

The Efficiency of Economic Development Expenditures: Returns to Primary Job Creation Under the Stewardship of the Development Corporation of Abilene

I. Introduction In May 2008, Abilene voters will consider a referendum that could reallocate \$15 million to the non-profit Abilene Youth Sports Authority (AYSA) for the proposed Abilene Youth Sports Complex (AYSC). This reallocation is significant in several respects beyond the designation of money for this venue. Currently, the stewardship of this money is in the management of the Development Corporation of Abilene (DCOA). Should this May referendum pass, \$15 million in tax revenues designated for economic development will be diverted from primary job creation to this tourism-oriented project. Historically, DCOA grants roughly \$600,000 per project on average¹. The outlay of \$15 million to this project will become the largest expenditure of economic development dollars to a single entity in the history of the DCOA.

At first blush, the appeal of the AYSA sports venue is that it will lure tourism dollars to Abilene. However, to focus exclusively on the tourism benefits arising from the redirection of \$15 million in economic development funds to this project is naïve. It fails to account for the opportunity cost of diverting money from a proven means of economic development to one which offers considerably less in local gross product. To appreciate this opportunity cost associated with diverting money from our current economic development efforts, it is worthwhile to contrast projected AYSA economic development to the historical performance of DCOA stewardship with the same funds.

Additionally, the creation of this venue introduces other concerns. No identified funding mechanism is in place to deal with the annual operation budget shortfall of the AYSC. The allocation of public monies to this private non-profit begs the question: will the City of Abilene ultimately bear the responsibility of anticipated AYSC annual shortfall?

Under its charter, the DCOA focuses on primary job creation and in its 17-year history, the DCOA succeeded in bringing a variety of primary jobs to Abilene. Many of these jobs represent

¹ Historically, the largest DCOA's incentive funding was under \$5 million or less than a 1/3 of the proposed AYSA sports venue.

traditional economic development in manufacturing. More recently, the DCOA has realized New Economy business relocations in the areas of health care research, computers engineering, and sustainable energy sources.

Important to this strategy is the DCOA's commitment to creating economic development clusters within the local economy. For example: the ability to attract biotech firms is not an isolated event; instead, it is crucial that an understory of supporting businesses be established first. Certainly, the relocation of these biotech firms is initiated by the prospect of financial assistance. However, their relocation is ultimately secured by the presence of a local source of labor from the graduate-degree-trained individuals from the Texas Tech Pharmacy school, vocationally-trained graduates from the Holland Science School, plus a burgeoning local market of similar businesses from which this firm can recruit employees and work collaboratively. With each new company recruited, the DCOA accelerates the return on each development dollar as past relocation and retention results make it easier to find new enterprises that benefit from the agglomerative economies offered by these development clusters. It is not enough to simply acknowledge that the DCOA is more efficient in creating returns when compared to the alternate AYSA investment; their contribution to the community is augmented by the rising efficiency of DCOA commitments that increases at an increasing rate as they build on past successes.

II. Historical performance of the DCOA: Since the ratification of the ½ cent sales tax in 1989 and the creation of the DCOA to act as steward for this fund, government-incentivized investment in the Abilene community has experienced steady success. **Table 1** offers a summary of these results. **Table 1** relies on information provided by DevelopAbilene, an umbrella organization which includes the DCOA². It introduces current dollar figures regarding:

- DCOA committed and actual expenditures
- Capital investment by DCOA-sponsored companies
- Property taxes from capital investments
- Job creation statistics

² DevelopAbilene figures are included in Table A1 in the appendix to this document.

Table 1: Current dollar expenditures and job creation associated with the DCOA ^a

	actual DCOA expenditures	projected capital investment	annual jobs committed	cumulative jobs committed	jobs existing	cumulative jobs existing	percent completion on jobs committed
1990	\$4,842,550	\$55,000,000	850	850	850	850	100.00%
1991	\$269,126	\$2,621,437	16	866	1	851	98.27%
1992	\$356,000	\$0	103	969	103	954	98.45%
1993	\$544,069	\$1,100,000	596	1565	462	1416	90.48%
1994	\$3,567,742	\$5,693,500	320	1885	251	1667	88.44%
1995	\$4,342,249	\$4,036,250	519	2404	35	1702	70.80%
1996	\$2,564,669	\$1,583,833	434	2838	3	1705	60.08%
1997	\$7,997,247	\$62,580,000	785	3623	590	2295	63.35%
1998	\$2,889,339	\$3,547,000	648	4271	615	2910	68.13%
1999	\$1,493,384	\$4,182,920	210	4481	865	3775	84.24%
2000	\$1,158,768	\$5,300,000	410	4891	160	3935	80.45%
2001	\$3,816,502	\$2,710,000	352	5243	352	4287	81.77%
2002	\$1,645,898	\$33,186,500	288	5531	46	4333	78.34%
2003	\$2,968,828	\$539,293	136	5667	53	4386	77.40%
2004	\$11,608,901	\$22,198,645	828	6495	559	4945	76.14%
2005	\$2,049,376	\$15,250,000	407	6902	290	5235	75.85%
2006	\$4,152,929	\$12,880,800	1083	7985	876	6111	76.53%
2007	\$1,469,508	\$9,256,960	229	8214	144	6255	76.15%
total	\$57,737,085	\$232,410,178	8214	-	6255		76.53%

^a DCOA data from 1/1/1990 through 12/31/2007 was provided by DevelopAbilene

DCOA accounting of job creation tracks both committed and actual figures, but **Table 1** employs actual statistics. Actual expenditures are awarded to DCOA-sponsored companies for meeting specific, job-linked performance measures and these figures are used to estimate the return on DCOA reinvestment in the community. Still, the difference between committed and actual infusions represents an encumbrance of DCOA fund balance. At the conclusion of January 2008, DCOA has \$33,489,741.35 million in the ½ cent sales tax fund. Contracts with existing DCOA-sponsored business encumber \$26,529,397.50 of this fund balance and, as they complete performance objectives regarding reinvestment and job creation, money is released from this fund. Lastly, negotiations with prospective DCOA recipients are pursued with the remaining \$6,960,343.85.³ It is essential for the DCOA to maintain this uncommitted fund to incent new relocations or expansions of business in Abilene.

Table 1 also includes information regarding job creation and retention. The table makes a distinction between jobs committed or pledged for creation, jobs lost and existing jobs. As an additional measure, a ratio of existing to committed jobs is included in **Table 1**. To use the most current year of measurement, it would appear that for every 10 jobs committed by a DCOA-incentivized company, seven are realized in the local economy.⁴ While there is not complete parity between these statistics, it helps to frame this 70% job creation success rate in context of a roughly 50% failure rate of small businesses fail in their first five years⁵.

The figures reported in **Table 1** are reported in current dollars and, therefore, make temporal comparison difficult. For this reason, **Table 2** was estimated to bring current dollar figures into 2008 constant dollar⁶. These constant-2008-dollar figures are:

- Actual DCOA expenditures, reported annually and accumulated
- Capital investment by DCOA-sponsored entities
- Annual property tax revenues from capital investments⁷

³ Development Corporation of Abilene, Status of Funds @ January 31, 2008. This document is included in the appendix in Table A2 entitled Development Corporation of Abilene Status of Funds @ January 31, 2008.

⁴ Or more accurately, for every 100 jobs pledged, 72 jobs are realized.

⁵ U.S. Small Business Administration (www.sba.gov)

⁶ All dollar figures in **Table 2** utilize the Consumer Price Index (CPI) from the Economic Report of the President (<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/eop/2008/b60.xls>) with an average inflation rate of 2.57%.

