project are factored into the base model used here. The Chapter 313 agreement approved by SISD in 2007 is also factored into the base model. The impact of the limitation value for the proposed DCP Midstream project is isolated separately and the focus of this analysis.

Student enrollment counts commence at 796 students in average daily attendance (ADA) in analyzing the effects of the DCP Midstream project on the finances of SISD, with small increases projected for the forecast period. The District's local tax base reached $1.75 billion for the 2012 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 $0.9133 per $100 is used throughout this analysis. SISD has estimated state property wealth per weighted ADA or WADA of approximately $1,275,464 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 SISD under the assumptions outlined above through the 2028-29 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. Based on these estimates, the SISD tax base will exceed the current Austin ISD yield for the forecast period.

Under the proposed agreement, a model is established to make a calculation of the "Baseline Revenue" by adding the value of the proposed DCP Midstream 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 DCP Midstream value but imposes the proposed property value limitation effective in the third year, which in this case is the 2016-17 school year. The results of this model are identified as "Value Limitation Revenue Model" under the revenue protection provisions of the proposed agreement (see Table 3). A summary of the differences between these models is shown in Table 4.

Under these assumptions, SISD would experience a very minor revenue loss as a result of the implementation of the value limitation in the 2016-17 school year (-$38). For the 2016-17 school year, it is anticipated that DCP Midstream would see M&O tax savings of $598,429 in this initial year of the value limitation. This reduction in M&O taxes would be offset by reduced recapture of $367,748 and increased ASATR funding of $218,675. This information is summarized in Table 4.

While ASATR funding may be subject to legislative change, the ASATR offset poses little financial risk to SISD as a result of the adoption of the value limitation agreement. But elimination of ASATR funding for the 2016-17 school year could reduce the residual tax savings to DCP Midstream in the first year that the $20 million value limitation takes 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. 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 $0.9133 per $100 of taxable value M&O rate is assumed for the 2012-13 school year and thereafter.

Under the assumptions used here, the potential tax savings from the value limitation total $3.8 million over the life of the agreement. In addition, DCP Midstream would be eligible for a tax credit for M&O taxes paid on value in excess of the value limitation in each of the first two qualifying years. The credit amount is paid out slowly through years 4-10 due to statutory limits on the scale of these payments over these seven years, with catch-up payments permitted in years 11-13. The tax credits are expected to total approximately $1.3 million over the life of the agreement, with no unpaid tax credits anticipated. The school district is to be reimbursed by the Texas Education Agency for the cost of these credits.

SISD revenue losses are very minor under the financial scenarios presented here. The total potential net tax benefits (inclusive of tax credits but after hold-harmless payments are made) are estimated to reach $5.1 million over the life of the agreement. While legislative changes to ASATR funding could increase the hold-harmless amount owed in the initial year of the agreement—the 2016-17 school year—there would still be a substantial tax benefit to DCP Midstream under the value limitation agreement for the remaining years that the limitation is in effect.

Facilities Funding Impact

The DCP Midstream project remains fully taxable for debt services taxes, with SISD currently levying a $0.0485 I&S rate. The value of the DCP Midstream project represents about a five percent increase to the SISD tax base at its peak taxable value, so it should assist SISD in meeting its debt service obligations.

The DCP Midstream project is not expected to affect SISD in terms of enrollment. The project is expected to add 10 permanent positions once it begins operation. Continued expansion of the project and related development could result in additional employment in the area and an increase in the school-age population—which has been the trend over the last several years—but this project is unlikely to have much impact on a stand-alone basis.

Conclusion

The proposed DCP Midstream natural gas project enhances the tax base of SISD. 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 $5.1 million. (This amount is net of any anticipated revenue losses for the District.) The additional taxable value also enhances the tax base of SISD in meeting its future debt service obligations.

