

October 31, 2013

CONFIDENTIAL & PRIVILEGED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NEGOTIATION

Dr. Lisa Garcia  
Superintendent  
Point Isabel Independent School District  
101 Port Rd  
Port Isabel, TX 78578

Dear Dr. Garcia:

Thank you for the interest and support that Point Isabel Independent School District (PI-ISD) has shown as Space Exploration Technologies Corp. (SpaceX) considers establishing the world's first commercial orbital launch site and an adjacent command control center in South Texas (the "spaceport").


Please find enclosed a completed Application for Appraised Value Limitation on Qualified Property form 50-296 and the requested attachments. Also enclosed is the required CD for submission to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Comptroller).

Consistent with state law, we ask that the application and all documents be kept confidential until an agreement is reached. Additionally, we ask that the district seek a review of confidentiality by the Comptroller and Attorney General, if required, of all documents marked confidential and related information in the application prior to the district's submittal of forms to the Comptroller. Given the competitive nature of the project, items have been marked confidential that detail privileged, ongoing negotiations and proprietary information related to the business as well as proprietary business, technical and financial plans of SpaceX to establish the first of its kind project in the commercial space industry.

Thank you for considering our incentive request. It is our goal to negotiate an award that will help to bring this project to the South Texas region and deliver significant economic development to the area and the State of Texas.

Please contact me, or our consultant Sarah Roberts, should you have any questions or feedback.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Lauren A. Dreyer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L".

Lauren A. Dreyer  
Director – Business Affairs & Compliance



# Application for Appraised Value Limitation on Qualified Property

(Tax Code, Chapter 313, Subchapter B or C)

**Form 50-296**  
(Revised July 2013)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** This application must be completed and filed with the school district. In order for an application to be processed, the governing body (school board) must elect to consider an application, but — by Comptroller rule — the school board may elect to consider the application only after the school district has received a completed application. Texas Tax Code, Section 313.025 requires that any completed application and any supplemental materials received by the school district must be forwarded within seven days to the Comptroller of Public Accounts.

If the school board elects to consider the application, the school district must:

- notify the Comptroller that the school board has elected to consider the application.  
This notice must include:
  - the date on which the school district received the application;
  - the date the school district determined that the application was complete;
  - the date the school board decided to consider the application; and
  - a request that the comptroller prepare an economic impact analysis of the application;
- provide a copy of the notice to the appraisal district;
- must complete the sections of the application reserved for the school district and provide information required in the Comptroller rules located at 34 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Section 9.1054; and
- forward the original completed application to the Comptroller in a three-ring binder with tabs separating each section of the documents, in addition to an electronic copy on CD. See 34 TAC Chapter 9, Subchapter F.

The governing body may, at its discretion, allow the applicant to supplement or amend the application after the filing date, subject to the restrictions in 34 TAC Chapter 9, Subchapter F.

When the Comptroller receives the notice and required information from the school district, the Comptroller will publish all submitted application materials on its website. The Comptroller is authorized to treat some application information as confidential and withhold it from publication on the Internet. To do so, however, the information must be segregated and comply with the other requirements set out in the Comptroller rules as explained in the Confidentiality Notice below.

The Comptroller will independently determine whether the application has been completed according to the Comptroller's rules (34 TAC Chapter 9, Subchapter F). If the Comptroller finds the application is not complete, the Comptroller will request additional materials from the school district. When the Comptroller determines that the application is complete, it will send the school district a notice indicating so. The Comptroller will determine the eligibility of the project, make a recommendation to the school board regarding the application and prepare an economic impact evaluation by the 90th day after the Comptroller receives a complete application—as determined by the Comptroller.

The school board must approve or disapprove the application before the 151st day after the application review start date (the date the application is finally determined to be complete), unless an extension is granted. The Comptroller and school district are authorized to request additional information from the applicant that is reasonably necessary to complete the recommendation, economic impact evaluation or consider the application at any time during the application review period.

Please visit the Comptroller's website to find out more about the program at [www.texasahead.org/tax\\_programs/chapter313/](http://www.texasahead.org/tax_programs/chapter313/). There are links on this Web page to the Chapter 313 statute, rules and forms. Information about minimum limitation values for particular districts and wage standards may also be found at that site.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION – CERTIFICATION OF APPLICATION

<b>Authorized School District Representative</b>		Date Application Received by District 10-31-13
First Name <b>Lisa</b>	Last Name <b>Garcia</b>	
Title <b>Superintendent</b>		
School District Name <b>Point Isabel Independent School District</b>		
Street Address <b>101 Port Road</b>		
Mailing Address <b>same</b>		
City <b>Port Isabel</b>	State <b>TX</b>	ZIP <b>78578</b>
Phone Number <b>956-943-0005</b>	Fax Number	
Mobile Number (optional)	Email Address <b>lgarcia@pi-isd.net</b>	

I authorize the consultant to provide and obtain information related to this application.  Yes  No

Will consultant be primary contact?  Yes  No

**SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION – CERTIFICATION OF APPLICATION (CONTINUED)**

**Authorized School District Consultant (If Applicable)**

First Name Kevin	Last Name O' Hanlon	
Title Partner		
Firm Name O' Hanlon, McCollom & Demerath		
Street Address 808 West Ave.		
Mailing Address same		
City Austin	State TX	ZIP 78701
Phone Number 512-494-9949	Fax Number	
Mobile Number (Optional) 512-633-1491	Email Address kohanlon@808west.com	

I am the authorized representative for the school district to which this application is being submitted. I understand that this application is a government record as defined in Chapter 37 of the Texas Penal Code.

Signature (Authorized School District Representative) <i>Lisa Garcia</i>	Date 11/21/13
---	------------------

Has the district determined this application complete?  Yes  No

If yes, date determined complete. 11/21/13

Have you completed the school finance documents required by TAC 9.1054(c)(3)?  Yes  No  
will supplement

**SCHOOL DISTRICT CHECKLIST AND REQUESTED ATTACHMENTS**

	Checklist	Page X of 16	Check Completed
1	Date application received by the ISD	1 of 16	✓
2	Certification page signed and dated by authorized school district representative	2 of 16	✓
3	Date application deemed complete by ISD	2 of 16	✓
4	Certification pages signed and dated by applicant or authorized business representative of applicant	4 of 16	✓
5	Completed company checklist	12 of 16	✓
6	School finance documents described in TAC 9.1054(c)(3) (Due within 20 days of district providing notice of completed application)	2 of 16	will supplement



**APPLICANT INFORMATION – CERTIFICATION OF APPLICATION**

**Authorized Business Representative (Applicant)**

First Name <b>Lauren</b>	Last Name <b>Dreyer</b>	
Title <b>Director - Business Affairs and Compliance</b>		
Organization <b>Space Exploration Technologies Corp.</b>		
Street Address <b>1 Rocket Road</b>		
Mailing Address <b>same</b>		
City <b>Hawthorne</b>	State <b>CA</b>	ZIP <b>90250</b>
Phone Number <b>254-840-5792</b>	Fax Number <b>310-363-6392</b>	
Mobile Number (optional) <b>254-6526976</b>	Business Email Address <b>lauren.dreyer@spacex.com</b>	

Will a company official other than the authorized business representative be responsible for responding to future information requests?  Yes  No

If yes, please fill out contact information for that person.

First Name <b>Ray</b>	Last Name <b>Kato</b>	
Title <b>Director of Finance</b>		
Organization <b>Space Exploration Technologies Corp.</b>		
Street Address <b>1 Rocket Road</b>		
Mailing Address <b>same</b>		
City <b>Hawthorne</b>	State <b>CA</b>	ZIP <b>90250</b>
Phone Number <b>310-363-6315</b>	Fax Number <b>313-363-6001</b>	
Mobile Number (optional)	Email Address <b>ray.kato@baylor.edu</b>	

I authorize the consultant to provide and obtain information related to this application.  Yes  No

Will consultant be primary contact?  Yes  No

APPLICANT INFORMATION – CERTIFICATION OF APPLICATION (CONTINUED)

Authorized Company Consultant (If Applicable)


First Name Sarah	Last Name Roberts	
Title President		
Firm Name KSR Capital LLC		
Street Address 2424 Austin Ave.		
Mailing Address same		
City Waco	State TX	ZIP 76710
Phone Number 254-723-3269	Fax Number	
Business Email Address roberts.sarah@outlook.com		

I am the authorized representative for the business entity for the purpose of filing this application. I understand that this application is a government record as defined in Chapter 37 of the Texas Penal Code. The information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I hereby certify and affirm that the business entity I represent is in good standing under the laws of the state in which the business entity was organized and that no delinquent taxes are owed to the State of Texas.

Signature (Authorized Business Representative (Applicant)) <i>Sarah Roberts</i>	Date 10/31/2013
--	--------------------

GIVEN under my hand and seal of office this 31<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2013



(Notary Seal)

*Bryanne-Michelle Lyerly*  
Notary Public, State of Texas

My commission expires May 19, 2014

If you make a false statement on this application, you could be found guilty of a Class A misdemeanor or a state jail felony under Texas Penal Code § 37.10.



**FEES AND PAYMENTS**

Enclosed is proof of application fee paid to the school district.

For the purpose of this question, "payments to the school district" include any and all payments or transfers of things of value made to the school district or to any person or persons in any form if such payment or transfer of thing of value being provided is in recognition of, anticipation of, or consideration for the agreement for limitation on appraised value.

Please answer only either A OR B:

A. Will any "payments to the school district" that you may make in order to receive a property tax value limitation agreement result in payments that are not in compliance with Tax Code, 313.027(i)?  Yes  No

B. If "payments to the school district" will only be determined by a formula or methodology without a specific amount being specified, could such method result in "payments to the school district" that are not in compliance with Tax Code §313.027(i)?  Yes  No

**BUSINESS APPLICANT INFORMATION**

Legal Name Under Which Application is Made  
Space Exploration Technologies Corp.

Texas Taxpayer I.D. Number of Entity Subject to Tax Code, Chapter 171 (11 digits)  
1-01-0627671-9

NAICS Code  
336414

Is the applicant a party to any other Chapter 313 agreements?  Yes  No

If yes, please list name of school district and year of agreement.  
n/a

**APPLICANT BUSINESS STRUCTURE**

Registered to do business in Texas with the Texas Secretary of State?  Yes  No

Identify Business Organization of Applicant (corporation, limited liability corporation, etc.)  
Corporation

1. Is the applicant a combined group, or comprised of members of a combined group, as defined by Texas Tax Code Chapter 171.0001(7)?  Yes  No  
If so, please attach documentation of the combined group membership and contact information.

2. Is the applicant current on all tax payments due to the State of Texas?  Yes  No

3. Are all applicant members of the combined group current on all tax payments due to the State of Texas?  NA  Yes  No  
If the answer to either question is no, please explain and/or disclose any history of default, delinquencies and/or any material litigation, including litigation involving the State of Texas. (Use attachment if necessary.)

n/a



ELIGIBILITY UNDER TAX CODE CHAPTER 313.024

Are you an entity to which Tax Code, Chapter 171 applies? Yes No

The property will be used as an integral part, or as a necessary auxiliary part, in one of the following activities:

- (1) manufacturing
(2) research and development
(3) a clean coal project, as defined by Section 5.001, Water Code
(4) an advanced clean energy project, as defined by Section 382.003, Health and Safety Code
(5) renewable energy electric generation
(6) electric power generation using integrated gasification combined cycle technology
(7) nuclear electric power generation
(8) a computer center that is used as an integral part or as a necessary auxiliary part for the activity conducted by applicant in one or more activities described by Subdivisions (1) through (7)

Are you requesting that any of the land be classified as qualified investment? Yes No

Will any of the proposed qualified investment be leased under a capitalized lease? Yes No

Will any of the proposed qualified investment be leased under an operating lease? Yes No

Are you including property that is owned by a person other than the applicant? Yes No

Will any property be pooled or proposed to be pooled with property owned by the applicant in determining the amount of your qualified investment? Yes No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provide a detailed description of the scope of the proposed project, including, at a minimum, the type and planned use of real and tangible personal property, the nature of the business, a timeline for property construction or installation, and any other relevant information. (Use attachments as necessary)

Please see attached "Project Description".

Describe the ability of your company to locate or relocate in another state or another region of the state.