Table 2: Impact of DCOA expenditures in constant 2008 dollars ^a

year	CPI ^b	actual DCOA expenditures	accumulated actual DCOA expenditures	projected capital investment by DCOA sponsored entities	accumulated projected capital investment by DCOA sponsored entities	returns on DCOA expenditures in capital investment created	value of taxable property arising from capital investment	property tax benefits from projected capital investment	cumulative annual property tax revenues	cumulative annual incomes ^c	total annual benefits sponsored by development expenditure	returns on DCOA expenditures in income and tax revenues created
1990	130.7	\$7,682,204	\$7,682,204	\$87,251,798	\$87,251,798	11.36	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,449,188	\$32,449,188	4.22
1991	136.2	\$409,700	\$8,091,903	\$3,990,705	\$91,242,503	11.28	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,487,363	\$32,487,363	4.01
1992	140.3	\$526,114	\$8,618,017	\$0	\$91,242,503	10.59	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,419,441	\$36,419,441	4.23
1993	144.5	\$780,681	\$9,398,698	\$1,578,382	\$92,820,885	9.88	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$54,056,529	\$54,056,529	5.75
1994	148.2	\$4,991,517	\$14,390,214	\$7,965,598	\$100,786,483	7.00	\$5,928,259	\$136,801	\$136,801	\$63,638,583	\$63,775,384	4.43
1995	152.4	\$5,907,681	\$20,297,895	\$5,491,366	\$106,277,849	5.24	\$2,186,917	\$50,465	\$187,266	\$64,974,726	\$65,025,192	3.20
1996	156.9	\$3,389,188	\$23,687,083	\$2,093,022	\$108,370,871	4.58	\$2,410,795	\$55,632	\$242,897	\$65,089,253	\$65,144,884	2.75
1997	160.5	\$10,331,247	\$34,018,331	\$80,844,002	\$189,214,873	5.56	\$19,285,693	\$445,037	\$687,934	\$87,612,807	\$88,057,843	2.59
1998	163.0	\$3,675,346	\$37,693,676	\$4,511,915	\$193,726,787	5.14	\$260,478	\$6,011	\$693,945	\$111,090,748	\$111,096,759	2.95
1999	166.6	\$1,858,591	\$39,552,267	\$5,205,852	\$198,932,640	5.03	\$5,182,735	\$119,597	\$813,542	\$144,112,569	\$144,232,165	3.65
2000	172.2	\$1,395,245	\$40,947,513	\$6,381,606	\$205,314,246	5.01	\$0	\$0	\$813,542	\$150,220,651	\$150,220,651	3.67
2001	177.1	\$4,468,217	\$45,415,729	\$3,172,766	\$208,487,012	4.59	\$0	\$0	\$813,542	\$163,658,432	\$163,658,432	3.60
2002	179.9	\$1,896,964	\$47,312,693	\$38,248,779	\$246,735,790	5.22	\$439,884	\$10,151	\$823,692	\$165,414,506	\$165,424,657	3.50
2003	184.0	\$3,345,450	\$50,658,143	\$607,707	\$247,343,498	4.88	\$1,122,933	\$25,913	\$849,605	\$167,437,808	\$167,463,721	3.31
2004	188.9	\$12,742,259	\$63,400,402	\$24,365,863	\$271,709,360	4.29	\$29,914,623	\$690,310	\$1,539,915	\$188,777,921	\$189,468,231	2.99
2005	195.3	\$2,175,738	\$65,576,140	\$16,190,300	\$287,899,660	4.39	\$13,211,968	\$304,879	\$1,844,794	\$199,848,820	\$200,153,700	3.05
2006	201.6	\$4,271,213	\$69,847,353	\$13,247,673	\$301,147,332	4.31	\$18,835,862	\$434,656	\$2,279,451	\$233,290,571	\$233,725,228	3.35
2007	207.3	\$1,469,508	\$71,316,861	\$9,256,960	\$310,404,292	4.35	\$36,553,724	\$843,514	\$3,122,964	\$238,787,846	\$239,631,359	3.36
total	-	\$71,316,861	-	\$310,404,292	-	4.35	\$135,333,871	\$3,122,964	\$3,122,964	\$238,787,846	\$239,631,359	3.36

^a DCOA data and property tax revenues from 1/1/1990 through 12/31/2007 was provided by DevelopAbilene

^b CPI from Economic Report of the President (<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48/48441.html>)

^c Income benefits is based on jobs existing from Table 1 and 2004 median income of \$34,780 for Taylor County provided by the Department of Census and adjusted using a CPI inflator to 2008 terms for comparability.

- Annual incomes paid by DCOA-sponsored jobs

Once updated into 2008 terms, cumulative capital investment is treated as a stock and annual property tax revenues and incomes paid by DCOA sponsored jobs are considered as yearly flows.

First, using the capital investment created as a measure of DCOA success, a ratio of accumulated capital investment to DCOA incentives are tabulated to assess the returns on DCOA expenditures in capital investment created. The 17-year history summarized in this table reveals that each dollar in DCOA reinvestment sponsored \$4.35 in capital investment by business. This table presents the impact of capital investment dollar-for-dollar when, in truth, capital investment, regardless of the project, has a multiplied impact that creates a ripple of job creation following the first infusion of monies into the local economy.⁸

These capital investments generate a annual flow in property tax revenues from the community. **Table 2** tabulates the creation of property tax revenues resulting from DCOA expenditures along with incomes created by this same expenditure.⁹ This evaluation uses a straightforward multiplier approach, identifying DCOA expenditures as the catalyst and the sum of property taxes collected and annual incomes from DCOA jobs as the return. A ratio of these two figures reveals a summary return of 3.36 which can be interpreted as each dollar of DCOA money spent across the past 17 years has lead to the creation of \$3.36 in incomes and tax benefits for the Abilene area.

III. Comparison of the DCOA to the proposed AYSA sport venue and sensitivity analysis

⁷ Property tax receipts are assume that DCOA sponsored companies pay taxes in the Abilene city limits and pay AISD taxes.

⁸ While it may have been worthwhile to find a multiplier to demonstrate the increased impact of capital investment, it does not help us in our aim for this document: to compare the efficiency of investment by the DCOA or the AYSA. Assuming a multiplier of 1 in both scenarios would not change the conclusions of this report.

⁹ Property tax figures were collected by DevelopAbilene and a more comprehensive delineation of these figures are in the appendix in Table A1. According to Richard Petree of Taylor CAD, the industrial properties that are currently on the tax roll are only about 30% of cost as a composite number. The newer properties are valued at a higher percent of cost and the old properties are lower percent of cost.

The Abilene City Council made a decision to draft a referendum for the May 2008 election regarding the reallocation of our ½ cent sales tax fund for economic development to a multi-use sports venue associated with the Abilene Youth Sports Authority. The referendum would authorize the allocation of \$15 million to be disbursed from ½ cent sales tax funds for this project. The disbursement of the \$15 million is contingent on the AYSA's ability to secure an additional \$15 million in support from community partners. The AYSA has been promised a 75 acre parcel of land by Kenneth Musgrave with an estimated value of \$10 million. Based on these figures, the \$15 million from the ½ cent sales tax will generate \$37 million in capital outlays or a one-time return of \$2.47 in capital outlays for each dollar spent from the ½ cent sales tax fund. Unlike DCOA-sponsored investment, none of this value will directly add to the community's property tax base.

In addition to the creation of capital investment at the inception of this project, AYSA estimates that the \$15 million from the ½ cent sale tax fund for this multi-venue sports complex can be leveraged into \$11.37 million in local benefits and \$519,000 in tax revenue each year¹⁰.

Comparison with DCOA performance using publicized AYSA economic returns

Table 3 makes compares the past success of the DCOA and the proposal to fund the AYSA venue with ½ cent sales tax funds.¹¹ Two scenarios are offered: one which considers the return on historical DCOA outlays and one for the requested funds for AYSA outlay. The AYSA-scenario returns, denominated in capital outlays or income and tax revenues, employ the returns promoted by the supporters of the AYSA.¹²

First, the reinvestment of a dollar in the AYSA venue from ½ cent sales tax funds will bring \$2.47 in capital expenditures to the community. This underperforms the return of

¹⁰ The AYSA has offered two sales tax scenarios: \$519,000 in their comprehensive December 18, 2006 report and \$400,000 in their February 2008 Abilene City Council presentation. According to Nanci Liles, this readjustment was upon the review and at the recommendation of the Abilene Visitors and Convention Bureau. For the remainder of this analysis both the \$519,000 and \$400,000 figures will be employed, the latter as a more conservative estimate of sales tax returns and the former as a more optimistic estimate.