Table 1 – Base District Information with DCP Midstream LP Project Value and Limitation Values

Year of Agreement	School Year	ADA	WADA	M&O Tax Rate	I&S Tax Rate	CAD Value with Project	CAD Value with Limitation	CPTD with Project	CPTD With Limitation	CPTD Value with Project per WADA	CPTD Value with Limitation per WADA
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	796.22	1,328.27	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,762,848,596	$1,762,848,596	$1,694,163,575	$1,694,163,575	$1,275,464	$1,275,464
1	2014-15	796.22	1,328.27	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,852,872,446	$1,852,872,446	$1,694,163,575	$1,694,163,575	$1,275,464	$1,275,464
2	2015-16	793.88	1,374.98	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,853,122,446	$1,853,122,446	$1,784,187,425	$1,784,187,425	$1,297,610	$1,297,610
3	2016-17	807.80	1,396.61	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,848,372,446	$1,782,848,596	$1,784,437,425	$1,784,437,425	$1,277,696	$1,277,696
4	2017-18	821.97	1,418.93	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,843,622,446	$1,782,848,596	$1,779,687,425	$1,714,163,575	$1,254,243	$1,208,065
5	2018-19	836.38	1,441.52	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,879,447,882	$1,823,424,032	$1,774,937,425	$1,714,163,575	$1,231,293	$1,189,134
6	2019-20	851.04	1,460.88	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,874,007,601	$1,819,883,751	$1,810,762,861	$1,754,739,011	$1,239,498	$1,201,149
7	2020-21	865.97	1,480.72	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,867,865,140	$1,816,591,290	$1,805,322,580	$1,751,198,730	$1,219,219	$1,182,666
8	2021-22	881.15	1,500.31	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,860,053,152	$1,813,529,302	$1,799,180,119	$1,747,906,269	$1,199,202	$1,165,026
9	2022-23	896.60	1,520.39	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,852,455,503	$1,810,681,653	$1,791,368,131	$1,744,844,281	$1,178,229	$1,147,629
10	2023-24	912.33	1,540.20	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,845,057,189	$1,808,033,339	$1,783,770,482	$1,741,996,632	$1,158,142	$1,131,019
11	2024-25	928.33	1,560.50	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,842,594,257	$1,842,594,257	$1,776,372,168	$1,739,348,318	$1,138,337	$1,114,612
12	2025-26	944.60	1,580.77	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,837,453,730	$1,837,453,730	$1,773,909,236	$1,773,909,236	$1,122,181	$1,122,181
13	2026-27	961.17	1,601.01	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,831,523,540	$1,831,523,540	$1,768,768,709	$1,768,768,709	$1,104,786	$1,104,786
14	2027-28	978.02	1,621.46	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,828,031,963	$1,828,031,963	$1,762,838,519	$1,762,838,519	$1,087,189	$1,087,189
15	2028-29	995.17	1,641.87	$0.9133	$0.0485	$1,824,715,377	$1,824,715,377	$1,759,346,942	$1,759,346,942	$1,071,548	$1,071,548

*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
1	2014-15	$16,617,375	$255,599	$968,758	$0	-$10,276,470	$0	$0	$0	$7,565,262
2	2015-16	$16,619,613	$282,522	$1,307,376	$0	-$10,379,166	$0	$0	$0	$7,830,345
3	2016-17	$16,577,098	$338,484	$1,292,751	$0	-$10,255,226	$0	$0	$0	$7,953,108
4	2017-18	$16,534,584	$287,873	$0	$0	-$10,111,029	$0	$0	$0	$6,711,428
5	2018-19	$16,855,234	$350,459	$0	$0	-$10,188,248	$0	$0	$0	$7,017,445
6	2019-20	$16,806,542	$298,058	$0	$0	-$10,199,519	$0	$0	$0	$6,905,081
7	2020-21	$16,751,565	$362,858	$0	$0	-$10,056,578	$0	$0	$0	$7,057,844
8	2021-22	$16,681,645	$308,602	$0	$0	-$9,903,200	$0	$0	$0	$7,087,047
9	2022-23	$16,613,643	$375,695	$0	$0	-$9,742,707	$0	$0	$0	$7,246,631
10	2023-24	$16,547,426	$319,520	$0	$0	-$9,585,215	$0	$0	$0	$7,281,731
11	2024-25	$16,525,382	$388,987	$0	$0	-$9,451,923	$0	$0	$0	$7,462,445
12	2025-26	$16,479,372	$395,807	$0	$0	-$9,323,831	$0	$0	$0	$7,551,348
13	2026-27	$16,426,295	$402,747	$0	$0	-$9,181,449	$0	$0	$0	$7,647,593
14	2027-28	$16,395,044	$409,810	$0	$0	-$9,047,175	$0	$0	$0	$7,757,679
15	2028-29	$16,365,360	$416,997	$0	$0	-$8,923,765	$0	$0	$0	$7,858,591
1	2014-15	$16,617,375	$255,599	$968,758	$0	-$10,276,470	$0	$0	$0	$7,565,262