Locations in GA, FL, Puerto Rico are competing candidates for the commercial orbital launch site.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- New Jobs, Construct New Facility, New Business / Start-up, Expand Existing Facility, Relocation from Out-of-State, Expansion, Purchase Machinery & Equipment, Consolidation, Relocation within Texas

PROJECTED TIMELINE

Begin Construction First Quarter 2014 Begin Hiring New Employees First Quarter 2014

Construction Complete Fourth Quarter 2016 Fully Operational First Quarter 2018

Purchase Machinery & Equipment Second Quarter 2014

Do you propose to construct a new building or to erect or affix a new improvement after your application review start date (date your application is finally determined to be complete)? Yes No

Note: Improvements made before that time may not be considered qualified property.

When do you anticipate the new buildings or improvements will be placed in service? Fourth Quarter 2015



**ECONOMIC INCENTIVES**

Identify state programs the project will apply for:

State Source	Amount
Texas Enterprise Fund	see attached
Texas Spaceport Trust Fund	see attached
Texas Capital Fund	see attached
Total	to be determined

Will other incentives be offered by local units of government?  Yes  No

Please use the following box for additional details regarding incentives. (Use attachments if necessary.)

Please see attached "Economic Incentives".

**THE PROPERTY**

Identify county or counties in which the proposed project will be located Cameron

Central Appraisal District (CAD) that will be responsible for appraising the property Cameron County Appraisal District

Will this CAD be acting on behalf of another CAD to appraise this property?  Yes  No

List all taxing entities that have jurisdiction for the property and the portion of project within each entity

County: Cameron (100%) City: N/A  
(Name and percent of project)

Hospital District: N/A Water District: Brownsville Navigation District (100%)  
(Name and percent of project)

Other (describe): Point Isabel I.S.D. (100%) Other (describe): South Texas I.S.D. (100%)  
(Name and percent of project)

Is the project located entirely within this ISD?  Yes  No

If not, please provide additional information on the project scope and size to assist in the economic analysis.

N/A



INVESTMENT

NOTE: The minimum amount of qualified investment required to qualify for an appraised value limitation and the minimum amount of appraised value limitation vary depending on whether the school district is classified as rural, and the taxable value of the property within the school district. For assistance in determining estimates of these minimums, access the Comptroller's website at www.texasahead.org/tax\_programs/chapter313/.

At the time of application, what is the estimated minimum qualified investment required for this school district? \$20,000,000.00
What is the amount of appraised value limitation for which you are applying? \$20,000,000.00
What is your total estimated qualified investment? \$55,850,000.00

NOTE: See 313.021(1) for full definition. Generally, Qualified Investment is the sum of the investment in tangible personal property and buildings and new improvements made between beginning of the qualifying time period (date of application final approval by the school district) and the end of the second complete tax year.

What is the anticipated date of application approval? March 2014
What is the anticipated date of the beginning of the qualifying time period? March 2014
What is the total estimated investment for this project for the period from the time of application submission to the end of the limitation period? \$73,650,000.00

Describe the qualified investment.[See 313.021(1).]

Attach the following items to this application:

- (1) a specific and detailed description of the qualified investment you propose to make on the property for which you are requesting an appraised value limitation as defined by Tax Code §313.021,
(2) a description of any new buildings, proposed improvements or personal property which you intend to include as part of your minimum qualified investment and
(3) a map of the qualified investment showing location of new buildings or new improvements with vicinity map.

Do you intend to make at least the minimum qualified investment required by Tax Code §313.023 (or 313.053 for rural school districts) for the relevant school district category during the qualifying time period? Yes No

Except for new equipment described in Tax Code §151.318(q) or (q-1), is the proposed tangible personal property to be placed in service for the first time:

- (1) in or on the new building or other new improvement for which you are applying? Yes No
(2) if not in or on the new building or other new improvement for which you are applying for an appraised value limitation, is the personal property necessary and ancillary to the business conducted in the new building or other new improvement? Yes No
(3) on the same parcel of land as the building for which you are applying for an appraised value limitation? Yes No

("First placed in service" means the first use of the property by the taxpayer.)

Will the investment in real or personal property you propose be counted toward the minimum qualified investment required by Tax Code §313.023, (or 313.053 for rural school districts) be first placed in service in this state during the applicable qualifying time period? Yes No

Does the investment in tangible personal property meet the requirements of Tax Code §313.021(1)? Yes No

If the proposed investment includes a building or a permanent, non-removable component of a building, does it house tangible personal property? Yes No

QUALIFIED PROPERTY

Describe the qualified property. [See 313.021(2)] (If qualified investment describes qualified property exactly you may skip items (1), (2) and (3) below.)

Attach the following items to this application:

- (1) a specific and detailed description of the qualified property for which you are requesting an appraised value limitation as defined by Tax Code §313.021,
(2) a description of any new buildings, proposed improvements or personal property which you intend to include as part of your qualified property and
(3) a map of the qualified property showing location of new buildings or new improvements – with vicinity map.

Land

Is the land on which you propose new construction or improvements currently located in an area designated as a reinvestment zone under Tax Code Chapter 311 or 312 or as an enterprise zone under Government Code Chapter 2303? Yes No

If you answered "no" to the question above, what is the anticipated date on which you will submit proof of a reinvestment zone with boundaries encompassing the land on which you propose new construction or improvements? not applicable

Will the applicant own the land by the date of agreement execution? Yes No

Will the project be on leased land? Yes No



QUALIFIED PROPERTY (CONTINUED)

If the land upon which the new building or new improvement is to be built is part of the qualified property described by §313.021(2)(A), please attach complete documentation, including:

- 1. Legal description of the land
2. Each existing appraisal parcel number of the land on which the improvements will be constructed, regardless of whether or not all of the land described in the current parcel will become qualified property
3. Owner
4. The current taxable value of the land. Attach estimate if land is part of larger parcel.
5. A detailed map (with a vicinity map) showing the location of the land

Attach a map of the reinvestment zone boundaries, certified to be accurate by either the governmental entity creating the zone, the local appraisal district, or a licensed surveyor. (With vicinity map)

Attach the order, resolution or ordinance establishing the zone, and the guidelines and criteria for creating the zone, if applicable.

Miscellaneous

Is the proposed project a building or new improvement to an existing facility? ... Yes No

Attach a description of any existing improvements and include existing appraisal district account numbers.

List current market value of existing property at site as of most recent tax year. not applicable (Market Value) not applicable (Tax Year)

Is any of the existing property subject to a value limitation agreement under Tax Code 313? ... Yes No

Will all of the property for which you are requesting an appraised value limitation be free of a tax abatement agreement entered into by a school district for the duration of the limitation? ... Yes No

WAGE AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

What is the estimated number of permanent jobs (more than 1,600 hours a year), with the applicant or a contractor of the applicant, on the proposed qualified property during the last complete quarter before the application review start date (date your application is finally determined to be complete)? ... 0

The last complete calendar quarter before application review start date is the: [ ] First Quarter [ ] Second Quarter [x] Third Quarter [ ] Fourth Quarter of 2013 (year)

What were the number of permanent jobs (more than 1,600 hours a year) this applicant had in Texas during the most recent quarter reported to the TWC? ... 196

Note: For job definitions see TAC §9.1051(14) and Tax Code 313.021(3). If the applicant intends to apply a definition for "new job" other than TAC §9.1051(14)(C), then please provide the definition of "new job" as used in this application.

Empty rectangular box for providing the definition of "new job".

Total number of new jobs that will have been created when fully operational ... 100

Do you plan to create at least 25 new jobs (at least 10 new jobs for rural school districts) on the land and in connection with the new building or other improvement? ... Yes No

Do you intend to request that the governing body waive the minimum new job creation requirement, as provided under Tax Code §313.025(f-1)? ... Yes No

If you answered "yes" to the question above, attach evidence documenting that the new job creation requirement above exceeds the number of employees necessary for the operation, according to industry standards. Note: Even if a minimum new job waiver is provided, 80% of all new jobs must be qualifying jobs pursuant to Texas Tax Code, §313.024(d). 80

What is the maximum number of qualifying jobs meeting all criteria of §313.021(3) you are committing to create? ...

If this project creates more than 1,000 new jobs, the minimum required wage for this project is 110% of the average county weekly wage for all jobs as described by 313.021(3)(E)(ii).

If this project creates less than 1,000 new jobs, does this district have territory in a county that meets the demographic characteristics of 313.051(2)? (see table of information showing this district characteristic at www.texasahead.org/tax\_programs/chapter313/)

If yes, the applicant must meet wage standard described in 313.051(b) (110% of the regional average weekly wage for manufacturing)

If no, the applicant shall designate one of the wage standards set out in §§313.021(5)(A) or 313.021(5)(B).



WAGE AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION (CONTINUED)

For the following three wage calculations please include on an attachment the four most recent quarters of data for each wage calculation. Show the average and the 110% calculation. Include documentation from TWC website. The final actual statutory minimum annual wage requirement for the applicant for each qualifying job — which may differ slightly from this estimate — will be based on information from the four quarterly periods for which data were available at the time of the application review start date (date of a completed application). See TAC §9.1051(7).

Table with 2 columns: Description of wage calculation and Amount. Rows include 110% of county average weekly wage for all jobs, manufacturing jobs in county, and manufacturing jobs in region.

Please identify which Tax Code section you are using to estimate the wage standard required for this project:

- Checkboxes for tax code sections: §313.021(5)(A), §313.021(5)(B) (checked), §313.021(3)(E)(ii), and §313.051(b)?

What is the estimated minimum required annual wage for each qualifying job based on the qualified property? \$37,357

What is the estimated minimum required annual wage you are committing to pay for each of the qualifying jobs you create on the qualified property? \$37,357

Will 80% of all new jobs created by the owner be qualifying jobs as defined by 313.021(3)? Yes (checked) No

Will each qualifying job require at least 1,600 of work a year? Yes (checked) No

Will any of the qualifying jobs be jobs transferred from one area of the state to another? Yes No (checked)

Will any of the qualifying jobs be retained jobs? Yes No (checked)

Will any of the qualifying jobs be created to replace a previous employee? Yes No (checked)

Will any required qualifying jobs be filled by employees of contractors? Yes No (checked)

If yes, what percent? n/a

Does the applicant or contractor of the applicant offer to pay at least 80% of the employee's health insurance premium for each qualifying job? Yes (checked) No

Describe each type of benefits to be offered to qualifying jobholders. (Use attachments as necessary.)

Please see attached Benefits Guide.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Is an Economic Impact Analysis attached (If supplied by other than the Comptroller's office)? Yes No (checked)

Is Schedule A completed and signed for all years and attached? Yes (checked) No

Is Schedule B completed and signed for all years and attached? Yes (checked) No

Is Schedule C (Application) completed and signed for all years and attached? Yes (checked) No

Is Schedule D completed and signed for all years and attached? Yes (checked) No

Note: Excel spreadsheet versions of schedules are available for download and printing at URL listed below.

If there are any other payments made in the state or economic information that you believe should be included in the economic analysis, please attach a separate schedule showing the amount for each year affected, including an explanation.

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE****Property Tax Limitation Agreement Applications  
Texas Government Code Chapter 313  
Confidential Information Submitted to the Comptroller**

Generally, an application for property tax value limitation, the information provided therein, and documents submitted in support thereof, are considered public information subject to release under the Texas Public Information Act.

There is an exception, outlined below, by which information will be withheld from disclosure.

The Comptroller's office will withhold information from public release if:

- 1) it describes the specific processes or business activities to be conducted or the specific tangible personal property to be located on real property covered by the application;
- 2) the information has been segregated in the application from other information in the application; and
- 3) the party requesting confidentiality provides the Comptroller's office a list of the documents for which confidentiality is sought and for each document lists the specific reasons, including any relevant legal authority, stating why the material is believed to be confidential.

All applications and parts of applications which are not segregated and marked as confidential as outlined above will be considered public information and will be posted on the internet.

Such information properly identified as confidential will be withheld from public release unless and until the governing body of the school district acts on the application, or we are directed to do so by a ruling from the Attorney General.

Other information in the custody of a school district or the comptroller submitted in connection with the application, including information related to the economic impact of a project or the essential elements of eligibility under Texas Tax Code, Chapter 313, such as

the nature and amount of the projected investment, employment, wages, and benefits, will not be considered confidential business information and will be posted on the internet.

All documents submitted to the Comptroller, as well as all information in the application once the school district acts thereon, are subject to public release unless specific parts of the application or documents submitted with the application are identified as confidential. Any person seeking to limit disclosure of such submitted records is advised to consult with their legal counsel regarding disclosure issues and also to take the appropriate precautions to safeguard copyrighted material, trade secrets, or any other proprietary information. The Comptroller assumes no obligation or responsibility relating to the disclosure or nondisclosure of information submitted by respondents. A person seeking to limit disclosure of information must submit in writing specific detailed reasons, including any relevant legal authority, stating why that person believes the material to be confidential.