¹¹ The comparison in Table 3 relies on the constant 2008 dollars reported in Table 2. This permits comparison between past expenditures of the DCOA and 2008 project costs for the AYSA venue without the distortion of inflation.

¹² From Feasibility Study for the Proposed Abilene Youth Sports Complex, dated December 18, 2006.

Table 3: Comparison of DCOA project returns to anticipated AYSA project returns
 (AYSA figures inclusive of direct, indirect, and induced impact)

	1/2 cent sales tax fund expenditures	projected capital investment by 1/2 cent sales tax fund sponsored entities	returns on 1/2 cent sales tax fund expenditures in capital investment created	sales tax & hotel tax revenues	property tax revenues	annual tax revenues	annual incomes	total annual benefits sponsored by development expenditure	returns on DCOA expenditures in income and tax revenues created
DCOA	\$71,316,861	\$310,404,292	4.35	\$0	\$3,122,964	\$3,122,964	\$238,787,846	\$239,631,359	3.36
AYSA venue (direct, indirect, and induced benefits)	\$15,000,000	\$37,000,000	2.47	\$519,000	\$0	\$519,000	\$11,370,000	\$11,889,000	0.79
DCOA results with proposed AYSA venue dollars	\$15,000,000	\$65,287,006	-	\$0	\$451,969	\$451,969	\$49,949,441	\$50,401,410	-

\$4.35 in capital expenditures sponsored by each dollar of DCOA-managed reinvestment. It is also important to note that, unlike DCOA-sponsored capital expenditures, the capital expenditures of the AYSA add nothing to the Abilene tax base, given the AYSA's non-profit status. Still, all values associated with initial AYSA development are included as they sponsor a single-period return when invested.¹³

Secondly, the reinvestment of a dollar in the AYSA venue from ½ cent sales tax funds will bring 79 cents in income and tax revenue for every \$1 spent from the ½ cent sales tax fund. This underperforms the return of \$3.36 in income and tax revenues for each dollar of DCOA-managed reinvestment.

The return in capital stock of 4.35 per DCOA-managed dollar spent and 3.36 per DCOA-managed dollar spent can be used as multipliers to estimate a third scenario for the \$15 million that may be allocated by referendum to the AYSA. Based on historical performance, the DCOA could use this same fund to add \$65,287,006 in capital investment to our community along with income and tax revenues totaling \$50,401,410 each year.

Again, this measure of economic benefit for the AYSA is a liberal one; it includes

- Second-order effects that are not a part of DCOA methodology for measuring the return on reinvestment.
- A gift of land that brings no genuine capital investment for securing a site
- An optimistic estimate of sales and hotel/motel taxes that appears to be corrected in later presentations by the AYSA.¹⁴

Still, based on the historical performance of the DCOA in contrast to the publicized performance of the AYSA, the community would be better served leaving this \$15 million in the stewardship of the DCOA.

¹³ The \$37 million figure includes \$10 million in land, \$18,318,500 for the Youth Sports Center, \$8,681,500 for the outdoor fields and the maintenance building. It excludes the \$3 million endowment for maintenance expenses. These figures were reported in slide 8 of the AYSA presentation to the Abilene City Council.

¹⁴ The initial feasibility study dated December 18, 2006 employs an estimate of \$519,000 and the Abilene City Council presentation from February 2008 estimates sales and hotel/motel tax revenues at \$400,000.

Comparison with DCOA performance using comparable AYSA economic returns

A common practice in economic development studies is to employ multipliers that evaluate the subsequent rounds of spending sponsored by the first infusion of investment. The DCOA does not employ this convention; instead, economic benefit figures are offered without a multiplier and evaluate only the direct impact of incomes and property tax revenues created. The economic and fiscal impact reported in the AYSA study includes direct, as well as induced and indirect returns to investment. To realize genuine comparability between DCOA reinvestment figures and AYSA proposed returns, induced and indirect impacts are removed from potential returns to the AYSA project.¹⁵

Additionally, the estimate of AYSA economic returns in **Table 4** do not include the \$10 million gift of land and adjusts downward the annual sales and motel/hotel taxes arising from activity at this facility from \$519,000 to \$400,000.

Table 4 is identical in construction to **Table 3** with one exception: it eliminates these overstated impacts of incomes created, capital expenditures realized and transaction taxes. This step is necessary to establish true comparability between the impact of the DCOA reinvestment and the proposed AYSA project.

Under these assumptions, the reinvestment of a dollar in the AYSA venue from ½ cent sales tax funds will bring \$1.80 in capital expenditures to the community. This underperforms the return of \$4.35 in capital expenditures for each dollar of DCOA-managed reinvestment reintroduced in **Table 4**.

Also, the reinvestment of a dollar in the AYSA venue from ½ cent sales tax funds will bring 51 cents in income for every \$1 spent from the ½ cent sales tax fund. This underperforms the return of \$3.36 in income and property tax revenues for each dollar of DCOA-managed reinvestment.

¹⁵ Direct impacts are first-round spending in the community. Indirect impacts are defined as business spending with other businesses in the community. Induced returns arise from direct impacts and are second-to-nth-round spending in the community.

Table 4: Comparison of DCOA project returns to anticipated AYSA project returns
 (AYSA figures inclusive of direct impact only)

	1/2 cent sales tax fund expenditures	projected capital investment by 1/2 cent sales tax fund sponsored entities	returns on 1/2 cent sales tax fund expenditures in capital investment created	sales tax & hotel tax revenues	property tax revenues	annual tax revenues	annual incomes	total annual benefits sponsored by development expenditure	returns on DCOA expenditures in income and tax revenues created
DCOA	\$71,316,861	\$310,404,292	4.35	\$0	\$3,122,964	\$3,122,964	\$238,787,846	\$239,631,359	3.36
AYSA venue (direct benefits only)	\$15,000,000	\$27,000,000	1.80	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$7,302,000	\$7,702,000	0.51
DCOA results with proposed AYSA venue dollars)	\$15,000,000	\$65,287,006	-	\$0	\$451,969	\$451,969	\$49,949,441	\$50,401,410	-

No property taxes are assessed as this venue is a non-profit

This impact re-estimation of the proposed AYSA venue underscores the benefits of DCOA stewardship. In both scenarios summarized in **Table 3** and **Table 4**, the historical performance of the DCOA outperforms the proposed AYSA venue.

Net present value of DCOA performance versus publicized AYSA economic returns

A component of the AYSA feasibility study reviews the economic development performance of this venue by calculating the net present value of a potential \$15 million investment in the AYSA. Using the results of **Table 3** and **Table 4**, a similar measure of stewardship can be estimated for the DCOA's use of the same \$15 million, based on historical performance. **Table 5** and **Table 6** compare the estimated results of \$15 million in the hands of AYSA or the DCOA. Assumptions regarding time¹⁶ and discount rate are identical to the AYSA feasibility study.¹⁷

The single difference between **Table 5** and **Table 6** is that **Table 5** employs the publicized AYSA estimates of incomes created, capital expenditures realized and transaction taxes. **Table 6** provides methodological comparability to DCOA figures as it omits the \$10 million in land, reduces transaction taxes to \$400,000 and eliminates multiplier effects on income sponsored. Performance in year 0 is based on capital expenditures which take place at the outset of the project. The estimation of return on the \$15 million investment by the DCOA is identical for **Table 5** and **Table 6**.

Table 5 and **Table 6** discount incomes and transaction taxes created over 30 years to current terms for the DCOA scenario and the AYSA scenario. Both tables sum these estimates annually, developing a cumulative measure of performance in absolute terms in 2008 dollars. Comparison of returns for the DCOA and the AYSA use of the \$15 million are in the columns entitled **Absolute Difference** and **Percent Difference**. The tables reveal that, regardless if one adopts an optimistic or a conservative view of AYSA

¹⁶ The author of the report acknowledges that it is appropriate to classify each event as perpetuity with an infinite stream of returns that can be discounted to current value – what would be referred to in a real estate appraisal as a capitalization rate. Still, 30 years was the choice of the author of the AYSA feasibility study and for comparability this convention will be used.