Table 3– "Value Limitation Revenue Model"--Project Value Added with Value Limit

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	$15,811,631	$253,388	$1,271,933	$0	-$9,771,743	$0	$0	$0	$7,565,209
1	2014-15	$16,617,375	$255,599	$968,758	$0	-$10,276,470	$0	$0	$0	$7,565,262
2	2015-16	$16,619,613	$282,522	$1,307,376	$0	-$10,379,166	$0	$0	$0	$7,830,345
3	2016-17	$15,990,638	$338,484	$1,511,426	$0	-$9,887,478	$0	$0	$0	$7,953,070
4	2017-18	$15,990,638	$287,873	$0	$0	-$9,541,516	$0	$0	$0	$6,736,995
5	2018-19	$16,353,802	$350,459	$0	$0	-$9,656,486	$0	$0	$0	$7,047,775
6	2019-20	$16,322,115	$298,058	$0	$0	-$9,700,986	$0	$0	$0	$6,919,186
7	2020-21	$16,292,646	$362,858	$0	$0	-$9,580,216	$0	$0	$0	$7,075,288
8	2021-22	$16,265,240	$308,602	$0	$0	-$9,462,666	$0	$0	$0	$7,111,177
9	2022-23	$16,239,753	$375,695	$0	$0	-$9,344,907	$0	$0	$0	$7,270,541
10	2023-24	$16,216,050	$319,520	$0	$0	-$9,230,185	$0	$0	$0	$7,305,385
11	2024-25	$16,525,382	$388,987	$0	$0	-$9,304,679	$0	$0	$0	$7,609,689
12	2025-26	$16,479,372	$395,807	$0	$0	-$9,323,831	$0	$0	$0	$7,551,348
13	2026-27	$16,426,295	$402,747	$0	$0	-$9,181,449	$0	$0	$0	$7,647,593
14	2027-28	$16,395,044	$409,810	$0	$0	-$9,047,175	$0	$0	$0	$7,757,679
15	2028-29	$16,365,360	$416,997	$0	$0	-$8,923,765	$0	$0	$0	$7,858,591

Table 4 – Value Limit less Project Value with No Limit

Year of Agreement	School Year	M&O Taxes @ Compressed Rate	State Aid	Additional State Aid-Hold Harmless	Excess Formula Reduction	Recapture Costs	Additional Local M&O Collections	State Aid From Additional M&O Tax Collections	Recapture from the Additional Local Tax Effort	Total General Fund
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
1	2014-15	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
2	2015-16	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
3	2016-17	-$586,461	$0	$218,675	$0	$367,748	$0	$0	$0	-$38
4	2017-18	-$543,947	$0	$0	$0	$569,513	$0	$0	$0	$25,566
5	2018-19	-$501,433	$0	$0	$0	$531,763	$0	$0	$0	$30,330
6	2019-20	-$484,427	$0	$0	$0	$498,532	$0	$0	$0	$14,106
7	2020-21	-$458,918	$0	$0	$0	$476,363	$0	$0	$0	$17,444
8	2021-22	-$416,404	$0	$0	$0	$440,534	$0	$0	$0	$24,130
9	2022-23	-$373,890	$0	$0	$0	$397,800	$0	$0	$0	$23,909
10	2023-24	-$331,376	$0	$0	$0	$355,030	$0	$0	$0	$23,654
11	2024-25	$0	$0	$0	$0	$147,244	$0	$0	$0	$147,244
12	2025-26	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
13	2026-27	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
14	2027-28	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
15	2028-29	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Table 5 - Estimated Financial impact of the DCP Midstream LP Project Property Value Limitation Request Submitted to SISD at $0.9133 per $100 M&O Tax Rate