The following outlines how the Comptroller's office will handle requests for information submitted under the Texas Public Information Act for application portions and submitted records appropriately identified as confidential.

- This office shall forward the request for records and a copy of the documents at issue to the Texas Attorney General's office for an opinion on whether such information may be withheld from disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act.
- The Comptroller will notify the person who submitted the application/documents when the information is forwarded to the Attorney General's office.
- Please be aware that this Office is obligated to comply with an Attorney General's decision, including release of information ruled public even if it was marked confidential.

**COMPANY CHECKLIST AND REQUESTED ATTACHMENTS**

	Checklist	Page X of 16	Check Completed
1	Certification pages signed and dated by Authorized Business Representative (applicant)	4 of 16	✓
2	Proof of Payment of Application Fee (Attachment)	5 of 16	✓
3	For applicant members, documentation of Combined Group membership under Texas Tax Code 171.0001(7) (if Applicable) (Attachment)	5 of 16	n/a
4	Detailed description of the project	6 of 16	✓
5	If project is located in more than one district, name other districts and list percentage in each district (Attachment)	7 of 16	✓
6	Description of Qualified Investment (Attachment)	8 of 16	✓
7	Map of qualified investment showing location of new buildings or new improvements with vicinity map.	8 of 16	✓
8	Description of Qualified Property (Attachment)	8 of 16	✓
9	Map of qualified property showing location of new buildings or new improvements with vicinity map	8 of 16	✓
10	Description of Land (Attachment)	9 of 16	✓
11	A detailed map showing location of the land with vicinity map.	9 of 16	✓
12	A description of all existing (if any) improvements (Attachment)	9 of 16	n/a
13	Request for Waiver of Job Creation Requirement (if applicable) (Attachment)	9 of 16	n/a
14	Calculation of three possible wage requirements with TWC documentation. (Attachment)	10 of 16	✓
15	Description of Benefits	10 of 16	✓
16	Economic Impact (if applicable)	10 of 16	n/a
17	Schedule A completed and signed	13 of 16	✓
18	Schedule B completed and signed	14 of 16	✓
19	Schedule C (Application) completed and signed	15 of 16	✓
20	Schedule D completed and signed	16 of 16	✓
21	Map of Reinvestment Zone (Attachment) (Showing the actual or proposed boundaries and size, Certified to be accurate by either the government entity creating the zone, the local appraisal district, or a licensed surveyor, with vicinity map)*	9 of 16	n/a
22	Order, Resolution, or Ordinance Establishing the Zone (Attachment)*	9 of 16	✓
23	Legal Description of Reinvestment Zone (Attachment)*	9 of 16	n/a
24	Guidelines and Criteria for Reinvestment Zone(Attachment)*	9 of 16	n/a

\* To be submitted with application or before date of final application approval by school board.

Proof of payment of filing fee received by the  
Comptroller of Public Accounts per TAC Rule  
§9.1054 (b)(5)

*(Page Inserted by Office of Texas Comptroller of Public  
Accounts)*

## Checklist Item 4

### **Page 6: Chapter 313 - Project Description**

#### ***Nature of the business***

Founded in 2002 with the singular goal of providing highly reliable, low-cost space transportation for both cargo and crew, SpaceX is a launch service provider that designs, manufactures, tests and launches its own vehicles. SpaceX vehicles carry commercial and government satellites into orbit and deliver cargo, and eventually astronauts, to the International Space Station (ISS) on behalf of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

SpaceX is the world's fastest-growing provider of launch services. The company has nearly 50 launches on its manifest, representing about \$5 billion in contracts.

Known for many historic firsts in the commercial space industry, SpaceX has a demonstrated record of mission success, including:

- Falcon 9 Demo Flight 1 on 4 June 2010
- Falcon 9 Demo Flight 2/Dragon COTS C1 on 8 December 2010
- Falcon 9 Demo Flight 3 Dragon COTS C2/C3 from 22-31 May 2012
- Falcon 9 Dragon CRS-1 from 7-28 October 2012
- Falcon 9 Dragon CRS-2 from 1-26 March 2013

These missions make SpaceX the only private company ever to return a spacecraft from low-Earth orbit and to perform official resupply missions for NASA. Its May 2012 payload delivery to the ISS and safe return was a technically challenging feat previously accomplished only by governments. SpaceX has repeated this feat two additional times since then with the CRS-1 and CRS-2 missions.

This proven capability has helped SpaceX build its aforementioned healthy manifest of more than 50 launches for commercial and government customers. This manifest includes an additional 10 CRS missions to deliver cargo to the ISS under a \$1.6 billion contract with NASA and more than 30 commercial missions through the end of the decade.

In parallel, SpaceX is to market the Dragon spacecraft for crew-carrying capability through the SuperDraco-driven emergency launch abort system under a \$440 million agreement with NASA -- the majority of which is being developed at its McGregor, TX Rocket Development Site -- and the debut of the Falcon Heavy with capability to launch large commercial and government satellites.

SpaceX is also rapidly deploying reusability concepts to substantially reduce launch prices through the SpaceX-funded Grasshopper program, which has successfully executed vertical takeoff and vertical landing (VTVL) at its McGregor, TX Rocket Development Site with "hops" of the 12-foot diameter, 106-foot tall vehicle reaching over 2,000-feet.

For more information, including SpaceX's Launch Manifest, visit the SpaceX website at [spacex.com](http://spacex.com)

***Planned use of real and tangible property***

South Texas is the final Texas location competing with sites in the United States and Puerto Rico to be locate the world's first commercial orbital launch site and an adjacent command control center. For operational safety, the two sites are approximately 2 miles apart. Both are located southeastern Cameron County (outside of any city's extra territorial jurisdiction) approximately 5 miles from South Padre Island and 17 miles from downtown Brownsville. Classified as a manufacturing site by the North American Industry Classification System, the launch site facilities and equipment are designed to accommodate commercial launches of the SpaceX Falcon 9 and Falcon Heavy vehicles. The nearby command control center is an integration and computer center necessary to coordinate and communicate with launch vehicles and spacecraft during missions and to prepare and process payloads before and after missions. Both the Launch and Command Control Center sites and equipment will also support the SpaceX corporate development plans.

***Timeline for property construction and installation***

SpaceX is currently on track to complete our technical due diligence of the proposed site in 2013, but that timing depends on the following: 1) completion of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Texas launch site; 2) publication of the FAA's final decision, officially referred to as the Record of Decision, in the Federal Register; and 3) final approvals and agreements for launch operations.

Construction could begin as early as first quarter 2014 and installation of machinery and equipment reaching substantial completion by the fourth quarter of 2015 with the goal of initiating unmanned launch at the site by the fourth quarter of 2015 and the ability to reach up to 12 launches annually by 2018.

## Checklist Item #5

### Additional taxing entities include:

Texas Southmost College District (100%)

Emergency Service District No. 1 (100%)

### Additional Economic Impact:

At full operation, the site is projected to reach a maximum launch rate of 12 launches annually. Conservatively, each launch is expected attract 15,000 to 25,000 visitors and create economic impact. These visitors typically stay for several days surrounding a launch and seek a variety of activities to occupy their time. Given existing, complementary tourism assets, the launch activity will generate increased year-round tourism.

In addition to benefits from launch-related tourism, SpaceX estimates that more than 350 customer representatives will temporarily reside in the area and work at or near the site on an annual basis. These visitors are representatives of SpaceX's customers and they are involved during the approximately 30-day mission integration process that precedes each launch. This will generate additional sales tax activity the area economy.

**Checklist Item 6**

**Page 8: Chapter 313 - Qualified Investment**

**Specific & Detailed description of the qualified investment you propose to make on the property for which you are requesting an appraised value limitation (as defined by Tax Code 313.021)**

The Launch Site is privately owned and leased by SpaceX. It totals approximately 19 acres inside the fence, 9 acres of which will contain launch site related improvements, located in Cameron County that is a designated enterprise zone. SpaceX has designed the site to minimize impact on environmentally sensitive land.

The launch pad will be constructed to the technical standard required for the orbital launch of the Falcon vehicles. The launch pad will consist of a concrete pad, which will serve as the launch platform and will include a launch mount (hardware fabricated by SpaceX and installed). Additionally, the launch pad will include a diverter that will be constructed of concrete and will serve to direct the exhaust away from the vehicle during the first few seconds of launch as the vehicle lifts off from the pad.

An integration and processing hangar (industrial/warehouse facility) of approximately 30,000 square feet of space (250 by 120 by 75 feet high) will be constructed of pre-fabricated steel framework with steel or aluminum sheet walls.

A water deluge system, which includes a retention basin, will be installed at the launch site for noise and vibration suppression. During a launch activity, the deluge system will discharge 30,000 - 80,000 gallons of water. All water not vaporized and expelled will be contained in the retention basin.

SpaceX will construct a metal erector that provides vehicle umbilical, which enables communication and control between the ground and vehicle and preparation for launch. The erector will be moved into the Hangar between launches.

Examples of the above described infrastructure can be seen in a video tour of SpaceX's operational Cape Canaveral launch site here: <http://bit.ly/CCAFStour>.

Located approximately 2 miles from the Launch Site for operational purposes, the nearby Command Control Center is approximately 2 acres located in Cameron County that is a designated enterprise zone on which SpaceX proposes the construction of three buildings: 1) computer and communications center for launch and landing control, 2) payload processing and 3) a second integration hangar or processing facility. Also located at the Command Control Center are significant infrastructure improvements to fiber and electricity as well as advanced computing and communication equipment.

***Description of any new buildings, proposed improvements or personal property you intend to include as part of your minimum qualified investment***

Integration and Processing Hangar

Launch pad and stand with its associated flame duct

Water tower

Lightning protection towers (four total)

Retention basin for deluge water

Propellant storage and handling areas

Workshop and office area

Warehouse

Erector

Roads, parking areas, fencing, security, lighting, and utilities

Dishes

Satellite Fuel Storage

Ordinance Storage

RF Receiver

Launch Control Center

Water Tank

Diesel Storage


Generator Facility

Hangar

**Checklist Item 7**

**Map of the qualified investment showing location of new buildings or new improvements with vicinity map**


**Orbital Launch Site Qualified Investments**



**Command Control Center Qualified Investments**



Vicinity map



## **Checklist Item 8**

### ***Page 8: Chapter 313 - Qualified Property***

#### **Specific & Detailed description of the qualified property for which you are requesting an appraised value limitation (as defined by Tax Code 313.021)**

The qualified property includes the Launch Site that is privately owned and leased by SpaceX. It totals of approximately 19 acres inside the fence, 9 acres of which will contain launch site related improvements, located in Cameron County that is a designated enterprise zone. SpaceX has designed the site to minimize impact on environmentally sensitive land.

The launch pad will be constructed to the technical standard required for the orbital launch of the Falcon vehicles. The launch pad will consist of a concrete pad, which will serve as the launch platform and will include a launch mount (hardware fabricated by SpaceX and installed). Additionally, the launch pad will include a diverter that will be constructed of concrete and will serve to direct the exhaust away from the vehicle during the first few seconds of launch as the vehicle lifts off from the pad.

An integration and processing hangar (industrial/warehouse facility) of approximately 30,000 square feet of space (250 by 120 by 75 feet high) will be constructed of pre-fabricated steel framework with steel or aluminum sheet walls.

A water deluge system, which includes a retention basin, will be installed at the launch site for noise and vibration suppression. During a launch activity, the deluge system will discharge 30,000 - 80,000 gallons of water. All water not vaporized and expelled will be contained in the retention basin.

SpaceX will construct a metal transporter-erector that provides vehicle umbilical, which enables communication and control between the ground and launch vehicle and preparation of vehicle for launch. The transporter erector will be housed in the Hangar between launches.

Examples of the above described infrastructure can be seen in a video tour of SpaceX's operational Cape Canaveral launch site here: <http://bit.ly/CCAFStour>.

The qualified property will also include a nearby Command Control Center that is located approximately 2 miles from the Launch Site for operational purposes. It is approximately 2 acres located in Cameron County that is a designated enterprise zone on which SpaceX proposes the construction of three buildings: 1) computer and communications center for launch and landing control, 2) payload processing and 3) a second integration hangar or processing facility. Also located at the Command Control Center are significant infrastructure improvements to fiber and electricity as well as advanced computing and communication equipment.