¹⁷ The AYSA feasibility study uses 30 years of returns, a 6% discount rate and an inflation rate of 3%, resulting in an adjusted discount rate of 3%.

Table 5: Comparison of net present value of future returns from \$15 million reinvestment
(AYSA figures inclusive of direct, indirect, and induced impact)

year	AYSA	DCOA	discounted AYSA benefits	discounted DCOA benefits	cumulative discounted AYSA benefits	cumulative discounted DCOA benefits	absolute difference	percent difference
0	\$37,000,000	\$65,287,006	\$37,000,000	\$65,287,006	\$37,000,000	\$65,287,006	-\$28,287,006	176.45%
1	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$11,542,718	\$48,933,408	\$48,542,718	\$114,220,414	-\$65,677,696	235.30%
2	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$11,206,523	\$47,508,163	\$59,749,241	\$161,728,577	-\$101,979,336	270.68%
3	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$10,880,119	\$46,124,430	\$70,629,360	\$207,853,008	-\$137,223,647	294.29%
4	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$10,563,223	\$44,781,000	\$81,192,583	\$252,634,008	-\$171,441,425	311.15%
5	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$10,255,556	\$43,476,699	\$91,448,139	\$296,110,707	-\$204,662,568	323.80%
6	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$9,956,850	\$42,210,388	\$101,404,989	\$338,321,094	-\$236,916,105	333.63%
7	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$9,666,845	\$40,980,959	\$111,071,834	\$379,302,053	-\$268,230,219	341.49%
8	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$9,385,286	\$39,787,339	\$120,457,120	\$419,089,392	-\$298,632,271	347.92%
9	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$9,111,929	\$38,628,484	\$129,569,049	\$457,717,876	-\$328,148,827	353.26%
10	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$8,846,533	\$37,503,383	\$138,415,582	\$495,221,259	-\$356,805,677	357.78%
11	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$8,588,867	\$36,411,051	\$147,004,448	\$531,632,310	-\$384,627,862	361.64%
12	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$8,338,705	\$35,350,535	\$155,343,153	\$566,982,845	-\$411,639,691	364.99%
13	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$8,095,830	\$34,320,908	\$163,438,984	\$601,303,753	-\$437,864,769	367.91%
14	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,860,030	\$33,321,270	\$171,299,014	\$634,625,022	-\$463,326,009	370.48%
15	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,631,097	\$32,350,747	\$178,930,110	\$666,975,770	-\$488,045,659	372.76%
16	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,408,832	\$31,408,493	\$186,338,942	\$698,384,262	-\$512,045,320	374.79%
17	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,193,041	\$30,493,682	\$193,531,983	\$728,877,944	-\$535,345,962	376.62%
18	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,983,534	\$29,605,517	\$200,515,517	\$758,483,461	-\$557,967,944	378.27%
19	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,780,131	\$28,743,220	\$207,295,648	\$787,226,681	-\$579,931,033	379.76%
20	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,582,651	\$27,906,039	\$213,878,299	\$815,132,719	-\$601,254,421	381.12%
21	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,390,923	\$27,093,242	\$220,269,222	\$842,225,961	-\$621,956,739	382.36%
22	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,204,780	\$26,304,118	\$226,474,002	\$868,530,079	-\$642,056,077	383.50%
23	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,024,058	\$25,537,979	\$232,498,060	\$894,068,058	-\$661,569,998	384.55%
24	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,848,600	\$24,794,154	\$238,346,660	\$918,862,212	-\$680,515,551	385.52%
25	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,678,253	\$24,071,994	\$244,024,913	\$942,934,206	-\$698,909,293	386.41%
26	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,512,867	\$23,370,868	\$249,537,780	\$966,305,074	-\$716,767,295	387.24%
27	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,352,298	\$22,690,163	\$254,890,077	\$988,995,237	-\$734,105,160	388.01%
28	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,196,406	\$22,029,285	\$260,086,483	\$1,011,024,522	-\$750,938,039	388.73%
29	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,045,054	\$21,387,655	\$265,131,537	\$1,032,412,177	-\$767,280,641	389.40%
30	\$11,889,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,898,111	\$20,764,714	\$270,029,647	\$1,053,176,891	-\$783,147,244	390.02%

Table 6: Comparison of net present value of future returns from \$15 million reinvestment
(AYSA returns without multiplier effects)

year	AYSA	DCOA	discounted AYSA benefits	discounted DCOA benefits	cumulative discounted AYSA benefits	cumulative discounted DCOA benefits	absolute difference	percent difference
0	\$27,000,000	\$65,287,006	\$27,000,000	\$65,287,006	\$27,000,000	\$65,287,006	-\$38,287,006	241.80%
1	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,477,670	\$48,933,408	\$34,477,670	\$114,220,414	-\$79,742,744	331.29%
2	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,259,874	\$47,508,163	\$41,737,544	\$161,728,577	-\$119,991,034	387.49%
3	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$7,048,421	\$46,124,430	\$48,785,965	\$207,853,008	-\$159,067,043	426.05%
4	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,843,127	\$44,781,000	\$55,629,092	\$252,634,008	-\$197,004,916	454.14%
5	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,643,813	\$43,476,699	\$62,272,905	\$296,110,707	-\$233,837,802	475.50%
6	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,450,304	\$42,210,388	\$68,723,209	\$338,321,094	-\$269,597,886	492.30%
7	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,262,431	\$40,980,959	\$74,985,639	\$379,302,053	-\$304,316,414	505.83%
8	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$6,080,030	\$39,787,339	\$81,065,669	\$419,089,392	-\$338,023,723	516.98%
9	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,902,942	\$38,628,484	\$86,968,611	\$457,717,876	-\$370,749,265	526.30%
10	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,731,011	\$37,503,383	\$92,699,622	\$495,221,259	-\$402,521,636	534.22%
11	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,564,089	\$36,411,051	\$98,263,711	\$531,632,310	-\$433,368,599	541.03%
12	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,402,028	\$35,350,535	\$103,665,739	\$566,982,845	-\$463,317,106	546.93%
13	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,244,687	\$34,320,908	\$108,910,426	\$601,303,753	-\$492,393,327	552.11%
14	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$5,091,929	\$33,321,270	\$114,002,355	\$634,625,022	-\$520,622,667	556.68%
15	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,943,621	\$32,350,747	\$118,945,976	\$666,975,770	-\$548,029,793	560.74%
16	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,799,632	\$31,408,493	\$123,745,608	\$698,384,262	-\$574,638,654	564.37%
17	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,659,837	\$30,493,682	\$128,405,444	\$728,877,944	-\$600,472,500	567.64%
18	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,524,113	\$29,605,517	\$132,929,558	\$758,483,461	-\$625,553,903	570.59%
19	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,392,343	\$28,743,220	\$137,321,901	\$787,226,681	-\$649,904,780	573.27%
20	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,264,411	\$27,906,039	\$141,586,311	\$815,132,719	-\$673,546,408	575.71%
21	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,140,205	\$27,093,242	\$145,726,516	\$842,225,961	-\$696,499,445	577.95%
22	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$4,019,616	\$26,304,118	\$149,746,132	\$868,530,079	-\$718,783,947	580.00%
23	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,902,540	\$25,537,979	\$153,648,672	\$894,068,058	-\$740,419,386	581.89%
24	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,788,874	\$24,794,154	\$157,437,545	\$918,862,212	-\$761,424,666	583.64%
25	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,678,518	\$24,071,994	\$161,116,064	\$942,934,206	-\$781,818,142	585.25%
26	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,571,377	\$23,370,868	\$164,687,440	\$966,305,074	-\$801,617,634	586.75%
27	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,467,356	\$22,690,163	\$168,154,796	\$988,995,237	-\$820,840,441	588.15%
28	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,366,365	\$22,029,285	\$171,521,162	\$1,011,024,522	-\$839,503,360	589.45%
29	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,268,316	\$21,387,655	\$174,789,477	\$1,032,412,177	-\$857,622,700	590.66%
30	\$7,702,000	\$50,401,410	\$3,173,122	\$20,764,714	\$177,962,599	\$1,053,176,891	-\$875,214,292	591.80%

returns, the DCOA significantly outperforms AYSA reinvestment by a measure approaching \$1 billion over a 30-year period.