Year of Agreement	School Year	Project Value	Estimated Taxable Value	Value Savings	Assumed M&O Tax Rate	Taxes Before Value Limit	Taxes after Value Limit	Tax Savings @ Projected M&O Rate	Tax Credits for First Two Years Above Limit	Tax Benefit to Company Before Revenue Protection	School District Revenue Losses	Estimated Net Tax Benefits
Pre-Year 1	2013-14	$0	$0	$0	$0.9133	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
1	2014-15	$90,023,850	$90,023,850	$0	$0.9133	$822,188	$822,188	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
2	2015-16	$90,273,850	$90,273,850	$0	$0.9133	$824,471	$824,471	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
3	2016-17	$85,523,850	$20,000,000	$65,523,850	$0.9133	$781,089	$182,660	$598,429	$0	$598,429	-$38	$598,391
4	2017-18	$80,773,850	$20,000,000	$60,773,850	$0.9133	$737,708	$182,660	$555,048	$110,918	$665,965	$0	$665,965
5	2018-19	$76,023,850	$20,000,000	$56,023,850	$0.9133	$694,326	$182,660	$511,666	$109,766	$621,432	$0	$621,432
6	2019-20	$74,123,850	$20,000,000	$54,123,850	$0.9133	$676,973	$182,660	$494,313	$109,305	$603,618	$0	$603,618
7	2020-21	$71,273,850	$20,000,000	$51,273,850	$0.9133	$650,944	$182,660	$468,284	$108,614	$576,898	$0	$576,898
8	2021-22	$66,523,850	$20,000,000	$46,523,850	$0.9133	$607,562	$182,660	$424,902	$107,462	$532,364	$0	$532,364
9	2022-23	$61,773,850	$20,000,000	$41,773,850	$0.9133	$564,181	$182,660	$381,521	$106,310	$487,831	$0	$487,831
10	2023-24	$57,023,850	$20,000,000	$37,023,850	$0.9133	$520,799	$182,660	$338,139	$105,158	$443,297	$0	$443,297
11	2024-25	$57,023,850	$57,023,850	$0	$0.9133	$520,799	$520,799	$0	$523,806	$523,806	$0	$523,806
12	2025-26	$54,173,850	$54,173,850	$0	$0.9133	$494,770	$494,770	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
13	2026-27	$50,373,850	$50,373,850	$0	$0.9133	$460,064	$460,064	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
14	2027-28	$48,863,350	$48,863,350	$0	$0.9133	$446,269	$446,269	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
15	2028-29	$47,389,165	$47,389,165	$0	$0.9133	$432,805	$432,805	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
					Totals	$9,234,948	$5,462,646	$3,772,302	$1,281,339	$5,053,641	-$38	$5,053,603

Tax Credit for Value Over Limit in First 2 Years	Year 1	Year 2	Max Credits
	$639,528	$641,811	$1,281,339
	Credits Earned		$1,281,339
	Credits Paid		$1,281,339
	Excess Credits Unpaid		$0

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

Attachment 3

Martin County

Population

- Total county population in 2010 for Martin County: 4,701 , up 2.3 percent from 2009. State population increased 1.8 percent in the same time period.
- Martin County was the state's 204th largest county in population in 2010 and the 28 th fastest growing county from 2009 to 2010.
- Martin County's population in 2009 was 52.6 percent Anglo (above the state average of 46.7 percent), 1.9 percent African-American (below the state average of 11.3 percent) and 44.6 percent Hispanic (above the state average of 36.9 percent).
- 2009 population of the largest cities and places in Martin County:

Stanton: 2,228

Economy and Income

Employment

- September 2011 total employment in Martin County: 2,212 , up 4.8 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 Martin County unemployment rate: 5.6 percent, down from 5.7 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

- Martin County's ranking in per capita personal income in 2009: 123rd with an average per capita income of $32,996, up 1.1 percent from 2008. Statewide average per capita personal income was $38,609 in 2009, down 3.1 percent from 2008.