***Description of any new buildings, proposed improvements or personal property you intend to include as part of your qualified property***

Launch Site land

Integration and Processing Hangar

Launch pad and stand with its associated flame duct

Water tower

Lightning protection towers (four total)

Retention basin for deluge water

Propellant storage and handling areas

Workshop and office area

Warehouse

Erector

Roads, parking areas, fencing, security, lighting, and utilities

Command Control Center land

Dishes

Satellite Fuel Storage

Ordinance Storage

RF Receiver

Launch Control Center

Water Tank

Diesel Storage


Generator Facility

Hangar

**Checklist Item 9**

**Map of the qualified property showing location of new buildings or new improvements with vicinity map**


**Orbital Launch Site Qualified Property (land and improvements)**



**Command Control Center Qualified Property (land and improvements)**



Vicinity map



**Attachment 14**

**Page 10: Chapter 313 - 110% average weekly wage calculation**

<b>County</b>	<b>Industry</b>	<b>Q3 2012</b>	<b>Q4 2012</b>	<b>Q1 2013</b>	<b>Q2 2013</b>	<b>Avg. Hourly</b>	<b>Average Weekly Wage</b>	<b>110% AWW</b>	<b>Avg. Annual</b>	<b>110% Avg. Annual</b>
Cameron	All	\$ 509.00	\$ 549.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 505.00	\$ -	\$ 517.75	\$ 569.53	\$ 26,923.00	\$ 29,615.30
Cameron	Manufacturing	\$ 794.00	\$ 909.00	\$ 831.00	\$ 785.00	\$ -	\$ 829.75	\$ 912.73	\$ 43,147.00	\$ 47,461.70
Lower Rio Grande COG	Manufacturing					\$ 16.33	\$ 653.10	\$ 718.41	\$ 33,961.00	\$ 37,357.10

**Source:** Texas Workforce Commission

**Date:** October 2013

**2012 Manufacturing Wages by Council of Government Region  
Wages for All Occupations**

COG	Wages	
	Hourly	Annual
<b>Texas</b>	<b>\$23.56</b>	<b>\$48,996</b>
<a href="#"><u>1. Panhandle Regional Planning Commission</u></a>	\$20.12	\$41,850
<a href="#"><u>2. South Plains Association of Governments</u></a>	\$16.18	\$33,662
<a href="#"><u>3. NORTEX Regional Planning Commission</u></a>	\$17.83	\$37,076
<a href="#"><u>4. North Central Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$24.68	\$51,333
<a href="#"><u>5. Ark-Tex Council of Governments</u></a>	\$16.84	\$35,032
<a href="#"><u>6. East Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$19.61	\$40,797
<a href="#"><u>7. West Central Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$18.24	\$37,941
<a href="#"><u>8. Rio Grande Council of Governments</u></a>	\$16.17	\$33,631
<a href="#"><u>9. Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission</u></a>	\$21.93	\$45,624
<a href="#"><u>10. Concho Valley Council of Governments</u></a>	\$16.33	\$33,956
<a href="#"><u>11. Heart of Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$19.07	\$39,670
<a href="#"><u>12. Capital Area Council of Governments</u></a>	\$26.03	\$54,146
<a href="#"><u>13. Brazos Valley Council of Governments</u></a>	\$16.55	\$34,424
<a href="#"><u>14. Deep East Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$16.20	\$33,698
<a href="#"><u>15. South East Texas Regional Planning Commission</u></a>	\$29.38	\$61,118
<a href="#"><u>16. Houston-Galveston Area Council</u></a>	\$26.59	\$55,317
<a href="#"><u>17. Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission</u></a>	\$21.03	\$43,742
<a href="#"><u>18. Alamo Area Council of Governments</u></a>	\$18.40	\$38,280
<a href="#"><u>19. South Texas Development Council</u></a>	\$13.54	\$28,170
<a href="#"><u>20. Coastal Bend Council of Governments</u></a>	\$22.97	\$47,786
<a href="#"><u>21. Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council</u></a>	\$16.33	\$33,961
<a href="#"><u>22. Texoma Council of Governments</u></a>	\$22.57	\$46,949
<a href="#"><u>23. Central Texas Council of Governments</u></a>	\$17.16	\$35,689
<a href="#"><u>24. Middle Rio Grande Development Council</u></a>	\$18.93	\$39,380

Source: Texas Occupational Employment and Wages

Data published: July 2013

Data published annually, next update will be July 31, 2014

Note: Data is not supported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

Wage data is produced from Texas OES data, and is not to be compared to BLS estimates.

Data intended for TAC 313 purposes only.

## District information to qualify as Enterprise Zone

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial		2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate
				Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent						
Anderson	no	58,458	16.5%	25.2%	9.1%	9.5%	8.8%	5.7%	5.2%	
Andrews	no	14,756	17.1%	27.3%	5.0%	6.0%	7.1%	3.4%	3.1%	
Angelina	no	86,771	17.8%	22.0%	7.7%	8.0%	8.3%	4.9%	4.4%	
Aransas	no	23,158	17.4%	14.8%	8.0%	8.1%	6.9%	4.5%	4.2%	
Archer	no	9,054	10.0%	16.0%	5.9%	6.0%	6.0%	3.8%	3.1%	
Armstrong	no	1,901	10.7%	8.5%	4.9%	4.7%	4.8%	3.6%	3.4%	
Atascosa	no	44,911	18.8%	26.2%	7.9%	7.9%	7.4%	4.7%	4.1%	
Austin	no	28,417	8.8%	18.8%	8.2%	8.0%	7.4%	4.3%	3.7%	
Bailey	no	7,165	17.3%	26.6%	7.3%	7.1%	5.6%	4.2%	4.4%	
Bandera	no	20,485	18.4%	11.0%	6.8%	7.1%	6.5%	4.4%	3.8%	
Bastrop	no	74,171	14.1%	19.4%	7.8%	8.4%	7.8%	4.9%	4.0%	
Baylor	no	3,726	17.3%	15.3%	5.8%	6.6%	5.8%	3.8%	3.8%	
<b>Bee</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>31,861</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	
Bell	no	310,235	14.1%	11.4%	8.0%	7.5%	6.7%	4.9%	4.4%	
Bexar	no	1,714,773	16.9%	18.6%	7.6%	7.4%	6.8%	4.7%	4.1%	
Blanco	no	10,497	11.7%	11.7%	6.1%	5.9%	5.1%	3.8%	3.4%	
Borden	no	641	4.3%	14.9%	3.9%	5.0%	5.7%	3.2%	4.4%	
Bosque	no	18,212	16.2%	19.9%	8.5%	8.7%	7.9%	4.7%	4.4%	
Bowie	no	92,565	16.8%	16.5%	7.7%	8.3%	6.7%	5.1%	4.8%	
Brazoria	no	313,166	10.6%	15.7%	8.6%	9.0%	8.1%	5.2%	4.4%	
Brazos	no	194,851	29.7%	15.5%	6.4%	6.1%	5.4%	3.9%	3.6%	
Brewster	no	9,232	16.5%	19.8%	5.3%	5.5%	4.9%	3.7%	3.2%	
Briscoe	no	1,637	19.9%	19.0%	6.8%	5.9%	5.6%	4.2%	4.3%	
<b>Brooks</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>7,223</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	
Brown	no	38,106	16.2%	18.3%	7.2%	7.3%	6.9%	4.5%	4.2%	
Burleson	no	17,187	13.5%	23.2%	6.8%	6.9%	6.8%	4.4%	3.7%	
Burnet	no	42,750	13.7%	16.5%	6.2%	6.5%	6.1%	4.0%	3.5%	
Caldwell	no	38,066	19.6%	24.4%	8.5%	8.6%	8.3%	5.2%	4.3%	
Calhoun	no	21,381	16.3%	21.8%	9.1%	9.0%	8.6%	4.9%	4.4%	
Callahan	no	13,544	13.9%	13.7%	6.2%	6.0%	5.9%	3.7%	3.4%	
<b>Cameron</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>406,220</b>	<b>34.7%</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	
Camp	no	12,401	20.4%	25.3%	8.8%	8.8%	8.9%	5.0%	4.6%	
Carson	no	6,182	5.7%	12.1%	5.0%	5.2%	5.9%	3.4%	3.1%	
Cass	no	30,464	19.3%	17.7%	10.6%	11.0%	11.5%	6.2%	5.5%	
Castro	no	8,062	23.3%	31.9%	5.7%	5.6%	5.0%	3.7%	3.8%	
Chambers	no	35,096	10.5%	15.2%	8.9%	9.9%	9.4%	5.8%	4.6%	
Cherokee	no	50,845	22.4%	25.8%	8.9%	9.1%	9.0%	6.0%	4.9%	
Childress	no	7,041	16.2%	17.9%	6.1%	7.1%	6.0%	5.1%	5.0%	
Clay	no	10,752	11.7%	10.8%	6.1%	6.6%	7.0%	4.0%	3.4%	
Cochran	no	3,127	24.9%	33.5%	9.0%	8.2%	6.7%	4.8%	5.0%	
Coke	no	3,320	15.1%	13.7%	7.0%	7.9%	8.4%	7.7%	5.7%	
Coleman	no	13,544	29.4%	22.2%	7.1%	6.9%	7.0%	4.0%	3.6%	
Collin	no	782,341	6.9%	7.2%	7.0%	7.5%	7.3%	4.6%	3.8%	

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial		2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate
				Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent						
Collingsworth	no	3,057	20.8%	25.8%		5.3%	5.4%	5.5%	3.9%	3.4%
Colorado	no	20,874	15.2%	20.4%		7.1%	7.5%	6.5%	4.0%	3.6%
Comal	no	108,472	10.0%	11.4%		6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	4.1%	3.6%
Comanche	no	13,974	22.1%	25.3%		6.7%	6.7%	6.1%	3.9%	3.9%
Concho	yes	4,087	20.0%	28.3%		7.9%	8.3%	7.4%	5.3%	5.0%
Cooke	no	38,437	13.6%	18.2%		5.4%	6.6%	6.6%	3.5%	3.6%
Coryell	no	75,388	13.2%	12.4%		9.2%	8.8%	8.4%	6.1%	5.7%
Cottle	no	1,505	10.9%	20.9%		6.4%	6.3%	5.6%	4.0%	4.2%
Crane	no	4,375	17.0%	27.8%		7.3%	8.1%	8.7%	4.1%	4.0%
Crockett	no	3,719	15.9%	38.1%		5.3%	6.8%	8.6%	2.9%	3.1%
Crosby	no	6,059	23.9%	24.8%		9.3%	7.9%	6.9%	4.9%	4.6%
Culberson	no	2,398	28.8%	38.2%		4.2%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%	2.7%
Dallam	no	6,703	12.5%	28.2%		4.6%	5.2%	4.3%	3.0%	2.8%
Dallas	no	2,368,139	17.6%	23.5%		8.4%	8.8%	8.2%	5.4%	4.5%
Dawson	yes	13,833	19.1%	33.0%		7.9%	8.2%	8.1%	5.4%	5.4%
Deaf Smith	no	19,372	17.5%	33.7%		5.6%	5.7%	5.3%	3.8%	3.6%
Delta	no	5,231	14.5%	15.8%		8.9%	9.1%	8.4%	5.3%	4.7%
Denton	no	662,614	8.0%	8.8%		7.0%	7.5%	7.2%	4.5%	3.9%
DeWitt	no	20,097	16.4%	24.5%		6.7%	7.9%	7.7%	4.2%	4.1%
Dickens	no	2,444	24.6%	27.1%		13.6%	10.3%	7.4%	4.4%	3.9%
Dimmit	yes	9,996	36.4%	39.0%		7.0%	9.6%	10.2%	6.7%	6.3%
Donley	no	3,677	10.5%	17.8%		6.1%	6.4%	6.2%	4.2%	4.3%
Duval	yes	11,782	22.9%	35.1%		9.1%	11.2%	11.1%	5.4%	5.0%
Eastland	no	18,583	21.0%	22.3%		7.1%	7.9%	7.6%	4.6%	4.3%
Ector	no	137,130	16.7%	27.1%		5.8%	7.8%	8.2%	3.4%	3.4%
Edwards	no	2,002	24.7%	32.3%		7.1%	7.2%	7.3%	3.8%	3.9%
El Paso	yes	800,647	25.6%	29.0%		10.3%	9.5%	8.0%	6.3%	5.9%
Ellis	no	149,610	11.3%	17.1%		8.1%	8.5%	9.0%	5.1%	4.3%
Erath	no	37,890	19.7%	20.5%		6.2%	6.5%	6.3%	3.8%	3.5%
Falls	yes	17,866	23.4%	26.5%		9.5%	9.6%	8.9%	5.8%	5.3%
Fannin	no	33,915	14.7%	17.6%		9.9%	9.3%	8.8%	5.9%	5.3%
Fayette	no	24,554	11.0%	21.0%		5.8%	5.9%	5.6%	3.5%	3.2%
Fisher	no	3,974	13.9%	19.0%		6.4%	6.5%	6.1%	3.9%	4.0%
Floyd	no	6,446	23.8%	25.4%		8.3%	8.5%	6.8%	4.7%	5.2%
Foard	no	1,336	23.4%	24.2%		7.0%	6.3%	5.8%	4.0%	4.0%
Fort Bend	no	585,375	8.0%	11.4%		7.3%	7.3%	7.2%	4.5%	4.1%
Franklin	no	10,605	14.8%	17.3%		7.3%	7.7%	6.9%	4.3%	3.6%
Freestone	no	19,816	16.0%	21.3%		6.4%	6.6%	6.3%	4.1%	3.7%
Frio	no	17,217	21.8%	35.7%		7.3%	7.6%	7.6%	5.5%	4.9%
Gaines	no	17,526	18.0%	41.8%		5.6%	6.2%	6.4%	3.9%	3.8%
Galveston	no	291,309	12.8%	14.1%		9.1%	9.2%	8.2%	5.8%	4.5%
Garza	no	6,461	21.7%	37.1%		7.1%	5.4%	5.3%	3.8%	3.5%
Gillespie	no	24,837	8.0%	13.6%		4.7%	4.8%	4.5%	3.1%	2.9%