In **Table 5**, the DCOA outperforms the AYSA scenario at a rate approaching \$4 for every \$1 return under AYSA management and this shown in the column entitled **Percent Difference**¹⁸. A DCOA-sponsored investment of \$15 million has the potential to create \$1,053,176,891 over the 30 years that follow this initial investment. Investment of the same \$15 million by the AYSA has the potential to create \$270,029,647.¹⁹ The difference, summarized in the column **Absolute Difference**, shows that DCOA-managed reinvestment has the potential to outperform the AYSA proposal by \$783,147,244 over the course of 30 years.

In **Table 6**, the DCOA outperforms the AYSA scenario at a rate approaching \$6 for every \$1 return under AYSA management and this shown in the column entitled **Percent Difference**²⁰. Again, the DCOA-sponsored investment of \$15 million has the potential to create \$1,053,176,891 over the 30 years that follow this initial investment. In this scenario, which is methodologically equivalent in its accounting of direct expenditures, the investment of the same \$15 million by the AYSA has the potential to create \$177,962,599.²¹ The difference, summarized in the column **Absolute Difference**, shows that DCOA-managed re-investment has the potential to outperform the AYSA proposal by \$875,214,292 over the course of 30 years.

In review of these results, Abilene would be better served leaving their economic development dollars in the care of the DCOA from an exclusively economic development standpoint. The historical performance of the DCOA argues that their use of the \$15 million would outperform the AYSA venue in terms of community impact.

¹⁸ Precisely, the DCOA creates \$3.90 versus each dollar the proposed AYSA facility would create.

¹⁹ This figure is different from the 30-year cumulative present-value impact of \$217,255,000 offered in the AYSA report. Part of the difference arises from the inclusion of \$37 million in investment at the outset of the AYSA project.

²⁰ Precisely, the DCOA creates \$5.92 versus each dollar the proposed AYSA facility would create.

²¹ This figure is different from the 30-year cumulative present-value impact of \$217,255,000 offered in the AYSA report because of the elimination of multiplied income impacts, gifted land and reduced transaction taxes.

IV. Review of the AYSA Feasibility Study

The most condemning aspect of this study is the significant loss of community income and tax revenues if the \$15 million in economic development dollars are taken from the stewardship of the DCOA. Still, other issues exist and they are addressed as separate themes that are relevant when evaluating the prudence of this potential diversion of \$15 million from the DCOA to the AYSA.

Budgeting for the AYSA venue The AYSA feasibility study is forthright in its estimation of a persistent shortfall in operating budget. The feasibility study offers a first-five-year projection of operating costs and revenues for the complex. The study also offers that the operating deficit of \$429,600 in the fifth year can be taken as a stabilized deficit for the facility in year 2012.

The feasibility study for the AYSA complex invites questions to the community as to how to bridge this budget shortfall. Several entities can be identified as funding sources, based on their past commitment to the community expressed in the ideals of their founder or their publically ratified charter. With regard to the public sector, the AYSA report is comprehensive in their recognition of the variety of options that are available to fund this facility from tax revenues. Potential funding sources for the proposed AYSA sports venue include:

Local foundations and corporate sponsors The AYSA feasibility study considers funding the forecasted budget shortfall of the sports venue through corporate sponsorships, fundraising, or charitable donations from local foundations. This need for an annual sum of \$429,600 to enable AYSA operations arrives at an awkward time for non-profit entities, with the recent reduction in foundation monies available to local charities.

In particular, the Dodge Jones Foundation has a long history of philanthropic work in the Abilene community. Likely, their historical support of charitable ventures in our community gives the Dodge Jones Foundation a direct or indirect impact on funding for the proposed AYSA sports venue.

Early in 2008, the Dodge Jones Foundation announced that it would restructure the \$200 million managed by the foundation, dividing its funds among four private family foundations outside of Abilene, leaving \$40 million with the Dodge Jones Foundation in Abilene. The more-than-\$10 million granted each year by the Dodge Jones Foundation will now be reduced to \$2 million to \$3 million.²²

It is unknown if the Dodge Jones Foundation was identified by the AYSA as a potential donor. Still, when the community loses between \$7 million to \$8 million in charitable donations, it has negative second-order effects on all fundraising efforts, from which AYSA fundraising efforts are not immune.

Public Entities Although the AYSA venue will function as an independent non-profit, the City of Abilene is a logically identified partner for AYSA venue. The City of Abilene funds a variety of similar venues through its general fund under its Parks and Recreation Department. The city also has developed alternate tax vehicles, such as the venue tax, that can be used to fund the proposed AYSA complex. The venue tax apportions its proceeds to local/tourist-oriented amenities like Frontier Texas!, the Expo Center and Shotwell Stadium. Additionally, the use of bonded indebtedness and general municipal funds from sales and property taxes are candidates for funding this proposed venue.

Parks and Recreation Division The City of Abilene Parks and Recreation division has an annual budget of \$3,795,940, with \$2,341,800 allocated to

²² Sarah Kleiner Varbel, [Abilene Reporter-News](#), January 29, 2008.

the Parks subdivision and \$1,454,140²³ from the city's general fund. The anticipated AYSA facility shortfall of \$429,600 would comprise 11.3% of the current parks and recreation budget should the parks department care to embark on this public/non-profit partnership.

Section V. of the AYSA Feasibility Study contains a review of comparable youth sports venues. In review of these venues, many are the responsibility of the city where they are located. No venue mentioned in this report benefitted from economic development dollars. Instead, these city-owned youth sports venues used general funds and bond debt to enable their creation.

To find a comparable venue that benefitted from economic development dollars, one should include the Scharbauer Sports Complex in Midland, Texas. The creation and operations of the Scharbauer Sports Complex is akin to the current dialogue involving the AYSA sports venue. The Scharbauer Sports Complex:

- Was developed on land donated by a Scharbauer family of Midland, Texas and
- Is located in West Texas
- Depended on an infusion of 4B economic development dollars at its inception.

Significant and unlike the proposed AYSA complex,

- The City of Midland owns the venue
- It does not exclusively target youth sports²⁴

²³ Mike Hall, Director of Parks and Recreation

²⁴ Section V. of the AYSA Feasibility Study contains a review of comparable youth sports venues. In review of these venues, many are the responsibility of the city where they are located. No venue mentioned in this report benefitted from economic development dollars. Instead, these city-owned youth sports venues used general funds and bond debt to enable their creation.

- The venue operates in a wealthier and larger metropolitan statistical area than Abilene
- The venue is more geographically isolated from major population centers.

Unfortunately for the City of Midland, the Scharbauer Sports Complex did not perform as planned. **Table 7** outlines City of Midland general fund transfers to the Scharbauer Sports Complex to cover its growing annual operating deficit.

Recently, the City of Abilene offered a long-term parks plan. Other things being equal, it does acknowledge that large park tracts exceeding 20 acres should be secured over the next 10 to 20 years totaling 219 acres at the close of acquisition. This donated land falls within this objective with one exception: it will be held by the AYSA and not the Abilene Parks and Recreation Department. However, the plan also outlines the competing budgetary needs for neighborhood parks, linear parks and regional parks at Lake Kirby and Lake Fort Phantom which the AYSA feasibility study ignores.²⁵

It would be worthwhile for the voters to know if city staff feels it is ready to assume a \$429,600 increase in their budget for the support of this non-city-controlled venue, in the context of parks master plan.

Furthermore, given the performance of the Scharbauer Sports Complex, the City of Abilene should be prepared to address the element of the unknown in future budgets if this venue needs financial support.