Industry

- Agricultural cash values in Martin County averaged $58.11 million annually from 2007 to 2010. County total agricultural values in 2010 were unchanged 0.0 percent from 2009. Major agriculture related commodities in Martin County during 2010 included:

  • Sorghum • Alfalfa • Other Beef • Cottonseed • Cotton
- 2011 oil and gas production in Martin County: 9.8 million barrels of oil and 17.0 million Mcf of gas. In September 2011, there were 2761 producing oil wells and 3 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 Martin County during the fourth quarter 2010: $8.60 million, up 29.3 percent from the same quarter in 2009.
- Taxable sales during the fourth quarter 2010 in the city of:

Stanton: $2.95 million, up 5.5 percent from the same quarter in 2009.

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

- Taxable sales in Martin County through the fourth quarter of 2010: $30.79 million, up 17.3 percent from the same period in 2009.
- Taxable sales through the fourth quarter of 2010 in the city of:

Stanton: $11.06 million, up 7.3 percent from the same period in 2009.

Annual (2010)

- Taxable sales in Martin County during 2010: $30.79 million, up 17.3 percent from 2009.
- Martin County sent an estimated $1.92 million (or 0.01 percent of Texas' taxable sales) in state sales taxes to the state treasury in 2010.
- Taxable sales during 2010 in the city of:

Stanton: $11.06 million, up 7.3 percent from 2009.

Sales Tax – Local Sales Tax Allocations

(The release date for sales tax allocations to cities for the sales activity month of September 2011 is currently scheduled for November 9, 2011.)

Monthly

- Statewide payments based on the sales activity month of August 2011: $505.22 million, up 13.9 percent from August 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Martin County based on the sales activity month of August 2011: $28,535.29, up 8.2 percent from August 2010.
- Payment based on the sales activity month of August 2011 to the city of:

Stanton: $28,535.29, up 8.2 percent from August 2010.

Fiscal Year

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: $6.08 billion, up 8.0 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Martin County based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011: $399,730.86, up 23.0 percent from fiscal 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months from September 2010 through August 2011 to the city of:

Stanton: $399,730.86, up 23.0 percent from fiscal 2010.

January 2011 through August 2011 (Sales Activity Year-To-Date)

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months through August 2011: $3.99 billion, up 8.3 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments to all cities in Martin County based on sales activity months through August 2011: $280,867.02, up 34.7 percent from the same period in 2010.
- Payments based on sales activity months through August 2011 to the city of:

Stanton: $280,867.02, up 34.7 percent from the same period in 2010.

12 months ending in August 2011

- Statewide payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: $6.08 billion, up 8.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments to all cities in Martin County based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011: $399,730.86, up 23.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.
- Payments based on sales activity in the 12 months ending in August 2011 to the city of:

Stanton: $399,730.86, up 23.0 percent from the previous 12-month period.

- *City Calendar Year-To-Date (RJ 2011)*
- Payment to the cities from January 2011 through October 2011:

Stanton: $343,072.79, up 28.4 percent from the same period in 2010.

Annual (2010)

- Statewide payments based on sales activity months in 2010: $5.77 billion, up 3.3 percent from 2009.
- Payments to all cities in Martin County based on sales activity months in 2010: $327,414.19, up 3.0 percent from 2009.
- Payment based on sales activity months in 2010 to the city of:

Stanton: $327,414.19, up 3.0 percent from 2009.

Property Tax

- As of January 2009, property values in Martin County: $1.93 billion, up 21.0 percent from January 2008 values. The property tax base per person in Martin County is $420,749, above the statewide average of $85,809. About 82.6 percent of the property tax base is derived from oil, gas and minerals.

State Expenditures

- Martin County's ranking in state expenditures by county in fiscal year 2010: 212th. State expenditures in the county for FY2010: $14.72 million, down 0.1 percent from FY2009.
- In Martin County, 5 state agencies provide a total of 23 jobs and $208,967.00 in annualized wages (as of 1st quarter 2011).
- Major state agencies in the county (as of first quarter 2011):
  - Department of Transportation
  - Department of Public Safety
  - Health & Human Services Commission
  - AgriLife Extension Service

Higher Education

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

- Martin 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 Martin County fall 2010 enrollment:
    - None.

School Districts

- Martin County had 2 school districts with 4 schools and 987 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.)

- Grady ISD had 206 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was $50,165. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 89 percent.
- Stanton ISD had 781 students in the 2009-10 school year. The average teacher salary was $49,512. The percentage of students meeting the 2010 TAKS passing standard for all tests was 74 percent.