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial		2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate
				Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent						
Glasscock	no	1,226	11.2%	22.0%	4.4%	5.6%	4.9%	3.7%	3.6%	
Goliad	no	7,210	11.8%	16.2%	6.1%	7.3%	6.9%	3.8%	3.8%	
Gonzales	no	19,807	20.3%	32.4%	5.7%	6.2%	5.5%	4.0%	3.9%	
Gray	no	22,535	15.0%	20.7%	6.0%	7.5%	8.2%	3.5%	3.4%	
Grayson	no	120,877	13.5%	14.8%	8.3%	8.4%	8.1%	5.3%	4.6%	
Gregg	no	121,730	16.5%	17.6%	6.8%	7.2%	7.2%	4.0%	3.8%	
Grimes	no	26,604	15.9%	22.8%	7.9%	8.8%	8.6%	5.2%	4.7%	
Guadalupe	no	131,533	9.7%	14.9%	6.7%	6.9%	6.5%	4.4%	3.8%	
Hale	no	36,273	19.0%	30.0%	7.2%	7.0%	6.2%	4.6%	4.7%	
Hall	yes	3,353	27.7%	27.8%	8.9%	9.2%	8.5%	5.6%	5.5%	
Hamilton	no	8,517	11.4%	17.4%	5.9%	6.1%	5.7%	3.6%	3.6%	
Hansford	no	5,613	13.5%	24.0%	4.5%	4.8%	5.2%	3.2%	3.1%	
Hardeman	no	4,139	19.2%	20.6%	5.9%	6.9%	7.5%	3.6%	3.7%	
Hardin	no	54,635	12.0%	14.9%	9.4%	9.3%	8.8%	5.5%	4.7%	
Harris	no	4,092,459	16.8%	22.4%	8.2%	8.5%	7.6%	4.8%	4.2%	
Harrison	no	65,631	15.2%	16.3%	7.8%	8.8%	8.2%	4.7%	4.4%	
Hartley	no	6,062	9.3%	21.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.2%	3.3%	3.4%	
Haskell	no	5,899	18.8%	22.1%	5.2%	5.0%	5.2%	3.3%	3.6%	
Hays	no	157,107	16.4%	11.9%	6.7%	7.1%	6.6%	4.3%	3.7%	
Hemphill	no	3,807	16.8%	19.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.5%	2.0%	2.1%	
Henderson	no	78,532	16.8%	21.0%	8.4%	8.6%	8.2%	5.4%	4.5%	
Hidalgo	yes	774,769	34.4%	39.8%	12.0%	11.8%	10.6%	7.3%	6.5%	
Hill	no	35,089	15.0%	21.9%	8.3%	8.3%	7.9%	5.1%	4.7%	
Hockley	no	22,935	17.0%	25.9%	5.7%	6.3%	6.9%	3.8%	3.7%	
Hood	no	51,182	10.9%	13.8%	7.2%	7.5%	7.1%	4.2%	4.2%	
Hopkins	no	35,161	15.8%	21.3%	6.9%	6.8%	6.1%	4.2%	3.9%	
Houston	no	23,732	23.7%	21.5%	10.4%	9.8%	9.4%	6.6%	6.0%	
Howard	no	35,012	17.7%	29.2%	7.2%	7.2%	7.4%	4.6%	4.2%	
Hudspeth	no	3,476	46.0%	49.5%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	4.1%	4.9%	
Hunt	no	86,129	19.2%	20.0%	8.4%	8.8%	8.2%	5.3%	4.5%	
Hutchinson	no	22,150	15.2%	16.5%	6.8%	7.3%	6.9%	4.2%	4.0%	
Irion	no	1,599	1.5%	18.4%	5.5%	4.8%	5.3%	3.5%	3.0%	
Jack	no	9,044	17.8%	21.1%	5.4%	6.1%	6.3%	3.3%	3.4%	
Jackson	no	14,075	11.7%	22.8%	6.6%	7.3%	7.5%	4.1%	3.1%	
Jasper	no	35,710	18.6%	18.4%	11.7%	11.5%	10.2%	6.5%	5.7%	
Jeff Davis	no	2,342	14.7%	16.1%	5.7%	5.3%	5.1%	3.7%	3.5%	
Jefferson	no	252,273	18.8%	18.6%	11.3%	10.9%	9.7%	6.8%	5.5%	
Jim Hogg	no	5,300	12.0%	31.1%	6.5%	7.9%	7.8%	3.9%	3.7%	
Jim Wells	no	40,838	21.9%	29.4%	6.7%	8.6%	8.9%	4.3%	4.0%	
Johnson	no	150,934	10.5%	18.3%	7.6%	8.3%	8.2%	4.7%	4.1%	
Jones	no	20,202	12.3%	30.4%	7.5%	8.0%	7.8%	5.0%	4.7%	
Karnes	yes	14,824	19.0%	34.4%	8.4%	9.4%	9.2%	6.1%	5.7%	
Kaufman	no	103,350	11.4%	17.3%	8.3%	9.0%	8.3%	5.4%	4.7%	

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial				2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate
		2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent						
Kendall	no	33,410	7.1%	8.9%	6.2%	6.0%	5.7%	3.8%	3.5%	
Kenedy	no	416	14.9%	40.2%	4.7%	5.5%	6.0%	3.3%	2.8%	
Kent	no	808	5.4%	9.4%	6.0%	5.9%	5.4%	4.5%	3.5%	
Kerr	no	49,625	14.1%	13.8%	6.4%	6.2%	5.8%	4.0%	3.5%	
Kimble	no	4,607	14.6%	23.5%	6.8%	6.5%	5.2%	3.8%	3.4%	
King	no	286	0.0%	9.2%	5.7%	6.7%	5.2%	4.2%	4.5%	
Kinney	no	3,598	32.2%	24.6%	8.6%	9.0%	7.7%	5.4%	4.8%	
Kleberg	no	32,061	24.8%	23.9%	6.9%	7.0%	6.8%	4.3%	4.1%	
Knox	no	3,719	16.0%	24.5%	6.1%	5.8%	6.1%	3.9%	3.8%	
La Salle	no	6,886	21.8%	40.1%	6.5%	7.9%	7.9%	5.6%	4.9%	
Lamar	no	49,793	16.7%	17.6%	9.7%	9.0%	7.8%	5.5%	4.6%	
Lamb	no	13,977	17.9%	28.1%	7.2%	7.1%	7.4%	4.5%	4.1%	
Lampasas	no	19,677	14.6%	17.4%	7.2%	6.2%	5.9%	4.1%	3.6%	
Lavaca	no	19,263	10.5%	23.7%	5.7%	6.6%	5.9%	3.5%	3.2%	
Lee	no	16,612	10.8%	20.9%	5.9%	6.7%	6.8%	4.0%	3.5%	
Leon	no	16,801	16.7%	21.3%	7.6%	7.8%	6.9%	4.4%	4.3%	
Liberty	no	75,643	15.4%	26.8%	10.6%	11.0%	10.1%	6.0%	5.2%	
Limestone	no	23,384	18.9%	25.5%	7.3%	6.8%	6.3%	4.5%	4.3%	
Lipscomb	no	3,302	14.2%	18.5%	4.5%	5.6%	6.7%	2.7%	2.6%	
Live Oak	no	11,531	13.3%	22.9%	5.5%	6.7%	7.3%	4.3%	3.9%	
Llano	no	19,301	12.6%	12.0%	7.5%	7.5%	7.0%	4.5%	4.0%	
Loving	no	82	0.0%	7.7%	9.8%	8.0%	10.0%	8.9%	9.7%	
Lubbock	no	278,831	18.8%	16.6%	6.1%	6.2%	5.3%	3.8%	3.6%	
Lynn	no	5,915	16.9%	25.8%	7.3%	7.1%	6.3%	4.7%	5.0%	
Madison	no	13,664	20.4%	21.8%	8.1%	7.9%	7.5%	5.3%	3.9%	
Marion	no	10,546	23.2%	23.1%	9.2%	10.3%	10.5%	5.1%	4.6%	
Martin	no	4,799	7.2%	29.1%	5.3%	5.7%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	
Mason	no	4,012	16.3%	20.1%	4.9%	5.1%	5.1%	3.0%	2.8%	
Matagorda	no	36,702	21.6%	23.4%	11.6%	11.3%	10.3%	7.0%	5.9%	
Maverick	yes	54,258	33.6%	44.8%	14.2%	15.2%	14.4%	11.0%	11.3%	
McCulloch	no	8,283	22.9%	25.2%	5.9%	7.1%	8.1%	4.1%	3.9%	
McLennan	no	234,906	20.5%	19.7%	7.4%	7.4%	6.7%	4.6%	4.2%	
McMullen	no	707	9.1%	21.3%	3.8%	6.7%	7.2%	5.6%	5.3%	
Medina	no	46,006	15.9%	21.7%	7.4%	7.4%	6.7%	5.1%	4.1%	
Menard	no	2,242	18.6%	19.9%	7.0%	7.0%	6.8%	4.4%	3.5%	
Midland	no	136,872	12.5%	18.8%	4.4%	5.3%	5.6%	2.9%	2.9%	
Milam	no	24,757	17.6%	18.5%	9.6%	10.4%	11.1%	5.5%	4.2%	
Mills	no	4,936	15.7%	22.8%	6.1%	6.0%	5.4%	4.0%	3.9%	
Mitchell	no	9,403	15.3%	26.6%	7.8%	8.6%	8.6%	5.4%	5.2%	
Montague	no	19,719	13.2%	18.8%	5.9%	7.2%	7.2%	3.7%	3.6%	
Montgomery	no	455,746	10.9%	14.1%	7.2%	7.6%	7.0%	4.3%	3.9%	
Moore	no	21,904	13.4%	30.5%	4.7%	4.9%	4.7%	3.1%	3.0%	
Morris	no	12,934	16.7%	17.7%	11.5%	13.1%	14.9%	6.2%	5.2%	