AYSA states that their venue is a private non-profit; however, this distinction becomes blurred once they accept tax dollars to fund their venue. If the AYSA venue is without funding for its projected operational

²⁵ City of Abilene Parks Master Plan, 2008 (<http://www.abilenetx.com/Parks/plan.htm>)

Table 7: Annual deficit of Scharbauer Sports Complex

fiscal year ending with	general fund contribution to Scharbauer Sports Complex ^a
2001	\$135,489
2002	\$115,197
2003	\$499,745
2004	\$585,365
2005	\$526,394
2006	\$620,247
2007	\$560,900
2008	\$741,776
total	\$3,785,113

^a Information provided by Bob McNaughton, Director of Finance, City of Midland.

shortfall, it is wholly reasonable to expect that the city will be forced to accept the responsibility of this shortfall to forestall political embarrassment, separate AYSA non-profit status notwithstanding.

Venue Tax The venue tax is overseen by a 3-person board²⁶ that decides the apportionment of the venue tax. Currently, the venue budget is \$609,090²⁷ with 55% allocated to Frontier Texas!, 25% allocated to the Expo Center, and 20% allocated to Shotwell Stadium for capital improvements. Funding the \$429,600 from the venue tax would require 71% of the venue tax fund.

Logically, the use of the venue tax makes good sense for the AYSC. The 2% venue tax on overnight hotel/motel stays fits the tourism market that the proposed AYSA seeks to draw. However, the awkwardness of this reallocation is most evident in the budget of Frontier Texas!. In the last fiscal year, 49% of the annual budget for Frontier Texas! came from the venue tax and it is evident that this attraction can ill-afford the loss of venue tax revenue necessary for its continued viability.

Like the Scharbauer Complex, Frontier Texas! is an additional proxy for the performance of the AYSA sports facility, as all three have a budget shortfall imbedded in their operating statement. However, the difference is that the annual shortfalls of Frontier Texas! were addressed prior to the creation of this tourist venue with voter acceptance of the venue tax. With the May referendum, our community may find itself in a position where a similar investment is made in a venue with no clear plan to address the long-term expense of this investment.

²⁶ The three taxing entities Abilene are represented on this board: the City of Abilene, AISD, and Taylor County.

²⁷ \$619,290 is collected in venue tax revenues. This amount gains \$3,200 in interest and is reduced by administrative costs of \$13,400 in administrative and audit costs for revenue generated of \$609,090.

Still, if the proposed AYSA venue moves forward following the May referendum there will be, ceteris paribus, other positive, second-order effects that may make public funding, from a very limited perspective, easier. These include:

Increased use of Frontier Texas! The gain in local visitors and the increase in collected venue tax will benefit Frontier Texas!. In light of this, Frontier Texas! might acquiesce to a board-determined reduction in their venue tax contribution with the proviso that the reduction of venue tax receipts be allocated to the proposed AYSA venue.

Gain in tax revenues from parcels surrounding the proposed AYSA facility.

Since the development of the Scharbauer Sports Complex, the Midland Central Appraisal District has realized an increase in taxable values in the properties adjacent to this complex.

Still, the potential return on the economic development dollars from the proposed AYSA sports venue is eclipsed by the historical performance of the DCOA. A review of **Table 2** reveals that the primary benefits of DCOA expenditures arise from incomes created, not property taxes. Property taxes and increased use of Frontier Texas! will generate benefits, but not to any degree that would significantly change the contrast in returns between the alternate investment strategies for the \$15 million.

Demographics

The AYSA feasibility study offers an honest assessment of regional demographics and trends which will not be readdressed comprehensively in this analysis. In their summary of local and regional market characteristics, they acknowledge:

- The need for philanthropic donations and corporate partners to meet operating obligations and to aid low-income athletes who would like to participate.
- The relatively low-income characteristics of the local population

Their relative analysis is limited to a table comparing the Abilene Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) to the Big Country and the nation as a whole. Compared to the nation, one can conclude that Abilene MSA is of a relatively lower income. However, when compared with the Big Country, the Abilene MSA slightly outperforms this 19-county region.

Table 8 was created to better appreciate the relative position of Abilene population and incomes to the Odessa-Midland MSA, largely comprised of Ector and Midland Counties. This MSA was selected as a peer for two reasons: its West Texas location and its recent redirection of 4A tax dollars to a 4B sports project. Data is broken down by county and includes population and per capita income figures. **Table 8** corroborates the AYSA feasibility study's assertion that population is flat to declining in the Taylor County and introduces that population growing in Ector and Midland County. **Table 8** also shows that Abilene's incomes are 63% of Midland County income and 97% of Ector County income.

Considering these demographics in tandem with the performance of the Scharbauer Sports Complex since its inception and the significant loss of local charitable donations, one must give serious consideration to the AYSA referendum in May. Midland-Odessa MSA, a community that is wealthier and more populous than Abilene, has been faced with deficits from their similarly-funded 4B amenity, requiring the city to annually cover these deficits from its general revenues.

The AYSA feasibility study acknowledges that local, lower-income demographics have the potential to intensify the annual shortfall of \$429,600. This risk exists as AYSA's primary revenue stream depends on assessment of a \$65 registration fee per event per user. The AYSA feasibility study acknowledges that the facility may still need to leverage other revenue sources beyond registration fees, such as corporate sponsorships and private philanthropy. These revenues are necessary to mitigate the potential impact

Table 8: Population and income for Midland, Ector, and Taylor Counties

year	CPI	Midland County				Ector County				Taylor County			
		population ^a	population growth	income in current dollars ^b	income in constant 2008 dollars	population ^a	population growth	income in current dollars ^b	income in constant 2008 dollars	population ^a	population growth	income in current dollars ^b	income in constant 2008 dollars
2002	179.9	117,384	1.1	-	-	124,901	-0.3	-	-	122,354	1.2	-	-
2003	184.0	118,653	1.1	-	-	124,729	-0.1	-	-	122,857	0.4	-	-
2004	188.9	119,942	1.1	36,899	40,501	124,949	0.2	26,289	28,856	124,221	1.1	23,457	25,747
2005	195.3	121,480	1.3	40,855	43,374	124,962	0.0	27,760	29,472	125,267	0.8	25,590	27,168
2006	201.6	124,380	2.4	45,274	46,564	124,927	0.0	29,738	30,585	127,462	1.8	28,707	29,525
2007	207.3												

^aPopulation figures are from the Texas A&M Real Estate Center (<http://recenter.tamu.edu>)

^bPer capita income figures are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (http://www.bea.gov/newsreleases/regional/mpi/mpi_newsrelease.htm)

that lower incomes may have on sports participation and the usage of the proposed AYSA complex, given the \$65 rate assessed on users of this facility²⁸.

V. Economic development: zero-sum or plus sum game?

If voter support exists, it is a relatively straightforward process to create a sales tax fund for economic development. Following state legislation in 1989, Abilene was the first community in the state to ratify its 4A economic development ½ cent sales tax. This uniqueness was short lived; other communities throughout the state brought economic development fund referendums to their voters and currently there are 123 communities with a 4A economic development tax, 318 communities with a 4B tax, and 97 cities with both a 4A and 4B tax.²⁹

As one would expect, the number of communities collecting sales tax for economic development has increased at a decreasing rate; after all, there are a finite number of communities that can adopt the tax. Among communities adopting this tax, the greatest gains in ratification of this tax occur with cities opting for the 4B tax. **Table 9** illustrates the growth in 4B and 4A communities. The percentage gains in 4B communities consistently surpass percentage gains in 4A communities. The table also reveals that in 1997, the number of 4B communities slightly surpasses 4A communities, but in eight years, the number of 4B communities outstrips 4A communities almost two to one.

This trend is fueled by the flexibility offered by 4B funding, which offers a broader definition of what can be classified as economic development spending. San Angelo is a Abilene peer city that collects an exclusively 4B tax and their tax collection and population is summarized in **Table 10**. Exclusively 4B corporations are attractive for urban areas that are using their 4B fund to incent major venues like Arlington or Grand Prairie. 4B funds are also favored by affluent

²⁸ AYSA Feasibility Study, December 2006, p. 12.

²⁹ This information is from a state report from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts entitled Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>). A tabular summary of each economic development corporation, size of their economic development fund, local population and per capita tax collected are in Tables A3-A7 in the appendix to this document.