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial								
		2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate	
Motley	no	1,210	22.1%	15.3%	6.0%	5.6%	5.4%	4.1%	4.0%	
Nacogdoches	no	64,524	24.6%	19.5%	6.8%	6.9%	6.4%	4.4%	4.1%	
Navarro	no	47,735	19.8%	23.5%	8.8%	9.1%	8.0%	5.6%	4.9%	
Newton	no	14,445	16.2%	22.3%	13.9%	13.0%	11.5%	7.3%	6.5%	
Nolan	no	15,216	19.4%	22.6%	6.6%	6.9%	6.4%	3.9%	3.7%	
Nueces	no	340,223	19.1%	21.8%	7.6%	7.6%	6.9%	4.6%	4.3%	
Ochiltree	no	10,223	17.7%	29.3%	4.2%	5.1%	6.0%	2.7%	2.7%	
Oldham	no	2,052	13.4%	17.7%	5.1%	6.0%	5.9%	4.2%	3.9%	
Orange	no	81,837	13.9%	14.2%	11.2%	10.8%	9.9%	6.6%	5.2%	
Palo Pinto	no	28,111	13.8%	23.2%	7.4%	7.9%	7.8%	4.3%	3.7%	
Panola	no	23,796	12.5%	18.5%	6.9%	7.3%	7.4%	3.9%	3.8%	
Parker	no	116,927	10.5%	14.6%	7.1%	7.7%	7.7%	4.5%	4.0%	
Parmer	no	10,269	18.6%	35.0%	5.1%	4.7%	4.5%	3.4%	3.2%	
Pecos	no	15,507	19.9%	34.9%	5.3%	6.7%	9.1%	4.8%	4.2%	
Polk	no	45,413	21.8%	25.1%	9.7%	9.9%	9.1%	6.4%	6.0%	
Potter	no	121,073	22.7%	24.6%	6.3%	6.5%	6.1%	4.1%	3.8%	
Presidio	yes	7,818	24.1%	46.3%	14.3%	17.3%	16.7%	10.8%	9.0%	
Rains	no	10,914	11.5%	19.2%	8.5%	9.2%	8.1%	5.2%	4.4%	
Randall	no	120,725	9.4%	8.7%	4.7%	5.0%	4.6%	3.1%	3.0%	
Reagan	no	3,367	10.5%	31.5%	3.2%	4.1%	6.5%	2.0%	2.0%	
Real	no	3,309	26.8%	22.4%	7.3%	5.8%	5.6%	3.9%	4.2%	
Red River	yes	12,860	17.5%	27.5%	11.8%	11.0%	9.3%	6.6%	5.0%	
Reeves	yes	13,783	28.7%	47.2%	11.0%	10.9%	11.8%	6.0%	5.3%	
Refugio	no	7,383	16.0%	27.3%	5.9%	6.9%	6.5%	3.9%	3.9%	
Roberts	no	929	14.6%	8.1%	4.0%	4.7%	5.2%	2.4%	2.3%	
Robertson	no	16,620	21.2%	23.4%	8.8%	8.6%	7.8%	4.9%	4.8%	
Rockwall	no	78,337	5.6%	8.7%	7.2%	7.6%	7.3%	4.6%	4.0%	
Runnels	no	10,501	21.6%	22.9%	8.2%	9.0%	7.6%	4.8%	4.5%	
Rusk	no	53,330	12.4%	20.6%	7.0%	7.6%	7.8%	4.4%	4.2%	
Sabine	no	10,834	18.0%	22.5%	16.3%	16.3%	14.9%	9.2%	8.3%	
San Augustine	yes	8,865	27.1%	28.6%	12.4%	11.1%	10.2%	6.4%	5.6%	
San Jacinto	no	26,384	17.8%	23.0%	9.6%	10.4%	9.2%	5.8%	5.1%	
San Patricio	no	64,804	16.6%	23.7%	9.5%	10.3%	8.7%	5.4%	4.9%	
San Saba	no	6,131	23.4%	18.6%	7.5%	8.3%	7.3%	5.5%	4.8%	
Schleicher	no	3,461	12.4%	21.5%	6.3%	8.0%	9.4%	3.5%	3.4%	
Scurry	no	16,921	17.7%	25.8%	5.6%	6.4%	6.8%	4.1%	3.9%	
Shackelford	no	3,378	13.2%	13.2%	4.2%	4.6%	4.1%	2.7%	2.7%	
Shelby	no	25,448	25.4%	24.6%	7.9%	7.9%	7.4%	4.9%	4.3%	
Sherman	no	3,034	12.9%	25.6%	5.0%	4.8%	4.7%	3.7%	3.5%	
Smith	no	209,714	15.4%	15.8%	7.8%	7.9%	7.6%	5.0%	4.2%	
Somervell	no	8,490	10.8%	12.6%	7.6%	7.9%	7.0%	4.5%	4.5%	
Starr	yes	60,968	38.0%	52.1%	16.9%	17.9%	16.7%	11.9%	10.5%	
Stephens	no	9,630	19.9%	17.8%	7.5%	7.1%	6.8%	3.7%	3.6%	

County	2012 Distressed County	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent						
				2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate	2007 Unemployment Rate		
Sterling	no	1,143	21.0%	22.5%	4.2%	4.6%	4.4%	2.8%	2.8%	
Stonewall	no	1,490	11.9%	14.5%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%	3.4%	3.1%	
Sutton	no	4,128	11.7%	30.6%	4.5%	6.4%	6.7%	2.0%	2.2%	
Swisher	no	7,854	15.4%	24.1%	6.5%	6.2%	6.0%	4.5%	4.4%	
Tarrant	no	1,809,034	13.4%	66.2%	7.8%	8.3%	7.7%	4.9%	4.2%	
Taylor	no	131,506	16.5%	15.9%	6.3%	6.4%	5.7%	3.8%	3.5%	
Terrell	no	984	16.5%	19.6%	8.6%	8.5%	9.0%	5.8%	5.4%	
Terry	no	12,651	16.6%	31.9%	7.3%	7.4%	7.0%	4.4%	4.6%	
Throckmorton	no	1,641	13.2%	21.6%	5.6%	4.8%	5.2%	3.4%	3.8%	
Titus	no	32,334	17.9%	27.1%	7.9%	7.8%	7.4%	4.3%	3.8%	
Tom Green	no	110,224	16.8%	18.8%	6.3%	6.4%	6.5%	4.1%	3.7%	
Travis	no	1,024,266	16.2%	13.7%	6.6%	6.9%	6.7%	4.2%	3.5%	
Trinity	no	14,585	16.6%	19.1%	9.2%	8.8%	8.5%	5.6%	4.9%	
Tyler	no	21,766	18.3%	17.1%	11.5%	10.6%	9.8%	6.1%	5.5%	
Upshur	no	39,309	13.1%	16.6%	7.2%	7.8%	7.6%	4.3%	4.0%	
Upton	no	3,355	13.9%	24.5%	4.5%	5.0%	5.7%	3.1%	3.0%	
Uvalde	yes	26,405	26.7%	30.1%	9.0%	9.1%	8.1%	5.9%	5.2%	
Val Verde	yes	48,879	24.0%	30.1%	9.0%	9.1%	9.3%	6.0%	5.4%	
Van Zandt	no	52,579	24.0%	36.0%	7.4%	7.6%	7.0%	4.4%	4.0%	
Victoria	no	86,793	16.4%	19.9%	6.4%	7.3%	7.1%	3.9%	3.5%	
Walker	no	67,861	21.1%	19.7%	7.8%	7.6%	7.0%	5.3%	4.8%	
Waller	no	43,205	21.1%	20.5%	8.2%	8.9%	8.2%	5.0%	4.5%	
Ward	no	10,658	17.3%	29.6%	6.2%	8.0%	8.9%	3.9%	3.8%	
Washington	no	33,718	16.0%	20.8%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	4.1%	3.7%	
Webb	no	250,304	29.8%	37.3%	8.1%	8.6%	8.7%	5.4%	4.8%	
Wharton	no	41,280	17.2%	24.9%	8.3%	8.6%	7.0%	4.5%	4.2%	
Wheeler	no	5,410	13.9%	20.6%	4.0%	4.7%	5.7%	2.5%	2.6%	
Wichita	no	131,500	15.3%	17.2%	7.3%	8.0%	7.6%	5.0%	4.1%	
Wilbarger	no	13,535	23.3%	26.4%	5.6%	6.1%	4.9%	3.7%	3.4%	
Willacy	yes	22,134	43.4%	42.6%	14.3%	12.7%	12.3%	9.0%	8.0%	
Williamson	no	422,679	6.5%	8.4%	6.8%	7.4%	7.4%	4.6%	3.6%	
Wilson	no	42,918	9.0%	15.5%	7.1%	7.4%	6.5%	4.7%	4.0%	
Winkler	no	7,110	16.3%	37.1%	6.1%	7.8%	9.4%	3.9%	3.2%	
Wise	no	59,127	9.8%	18.5%	7.2%	8.2%	8.7%	4.4%	4.1%	
Wood	no	41,964	14.0%	19.2%	8.0%	8.6%	8.0%	5.1%	4.6%	
Yoakum	no	7,879	25.0%	28.6%	4.7%	6.3%	7.7%	3.1%	3.2%	
Young	no	18,550	15.6%	23.5%	6.5%	6.7%	6.5%	3.6%	3.3%	
Zapata	yes	14,018	37.6%	43.3%	8.5%	11.0%	10.8%	5.6%	5.3%	
Zavala	yes	11,677	43.0%	83.2%	15.4%	15.6%	14.9%	10.8%	10.5%	