Table 9: Growth in 4A and 4B Economic Development Corporations in Texas

	4A	% change in 4A	4B	% change in 4B
1997	154		182	
1998	166	3.75%	223	10.12%
1999	174	2.35%	272	9.90%
2000	189	4.13%	301	5.06%
2001	199	2.58%	325	3.83%
2002	203	1.00%	352	3.99%
2003	208	1.22%	380	3.83%
2004	209	0.24%	397	2.19%
2005	211	0.48%	413	1.98%

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006
 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)

Table 10: Peer cities and their economic development funds

	population	4A	4B	total economic development tax collected	per capita economic tax collected
Abilene	115,930	\$6,712,922	\$0.00	\$6,712,922.00	\$57.90
Amarillo	173,627	\$11,790,264	\$0.00	\$11,790,264.00	\$67.91
Midland	94,996	\$3,599,087.00	\$3,599,087.00	\$7,198,174.00	\$75.77
Odessa	90,943	\$2,965,033	\$0.00	\$2,965,033.00	\$32.60
San Angelo	88,439	\$0.00	\$4,896,478	\$4,896,478.00	\$55.37
Wichita Falls	104,197	\$3,008,598.00	\$2,956,939.00	\$5,965,537.00	\$57.25

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)

communities where amenities are important like Southlake, Colleyville or Coppell. Primary job creation specified by 4A economic development charter is of lesser or no interest to these communities that can rely on surrounding cities to create jobs for them. 4B corporations also work for small rural communities like Goldthwaite, Hico, Strawn or Rising Star. For example: since 2003, the state has permitted the creation of 4B corporations to collect and oversee a fund for street maintenance and repairs. Having another tax that can spread the tax base and reduce property and sales tax rates is appealing for small communities with limited resources. Like their suburban counterparts, it permits them develop a fund for civic projects that may indirectly create business relocation, but more likely add to the quality of life for those already there.

Many communities collect a 4A fund for primary job creation and a 4B fund for amenities. This has been a popular trend for communities that once started as exclusively 4A, but brought referendums to their voters to designate a separate 4B fund. Midland and Wichita Falls dually collect a sales tax increment for separate 4A and 4B funds and their tax collection for both funds and population is summarized in **Table 10**. Interestingly, joint 4A-4B communities appear aggressive in their collection of economic development taxes. On a per capita basis, 4A communities collect \$51.31 and 4B communities collect \$47.43. Communities that jointly collect a 4A-4B tax collect \$99.56 per capita³⁰.

Still, exclusively 4A funds can be found in West Texas. West Texas cities that fund a 4A economic development fund include Amarillo, Abilene, Big Spring, Brownwood and Odessa. Amarillo funds the second-largest 4A fund in the state with almost double the resources of the Abilene 4A fund. Odessa, with a comparable population, has a fund with is less than half of Abilene's fund. This information is summarized in **Table 10**. **Table 10** also tabulates an additional statistic: per capita economic development tax collected. As a 4A-4B community, Midland collects the highest per capita economic development tax of the cities summarized in **Table 10**.

³⁰ These per capita figures are in Tables A3-A5 in the appendix of this document.

Again, economic development tax funds are a zero-sum game: communities across the state and all major West Texas communities, with the exception of Lubbock, fund them. However, the creation of the 4B tax fund has allowed Abilene to regain, to a degree, its original comparative advantage through the attrition of other exclusively 4A communities. Due to 4B projects, Midland and Wichita Falls have cut their 4A funds to roughly half the size of Abilene's 4A fund, which gives Abilene an advantage in recruiting companies to Abilene. Abilene is poised to lose this advantage with the May referendum and find themselves in the same position as Midland and Wichita Falls with regard to their ability to incent and retain jobs.

Defying the zero-sum assessment of economic development is not limited to the fund we collect, but the type of venues we fund. Abilene has been successful in developing economic clustering in:

- Medical research and education
- Computer engineering, training and software
- Energy market supplies and servicing

Each of these clusters expand with hard-won negotiations, deliberate planning, and the careful use of development funds to bring them to Abilene. Each cluster becomes a unique system that benefits from the other, similar businesses located Abilene and cannot be replicated in other communities, given their distinct nature.

Unlike the economic benefits arising from job creation, the benefits from civic centers and sports arenas are easily replicated and can be designed to mimic the successful attributes of similar venues in other communities. Admittedly, civic centers and sports arenas are all good for community pride, but if each community pursues development of these comparable projects, the fallacy of composition implicit in each individual and well-meaning venue bodes poorly for sustained future success of the whole.

VI. Conclusion

This report acknowledges that the proposed AYSA sports venue creates tangible economic benefits for the community in terms of private and public revenues associated with hotel stays, increased restaurant patronage, and increased use of tourist venues. Additionally, this venue will provide intangible returns for the community and area youth.

However, to focus exclusively on the benefits of allocating \$15 million to this venue is myopic and wholly neglects the opportunity cost of this reallocation from our current designation for these funds. Most compelling is loss of future incomes and development if our 4A-funded development corporation is limited by the reallocation of these monies by the May referendum. Abilene stands to lose its ability to further current successes with job recruitment and retention and the development of property tax base, resulting an opportunity cost in excess of a billion dollars if this money is diverted from DCOA management.

A worrisome aspect of this venue is that we are on the brink of committing \$15 million of public money with no assured mechanism for funding this venue. The \$429,600 shortfall at project stabilization could force the city to subsidize the private facility, diverting resources from other planned public needs. The annual shortfall of the proposed AYSA facility represents .66% of our general fund expenses and 11.3% of our parks and recreation budget in fiscal year 2006-7.

The AYSA sports facility is packaged as something for our community's youth. This perspective neglects the fact that we have neighborhood parks, school facilities, recreation centers, university facilities and other public sports venues that, collectively, provide a similar outlet for our youth that are located in their own neighborhood. Furthermore, the user fees to gain access to this facility may prove to be prohibitively expensive for many in our community. The current geographic isolation of the proposed AYSA site and narrow demographic focus of this facility make the commitment of community dollars questionable.

Lastly, it is important to recognize the benefits arising from a committed 4A strategy. Through careful planning, Abilene has succeeded in developing a community of unique, export-oriented industries. Unlike easy-to-replicate venues such as civic centers and sports complexes, the system of DCOA-sponsored businesses cannot be reproduced by our peer cities that hold identical goals regarding economic development. To divert \$15 million of our DCOA fund to this project diminishes the efficiency of economic development, consigns us to a comparable or weakened position versus peer cities and most importantly, yields a poorer tangible return to our community.

Appendix

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Actual Tax Roll Value - Buildings	Actual Tax Roll Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total	Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	Status
FY 1990								
*Texas Dept. Criminal Justice-								
1 Robertson Unit	1/90, 11/91	\$ 55,000,000	\$ 302,906	\$ 25,349,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Active (Tax Exempt)
TOTAL		\$ 55,000,000	\$ 302,906	\$ 25,349,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FY 1991								
1 McLemore Bass	5/91	\$ 121,437	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Closed
2 Cummins Power Generation	9/91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Closed
3 Independent Grocers	9/91	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Purchased by Affiliated Foods
TOTAL		\$ 2,621,437	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FY 1992								
1 Expo Center Horse Stalls	5/92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	PAID
2 Fehr Foods	2/92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Active - see 2004
TOTAL		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FY 1993								
1 USA VenturCraft Texas Dept of Criminal Justice-	10/92	\$ 1,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Closed
2 Middleton Unit	1/93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Active (Tax Exempt)
TOTAL		\$ 1,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FY 1994								
1 Multicomp	11/93, 8/94	\$ 175,000			\$ 15,538	\$ 15,538		Active
2 ABCO Industries	11/93	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 50,965	\$ 919,528	\$ 1,611,561	\$ 2,582,054		Purchased by Peerless
3 Danielle & Co (Ladanco)	1/94	\$ 150,000				\$ -		Closed
4 Willis Supply Texas Boll Weevil Eradication	7/94	\$ 126,000	\$ 10,305	\$ 103,181	\$ 108,100	\$ 221,586		Active
5 Foundation	7/94	\$ 84,500				\$ -		Active (Tax Exempt)
6 Hamilton Manufacturing	5/94	\$ 17,500			\$ 9,515	\$ 9,515		Active
7 Lauren Engineering	3/94	\$ 500,000				\$ -		Active - see 2005