Checklist Item 22

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Anderson	no	58,458	16.50%	25.20%	7.70%	9.1%	9.5%	8.8%	5.7%
Andrews	no	14,756	17.10%	27.30%	3.70%	5.0%	6.0%	7.1%	3.4%
Angelina	no	86,771	17.80%	22.00%	6.70%	7.7%	8.0%	8.3%	4.9%
Aransas	no	23,158	17.40%	14.80%	6.10%	8.0%	8.1%	6.9%	4.5%
Archer	no	9,054	10.00%	16.00%	4.90%	5.9%	6.0%	6.0%	3.8%
Armstrong	no	1,901	10.70%	8.50%	4.80%	4.9%	4.7%	4.8%	3.6%
Atascosa	no	44,911	18.80%	26.20%	6.60%	7.9%	7.9%	7.4%	4.7%
Austin	no	28,417	8.80%	18.80%	6.00%	8.2%	8.0%	7.4%	4.3%
Bailey	no	7,165	17.30%	26.60%	6.60%	7.3%	7.1%	5.6%	4.2%
Bandera	no	20,485	18.40%	11.00%	6.00%	6.8%	7.1%	6.5%	4.4%
Bastrop	no	74,171	14.10%	19.40%	6.40%	7.8%	8.4%	7.8%	4.9%
Baylor	no	3,726	17.30%	15.30%	4.30%	5.8%	6.6%	5.8%	3.8%
Bee	yes	31,861	19.00%	30.50%	7.00%	8.6%	9.1%	9.3%	6.3%
Bell	no	310,235	14.10%	11.40%	7.30%	8.0%	7.5%	6.7%	4.9%
Bexar	no	1,714,773	16.90%	18.60%	6.60%	7.6%	7.4%	6.8%	4.7%
Blanco	no	10,497	11.70%	11.70%	5.50%	6.1%	5.9%	5.1%	3.8%
Borden	no	641	4.30%	14.90%	3.00%	3.9%	5.0%	5.7%	3.2%
Bosque	no	18,212	16.20%	19.90%	7.40%	8.5%	8.7%	7.9%	4.7%
Bowie	no	92,565	16.80%	16.50%	6.80%	7.7%	8.3%	6.7%	5.1%
Brazoria	no	313,166	10.60%	15.70%	7.00%	8.6%	9.0%	8.1%	5.2%
Brazos	no	194,851	29.70%	15.50%	5.50%	6.4%	6.1%	5.4%	3.9%
Brewster	no	9,232	16.50%	19.80%	4.70%	5.3%	5.5%	4.9%	3.7%
Briscoe	no	1,637	19.90%	19.00%	6.30%	6.8%	5.9%	5.6%	4.2%
Brooks	yes	7,223	34.00%	46.30%	7.10%	8.9%	9.9%	9.5%	5.4%
Brown	no	38,106	16.20%	18.30%	6.00%	7.2%	7.3%	6.9%	4.5%
Burleson	no	17,187	13.50%	23.20%	6.00%	6.8%	6.9%	6.8%	4.4%
Burnet	no	42,750	13.70%	16.50%	5.40%	6.2%	6.5%	6.1%	4.0%
Caldwell	no	38,066	19.60%	24.40%	7.00%	8.5%	8.6%	8.3%	5.2%
Calhoun	no	21,381	16.30%	21.80%	7.00%	9.1%	9.0%	8.6%	4.9%
Callahan	no	13,544	13.90%	13.70%	5.10%	6.2%	6.0%	5.9%	3.7%
<b>Cameron</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>406,220</b>	<b>34.70%</b>	<b>37.70%</b>	<b>10.50%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>
Camp	no	12,401	20.40%	25.30%	7.70%	8.8%	8.8%	8.9%	5.0%
Carson	no	6,182	5.70%	12.10%	4.50%	5.0%	5.2%	5.9%	3.4%
Cass	no	30,464	19.30%	17.70%	9.10%	10.6%	11.0%	11.5%	6.2%
Castro	no	8,062	23.30%	31.90%	5.10%	5.7%	5.6%	5.0%	3.7%
Chambers	no	35,096	10.50%	15.20%	7.70%	8.9%	9.9%	9.4%	5.8%
Cherokee	yes	50,845	22.40%	25.80%	7.70%	8.9%	9.1%	9.0%	6.0%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Childress	no	7,041	16.20%	17.90%	5.30%	6.1%	7.1%	6.0%	5.1%
Clay	no	10,752	11.70%	10.80%	5.10%	6.1%	6.6%	7.0%	4.0%
Cochran	no	3,127	24.90%	33.50%	7.70%	9.0%	8.2%	6.7%	4.8%
Coke	no	3,320	15.10%	13.70%	6.20%	7.0%	7.9%	8.4%	7.7%
Coleman	no	13,544	29.40%	22.20%	5.90%	7.1%	6.9%	7.0%	4.0%
Collin	no	782,341	6.90%	7.20%	6.10%	7.0%	7.5%	7.3%	4.6%
Collingsworth	no	3,057	20.80%	25.80%	4.70%	5.3%	5.4%	5.5%	3.9%
Colorado	no	20,874	15.20%	20.40%	5.70%	7.1%	7.5%	6.5%	4.0%
Comal	no	108,472	10.00%	11.40%	6.10%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	4.1%
Comanche	no	13,974	22.10%	25.30%	5.80%	6.7%	6.7%	6.1%	3.9%
Concho	yes	4,087	20.00%	28.30%	7.10%	7.9%	8.3%	7.4%	5.3%
Cooke	no	38,437	13.60%	18.20%	4.40%	5.4%	6.6%	6.6%	3.5%
Coryell	no	75,388	13.20%	12.40%	8.60%	9.2%	8.8%	8.4%	6.1%
Cottle	no	1,505	10.90%	20.90%	6.10%	6.4%	6.3%	5.6%	4.0%
Crane	no	4,375	17.00%	27.80%	5.30%	7.3%	8.1%	8.7%	4.1%
Crockett	no	3,719	15.90%	38.10%	4.00%	5.3%	6.8%	8.6%	2.9%
Crosby	no	6,059	23.90%	24.80%	6.80%	9.3%	7.9%	6.9%	4.9%
Culberson	no	2,398	28.80%	38.20%	3.50%	4.2%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Dallam	no	6,703	12.50%	28.20%	3.90%	4.6%	5.2%	4.3%	3.0%
Dallas	no	2,368,139	17.60%	23.50%	7.20%	8.4%	8.8%	8.2%	5.4%
Dawson	yes	13,833	19.10%	33.00%	6.90%	7.9%	8.2%	8.1%	5.4%
Deaf Smith	no	19,372	17.50%	33.70%	4.90%	5.6%	5.7%	5.3%	3.8%
Delta	no	5,231	14.50%	15.80%	7.60%	8.9%	9.1%	8.4%	5.3%
Denton	no	662,614	8.00%	8.80%	6.00%	7.0%	7.5%	7.2%	4.5%
DeWitt	no	20,097	16.40%	24.50%	5.00%	6.7%	7.9%	7.7%	4.2%
Dickens	no	2,444	24.60%	27.10%	9.50%	13.6%	10.3%	7.4%	4.4%
Dimmit	yes	9,996	36.40%	39.00%	5.10%	7.0%	9.6%	10.2%	6.7%
Donley	no	3,677	10.50%	17.80%	5.50%	6.1%	6.4%	6.2%	4.2%
Duval	yes	11,782	22.90%	35.10%	6.70%	9.1%	11.2%	11.1%	5.4%
Eastland	no	18,583	21.00%	22.30%	6.10%	7.1%	7.9%	7.6%	4.6%
Ector	no	137,130	16.70%	27.10%	4.20%	5.8%	7.8%	8.2%	3.4%
Edwards	no	2,002	24.70%	32.30%	6.80%	7.1%	7.2%	7.3%	3.8%
El Paso	yes	800,647	25.60%	29.00%	6.80%	10.3%	9.5%	8.0%	6.3%
Ellis	no	149,610	11.30%	17.10%	9.30%	8.1%	8.5%	9.0%	5.1%
Erath	no	37,890	19.70%	20.50%	5.50%	6.2%	6.5%	6.3%	3.8%
Falls	yes	17,866	23.40%	26.50%	8.40%	9.5%	9.6%	8.9%	5.8%
Fannin	no	33,915	14.70%	17.60%	8.60%	9.9%	9.3%	8.8%	5.9%
Fayette	no	24,554	11.00%	21.00%	4.80%	5.8%	5.9%	5.6%	3.5%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Fisher	no	3,974	13.90%	19.00%	5.20%	6.4%	6.5%	6.1%	3.9%
Floyd	no	6,446	23.80%	25.40%	6.80%	8.3%	8.5%	6.8%	4.7%
Foard	no	1,336	23.40%	24.20%	5.70%	7.0%	6.3%	5.8%	4.0%
Fort Bend	no	585,375	8.00%	11.40%	6.10%	7.3%	8.0%	7.2%	4.5%
Franklin	no	10,605	14.80%	17.30%	6.50%	7.3%	7.7%	6.9%	4.3%
Freestone	no	19,816	16.00%	21.30%	5.40%	6.4%	6.6%	6.3%	4.1%
Frio	yes	17,217	21.80%	35.70%	5.60%	7.3%	7.6%	7.6%	5.5%
Gaines	no	17,526	18.00%	41.80%	4.60%	5.6%	6.2%	6.4%	3.9%
Galveston	no	291,309	12.80%	14.10%	7.70%	9.1%	9.2%	8.2%	5.8%
Garza	no	6,461	21.70%	37.10%	6.10%	7.1%	5.4%	5.3%	3.8%
Gillespie	no	24,837	8.00%	13.60%	4.20%	4.7%	4.8%	4.5%	3.1%
Glasscock	no	1,226	11.20%	22.00%	4.30%	4.4%	5.6%	4.9%	3.7%
Goliad	no	7,210	11.80%	16.20%	5.30%	6.1%	7.3%	6.9%	3.8%
Gonzales	no	19,807	20.30%	32.40%	4.60%	5.7%	6.2%	5.5%	4.0%
Gray	no	22,535	15.00%	20.70%	4.80%	6.0%	7.5%	8.2%	3.5%
Grayson	no	120,877	13.50%	14.80%	7.20%	8.3%	8.4%	8.1%	5.3%
Gregg	no	121,730	16.50%	17.60%	5.70%	6.8%	7.2%	7.2%	4.0%
Grimes	no	26,604	15.90%	22.80%	6.50%	7.9%	8.8%	8.6%	5.2%
Guadalupe	no	131,533	9.70%	14.90%	5.80%	6.7%	6.9%	6.5%	4.4%
Hale	no	36,273	19.00%	30.00%	6.50%	7.2%	7.0%	6.2%	4.6%
Hall	yes	3,353	27.70%	27.80%	8.00%	8.9%	9.2%	8.5%	5.6%
Hamilton	no	8,517	11.40%	17.40%	5.40%	5.9%	6.1%	5.7%	3.6%
Hansford	no	5,613	13.50%	24.00%	3.90%	4.5%	4.8%	5.2%	3.2%
Hardeman	no	4,139	19.20%	20.60%	5.10%	5.9%	6.9%	7.5%	3.6%
Hardin	no	54,635	12.00%	14.90%	7.90%	9.4%	9.3%	8.8%	5.5%
Harris	no	4,092,459	16.80%	22.40%	6.80%	8.2%	8.5%	7.6%	4.8%
Harrison	no	65,631	15.20%	16.30%	6.90%	7.8%	8.8%	8.2%	4.7%
Hartley	no	6,062	9.30%	21.60%	4.40%	5.1%	4.8%	4.2%	3.3%
Haskell	no	5,899	18.80%	22.10%	5.60%	5.2%	5.0%	5.2%	3.3%
Hays	no	157,107	16.40%	11.90%	5.70%	6.7%	7.1%	6.6%	4.3%
Hemphill	no	3,807	16.80%	19.30%	2.30%	2.7%	3.2%	3.5%	2.0%
Henderson	no	78,532	16.80%	21.00%	7.30%	8.4%	8.6%	8.2%	5.4%
Hidalgo	yes	774,769	34.40%	39.80%	11.00%	12.0%	11.8%	10.6%	7.3%
Hill	no	35,089	15.00%	21.90%	6.90%	8.3%	8.3%	7.9%	5.1%
Hockley	no	22,935	17.00%	25.90%	4.70%	5.7%	6.3%	6.9%	3.8%
Hood	no	51,182	10.90%	13.80%	5.60%	7.2%	7.5%	7.1%	4.2%
Hopkins	no	35,161	15.80%	21.30%	6.00%	6.9%	6.8%	6.1%	4.2%
Houston	no	23,732	23.70%	21.50%	9.50%	10.4%	9.8%	9.4%	6.6%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Howard	no	35,012	17.70%	29.20%	6.10%	7.2%	7.2%	7.4%	4.6%
Hudspeth	no	3,476	46.00%	49.50%	5.70%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	4.1%
Hunt	no	86,129	19.20%	20.00%	7.80%	8.4%	8.8%	8.2%	5.3%
Hutchinson	no	22,150	15.20%	16.50%	5.50%	6.8%	7.3%	6.9%	4.2%
Irion	no	1,599	1.50%	18.40%	4.30%	5.5%	4.8%	5.3%	3.5%
Jack	no	9,044	17.80%	21.10%	4.50%	5.4%	6.1%	6.3%	3.3%
Jackson	no	14,075	11.70%	22.80%	5.20%	6.6%	7.3%	7.5%	4.1%
Jasper	no	35,710	18.60%	18.40%	9.90%	11.7%	11.5%	10.2%	6.5%
Jeff Davis	no	2,342	14.70%	16.10%	5.50%	5.7%	5.3%	5.1%	3.7%
Jefferson	no	252,273	18.80%	18.60%	10.70%	11.3%	10.9%	9.7%	6.8%
Jim Hogg	no	5,300	12.00%	31.10%	4.80%	6.5%	7.9%	7.8%	3.9%
Jim Wells	no	40,838	21.90%	29.40%	4.90%	6.7%	8.6%	8.9%	4.3%
Johnson	no	150,934	10.50%	18.30%	6.60%	7.6%	8.3%	8.2%	4.7%
Jones	no	20,202	12.30%	30.40%	6.30%	7.5%	8.0%	7.8%	5.0%
Karnes	yes	14,824	19.00%	34.40%	6.80%	8.4%	9.4%	9.2%	6.1%
Kaufman	no	103,350	11.40%	17.30%	7.10%	8.3%	9.0%	8.3%	5.4%
Kendall	no	33,410	7.10%	8.90%	5.50%	6.2%	6.0%	5.7%	3.8%
Kenedy	no	416	14.90%	40.20%	3.30%	4.7%	5.5%	6.0%	3.3%
Kent	no	808	5.40%	9.40%	5.00%	6.0%	5.9%	5.4%	4.5%
Kerr	no	49,625	14.10%	13.80%	5.50%	6.4%	6.2%	5.8%	4.0%
Kimble	no	4,607	14.60%	23.50%	5.50%	6.8%	6.5%	5.2%	3.8%
King	no	286	0.00%	9.20%	6.30%	5.7%	6.7%	5.2%	4.2%
Kinney	no	3,598	32.20%	24.60%	7.50%	8.6%	9.0%	7.7%	5.4%
Kleberg	no	32,061	24.80%	23.90%	5.90%	6.9%	7.0%	6.8%	4.3%
Knox	no	3,719	16.00%	24.50%	5.60%	6.1%	5.8%	6.1%	3.9%
La Salle	yes	6,886	21.80%	40.10%	9.00%	6.5%	7.9%	9.7%	5.6%
Lamar	no	49,793	16.70%	17.60%	7.70%	9.7%	9.0%	7.8%	5.5%
Lamb	no	13,977	17.90%	28.10%	6.90%	7.2%	7.1%	7.4%	4.5%
Lampasas	no	19,677	14.60%	17.40%	4.30%	7.2%	6.2%	5.9%	4.1%
Lavaca	no	19,263	10.50%	23.70%	4.50%	5.7%	6.6%	5.9%	3.5%
Lee	no	16,612	10.80%	20.90%	4.90%	5.9%	6.7%	6.8%	4.0%
Leon	no	16,801	16.70%	21.30%	6.70%	7.6%	7.8%	6.9%	4.4%
Liberty	no	75,643	15.40%	26.80%	8.80%	10.6%	11.0%	10.1%	6.0%
Limestone	no	23,384	18.90%	25.50%	6.10%	7.3%	6.8%	6.3%	4.5%
Lipscomb	no	3,302	14.20%	18.50%	3.50%	4.5%	5.6%	6.7%	2.7%
Live Oak	no	11,531	13.30%	22.90%	4.20%	5.5%	6.7%	7.3%	4.3%
Llano	no	19,301	12.60%	12.00%	6.50%	7.5%	7.5%	7.0%	4.5%
Loving	no	82	0.00%	7.70%	9.30%	9.8%	8.0%	10.0%	8.9%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Lubbock	no	278,831	18.80%	16.60%	5.50%	6.1%	6.2%	5.3%	3.8%
Lynn	no	5,915	16.90%	25.80%	6.80%	7.3%	7.1%	6.3%	4.7%
Madison	no	13,664	20.40%	21.80%	5.30%	8.1%	7.9%	7.5%	5.3%
Marion	no	10,546	23.20%	23.10%	6.50%	9.2%	10.3%	10.5%	5.1%
Martin	no	4,799	7.20%	29.10%	2.60%	5.3%	5.7%	4.9%	3.4%
Mason	no	4,012	16.30%	20.10%	6.90%	4.9%	5.1%	5.1%	3.0%
Matagorda	no	36,702	21.60%	23.40%	7.90%	11.6%	11.3%	10.3%	7.0%
Maverick	yes	54,258	33.60%	44.80%	4.30%	14.2%	15.2%	14.4%	11.0%
McCulloch	no	8,283	22.90%	25.20%	4.30%	5.9%	7.1%	8.1%	4.1%
McLennan	no	234,906	20.50%	19.70%	9.90%	7.4%	7.4%	6.7%	4.6%
McMullen	no	707	9.10%	21.30%	12.60%	3.8%	6.7%	7.2%	5.6%
Medina	no	46,006	15.90%	21.70%	6.40%	7.4%	7.4%	6.7%	5.1%
Menard	no	2,242	18.60%	19.90%	6.10%	7.0%	7.0%	6.8%	4.4%
Midland	no	136,872	12.50%	18.80%	3.50%	4.4%	5.3%	5.6%	2.9%
Milam	no	24,757	17.60%	18.50%	7.90%	9.6%	10.4%	11.1%	5.5%
Mills	no	4,936	15.70%	22.80%	5.10%	6.1%	6.0%	5.4%	4.0%
Mitchell	no	9,403	15.30%	26.60%	6.40%	7.8%	8.6%	8.6%	5.4%
Montague	no	19,719	13.20%	18.80%	4.90%	5.9%	7.2%	7.2%	3.7%
Montgomery	no	455,746	10.90%	14.10%	6.00%	7.2%	7.6%	7.0%	4.3%
Moore	no	21,904	13.40%	30.50%	4.10%	4.7%	4.9%	4.7%	3.1%
Morris	no	12,934	16.70%	17.70%	9.20%	11.5%	13.1%	14.9%	6.2%
Motley	no	1,210	22.10%	15.30%	5.40%	6.0%	5.6%	5.4%	4.1%
Nacogdoches	no	64,524	24.60%	19.50%	6.30%	6.8%	6.9%	6.4%	4.4%
Navarro	no	47,735	19.80%	23.50%	7.70%	8.8%	9.1%	8.0%	5.6%
Newton	no	14,445	16.20%	22.30%	11.80%	13.9%	13.0%	11.5%	7.3%
Nolan	no	15,216	19.40%	22.60%	5.60%	6.6%	6.9%	6.4%	3.9%
Nueces	no	340,223	19.10%	21.80%	6.20%	7.6%	7.6%	6.9%	4.6%
Ochiltree	no	10,223	17.70%	29.30%	3.30%	4.2%	5.1%	6.0%	2.7%
Oldham	no	2,052	13.40%	17.70%	4.40%	5.1%	6.0%	5.9%	4.2%
Orange	no	81,837	13.90%	14.20%	9.80%	11.2%	10.8%	9.9%	6.6%
Palo Pinto	no	28,111	13.80%	23.20%	6.20%	7.4%	7.9%	7.8%	4.3%
Panola	no	23,796	12.50%	18.50%	5.60%	6.9%	7.3%	7.4%	3.9%
Parker	no	116,927	10.50%	14.60%	6.10%	7.1%	7.7%	7.7%	4.5%
Parmer	no	10,269	18.60%	35.00%	4.80%	5.1%	4.7%	4.5%	3.4%
Pecos	no	15,507	19.90%	34.90%	4.50%	5.3%	6.7%	9.1%	4.8%
Polk	no	45,413	21.80%	25.10%	8.30%	9.7%	9.9%	9.1%	6.4%
Potter	no	121,073	22.70%	24.60%	5.60%	6.3%	6.5%	6.1%	4.1%
Presidio	yes	7,818	24.10%	46.30%	12.40%	14.3%	17.3%	16.7%	10.8%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Rains	no	10,914	11.50%	19.20%	7.30%	8.5%	9.2%	8.1%	5.2%
Randall	no	120,725	9.40%	8.70%	4.20%	4.7%	5.0%	4.6%	3.1%
Reagan	no	3,367	10.50%	31.50%	2.40%	3.2%	4.1%	6.5%	2.0%
Real	no	3,309	26.80%	22.40%	7.20%	7.3%	5.8%	5.6%	3.9%
Red River	yes	12,860	17.50%	27.50%	10.40%	11.8%	11.0%	9.3%	6.6%
Reeves	yes	13,783	28.70%	47.20%	9.60%	11.0%	10.9%	11.8%	6.0%
Refugio	no	7,383	16.00%	27.30%	4.60%	5.9%	6.9%	6.5%	3.9%
Roberts	no	929	14.60%	8.10%	3.90%	4.0%	4.7%	5.2%	2.4%
Robertson	no	16,620	21.20%	23.40%	7.70%	8.8%	8.6%	7.8%	4.9%
Rockwall	no	78,337	5.60%	8.70%	6.20%	7.2%	7.6%	7.3%	4.6%
Runnels	no	10,501	21.60%	22.90%	6.20%	8.2%	9.0%	7.6%	4.8%
Rusk	no	53,330	12.40%	20.60%	6.20%	7.0%	7.6%	7.8%	4.4%
Sabine	no	10,834	18.00%	22.50%	15.30%	16.3%	16.3%	14.9%	9.2%
San Augustine	yes	8,865	27.10%	28.60%	10.50%	12.4%	11.1%	10.2%	6.4%
San Jacinto	no	26,384	17.80%	23.00%	8.00%	9.6%	10.4%	9.2%	5.8%
San Patricio	no	64,804	16.60%	23.70%	7.60%	9.5%	10.3%	8.7%	5.4%
San Saba	no	6,131	23.40%	18.60%	7.80%	7.5%	8.3%	7.3%	5.5%
Schleicher	no	3,461	12.40%	21.50%	4.40%	6.3%	8.0%	9.4%	3.5%
Scurry	no	16,921	17.70%	25.80%	4.30%	5.6%	6.4%	6.8%	4.1%
Shackelford	no	3,378	13.20%	13.20%	2.90%	4.2%	4.6%	4.1%	2.7%
Shelby	no	25,448	25.40%	24.60%	6.50%	7.9%	7.9%	7.4%	4.9%
Sherman	no	3,034	12.90%	25.60%	4.60%	5.0%	4.8%	4.7%	3.7%
Smith	no	209,714	15.40%	15.80%	7.00%	7.8%	7.9%	7.6%	5.0%
Somervell	no	8,490	10.80%	12.60%	6.00%	7.6%	7.9%	7.0%	4.5%
Starr	yes	60,968	38.00%	52.10%	15.00%	16.9%	17.9%	16.7%	11.9%
Stephens	no	9,630	19.90%	17.80%	5.70%	7.5%	7.1%	6.8%	3.7%
Sterling	no	1,143	21.00%	22.50%	3.00%	4.2%	4.6%	4.4%	2.8%
Stonewall	no	1,490	11.90%	14.50%	3.90%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%	3.4%
Sutton	no	4,128	11.70%	30.60%	3.20%	4.5%	6.4%	6.7%	2.0%
Swisher	no	7,854	15.40%	24.10%	5.70%	6.5%	6.2%	6.0%	4.5%
Tarrant	no	1,809,034	13.40%	66.20%	6.60%	7.8%	8.3%	7.7%	4.9%
Taylor	no	131,506	16.50%	15.90%	5.30%	6.3%	6.4%	5.7%	3.8%
Terrell	no	984	16.50%	19.60%	6.30%	8.6%	8.5%	9.0%	5.8%
Terry	no	12,651	16.60%	31.90%	6.60%	7.3%	7.4%	7.0%	4.4%
Throckmorton	no	1,641	13.20%	21.60%	4.50%	5.6%	4.8%	5.2%	3.4%
Titus	no	32,334	17.90%	27.10%	7.10%	7.9%	7.8%	7.4%	4.3%
Tom Green	no	110,224	16.80%	18.80%	5.30%	6.3%	6.4%	6.5%	4.1%
Travis	no	1,024,266	16.20%	13.70%	5.70%	6.6%	6.9%	6.7%	4.2%

**Checklist Item 22**

**Page 9: Chapter 313 - Reinvestment Zone designation**

County	2013 Distressed County*	2010 Decennial Population	2010 Decennial Poverty	2010 Decennial Adults without High School Diploma or Equivalent	2012 Unemployment Rate	2011 Unemployment Rate	2010 Unemployment Rate	2009 Unemployment Rate	2008 Unemployment Rate
Trinity	no	14,585	16.60%	19.10%	7.90%	9.2%	8.8%	8.5%	5.6%
Tyler	no	21,766	18.30%	17.10%	10.00%	11.5%	10.6%	9.8%	6.1%
Upshur	no	39,309	13.10%	16.60%	5.80%	7.2%	7.8%	7.6%	4.3%
Upton	no	3,355	13.90%	24.50%	3.40%	4.5%	5.0%	5.7%	3.1%
Uvalde	yes	26,405	26.70%	30.10%	8.00%	9.0%	9.1%	8.1%	5.9%
Val Verde	yes	48,879	24.00%	30.10%	7.60%	9.0%	9.1%	9.3%	6.0%
Van Zandt	no	52,579	24.00%	36.00%	6.40%	7.4%	7.6%	7.0%	4.4%
Victoria	no	86,793	16.40%	19.90%	5.40%	6.4%	7.3%	7.1%	3.9%
Walker	no	67,861	21.10%	19.70%	6.70%	7.8%	7.6%	7.0%	5.3%
Waller	no	43,205	21.10%	20.50%	7.00%	8.2%	8.9%	8.2%	5.0%
Ward	no	10,658	17.30%	29.60%	4.50%	6.2%	8.0%	8.9%	3.9%
Washington	no	33,718	16.00%	20.80%	5.10%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	4.1%
Webb	yes	250,304	29.80%	37.30%	7.10%	8.1%	8.6%	8.7%	5.4%
Wharton	no	41,280	17.20%	24.90%	6.80%	8.3%	8.6%	7.0%	4.5%
Wheeler	no	5,410	13.90%	20.60%	3.60%	4.0%	4.7%	5.7%	2.5%
Wichita	no	131,500	15.30%	17.20%	6.30%	7.3%	8.0%	7.6%	5.0%
Wilbarger	no	13,535	23.30%	26.40%	4.60%	5.6%	6.1%	4.9%	3.7%
Willacy	yes	22,134	43.40%	42.60%	14.00%	14.3%	12.7%	12.3%	9.0%
Williamson	no	422,679	6.50%	8.40%	5.90%	6.8%	7.4%	7.4%	4.6%
Wilson	no	42,918	9.00%	15.50%	5.90%	7.1%	7.4%	6.5%	4.7%
Winkler	no	7,110	16.30%	37.10%	4.70%	6.1%	7.8%	9.4%	3.9%
Wise	no	59,127	9.80%	18.50%	6.30%	7.2%	8.2%	8.7%	4.4%
Wood	no	41,964	14.00%	19.20%	7.20%	8.0%	8.6%	8.0%	5.1%
Yoakum	no	7,879	25.00%	28.60%	3.50%	4.7%	6.3%	7.7%	3.1%
Young	no	18,550	15.60%	23.50%	5.00%	6.5%	6.7%	6.5%	3.6%
Zapata	yes	14,018	37.60%	43.30%	6.50%	8.5%	11.0%	10.8%	5.6%
Zavala	yes	11,677	43.00%	83.20%	14.10%	15.4%	15.6%	14.9%	10.8%

**Source:** Texas Economic Development Bank <http://www.texaswideopenforbusiness.com/incentives-financing/tax/tez.php>

**Date:** 2013

\* For counties that have been designated as an enterprise zone under Chapter 2003, Government Code, the designation of the area as a reinvestment zone under this subchapter without further hearing or other procedural requirements other than those provided by Chapter 2303, Government Code.