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital		Actual Tax Roll		Actual Tax Roll		Status
		Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Actual Tax Roll Value - Buildings	Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total	Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	
8 Tige Boats	8/94	\$ 75,000				\$ -		Active - see 2004
9 ACCO Feeds	5/94	\$ 2,965,000			\$ 3,099,566	\$ 3,099,566		Active
10 Eagle Aviation Services	6/94	\$ 300,000				\$ -		Active - see 2007
11 Cummings Sign	9/94	\$ 100,500				\$ -		Closed, bldg bought by Bandag
TOTAL		\$ 5,693,500	\$ 61,270	\$ 1,022,709	\$ 4,844,280	\$ 5,928,259	\$ 5,928,259	
FY 1995								
1 Marsh Scale	1/95	\$ 126,250				\$ -		Closed
2 Pride (Downtown office)	10/94	\$ 200,000				\$ -		Closed
3 A-1 Core		\$ 10,000			\$ 23,625	\$ 23,625		Active
4 Directors Investment Group	5/95	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 46,043	\$ 1,383,517	\$ 718,194	\$ 2,147,754		Active
5 US Postal Service	2/95	\$ 600,000				\$ -		Closed
6 Multicomp	5/95	\$ -			\$ 15,538	\$ 15,538		Active
7 Cummins Power Generation	2/95	\$ 500,000				\$ -		Closed
TOTAL		\$ 4,036,250	\$ 46,043	\$ 1,383,517	\$ 757,357	\$ 2,186,917	\$ 8,115,176	
FY 1996								
Texas Boll Weevil Erad. Found.-								
1 Phase 2	11/95	\$ -				\$ -		Active (tax exempt)
2 Eagle Aviation Services	8/95	\$ -				\$ -		Active - see 2007
3 Nash Partners (Global)	3/96	\$ 400,000				\$ -		Closed
4 Sitel Corporation	7/96	\$ 200,000				\$ -		Closed
5 Banyan International	8/96	\$ 3,333				\$ -		Closed
6 Technical Space	9/96	\$ 254,000				\$ -		Closed
7 USA VenturCraft	11/95	\$ -				\$ -		Closed
8 Hirschfeld Steel (Virgil St.)	9/96	\$ 726,500	\$ 94,907	\$ 974,520	\$ 1,341,368	\$ 2,410,795		Active
TOTAL		\$ 1,583,833	\$ 94,907	\$ 974,520	\$ 1,341,368	\$ 2,410,795	\$ 10,525,971	
FY 1997								
1 BlueCross Blue Shield Phase I	11/96	\$ 3,780,000				\$ -		Active - see 2004
2 Zoltek	3/97	\$ 56,000,000	\$ 575,668	\$ 4,836,987	\$ 12,401,667	\$ 17,814,322		Active

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll				Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	Status
			Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Actual Tax Roll Value - Buildings	Actual Tax Roll Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total		
3 Ab-Tex Beverage	8/97	\$ 350,000				\$ -	Active - see 2007	
4 Fehr Foods	7/97	\$ 1,450,000				\$ -	Active - see 2004	
5 Hirschfeld (FM 18)	8/97	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 128,316	\$ 593,055	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,471,371	Sold to Mueller, Inc.	
6 Tigé Boats	12/96	\$ -				\$ -	Active - see 2004	
TOTAL		\$ 62,580,000	\$ 703,984	\$ 5,430,042	\$ 13,151,667	\$ 19,285,693	\$ 29,811,664	
FY 1998								
1 Rentech Boiler Systems	2/98	\$ 456,000				\$ -	Active - see 2005	
2 Hartmann dba Torco	2/98	\$ 68,000	\$ 23,175	\$ 125,862	\$ 111,441	\$ 260,478	Active	
3 BlueCross Blue Shield Phase II	3/98	\$ 2,824,000				\$ -	Active - see 2004	
4 Eagle Aviation Services	3/98	\$ -				\$ -	Active - see 2007	
5 Hancock Industries	10/97	\$ 99,000				\$ -	Moved out of town	
6 LenStar Corp	6/98	\$ 100,000				\$ -	Closed	
TOTAL		\$ 3,547,000	\$ 23,175	\$ 125,862	\$ 111,441	\$ 260,478	\$ 30,072,142	
FY 1999								
1 Phillips Driscopipe	1/99	\$ 868,000				\$ -	Closed	
2 Rentech Boiler Systems	1/99	\$ -				\$ -	Active - see 2005	
3 US Brass	2/99	\$ 3,314,920	\$ 129,294	\$ 929,949	\$ 4,123,492	\$ 5,182,735	Active - warehouse only	
TOTAL		\$ 4,182,920	\$ 129,294	\$ 929,949	\$ 4,123,492	\$ 5,182,735	\$ 35,254,877	
FY 2000								
1 Aerobotics	10/99	\$ 4,400,000				\$ -	Closed	
2 BlueCross BlueShield-Phase III	2/00	\$ 900,000				\$ -	Active - see 2004	
TOTAL		\$ 5,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,254,877	

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital		Actual Tax Roll		Actual Tax Roll		Status
		Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Value - Buildings	Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total	Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	
FY 2001								
1 Lauren Engineers & Constructors, Inc.	10/00	\$ 489,000				\$ -		Active - see 2005
2 Fehr Foods	5/01	\$ 971,000				\$ -		Active - see 2004
3 Rentech Boiler Systems	5/01	\$ 50,000				\$ -		Active - see 2005
4 BlueCross BlueShield-Phase IV	5/01	\$ 1,200,000				\$ -		Active - see 2004
5 Eagle Aviation Services	9/01	\$ -				\$ -		Active - see 2007
TOTAL		\$ 2,710,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,254,877	
FY 2002								
1 Glazer's Wholesale Drug Co.	10/01	\$ 1,387,500				\$ -		Active - see 2004
2 Cisco Jr. College	10/01	\$ 6,245,000				\$ -		Active (tax exempt)
3 Buttery Hardware	11/01	\$ 625,000	\$ 79,800	\$ 191,889	\$ 168,195	\$ 439,884		Active
4 Texas Metals & Recycling	12/01	\$ 427,000				\$ -		Active - see 2007
5 Orange Plastics	1/02	\$ 24,500,000				\$ -		Closed
6 National Distribution Centers	8/02	\$ 2,000				\$ -		Closed
TOTAL		\$ 33,186,500	\$ 79,800	\$ 191,889	\$ 168,195	\$ 439,884	\$ 35,694,761	
FY 2003								
1 Eagle Aviation Services	12/02	\$ -				\$ -		Active - see 2007
2 Horizon Ag Products	1/03	\$ 150,000	\$ 23,493	\$ 227,371	\$ 438,657	\$ 689,521		Active
3 Leapfrog Technologies	3/03	\$ 150,000				\$ -		Closed Purchased by Continental Connection
4 SkyWest Airlines	6/03	\$ -				\$ -		Active
5 MuRF Systems	8/03	\$ 79,293			\$ 12,746	\$ 12,746		Active
6 Day Sign	9/03	\$ 160,000	\$ 49,659	\$ 328,537	\$ 42,470	\$ 420,666		Active
TOTAL		\$ 539,293	\$ 73,152	\$ 555,908	\$ 493,873	\$ 1,122,933	\$ 36,817,694	

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital		Actual Tax Roll		Actual Tax Roll		Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	Status
		Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Value - Buildings	Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total			
FY 2004									
1 BlueCross BlueShield-Phase V	10/03	\$ 317,000	\$ 708,939	\$ 2,913,561	\$ 2,140,028	\$ 5,762,528			Active
2 McWhiney Research Found	11/03	\$ -				\$ -			Active (tax exempt)
3 Tige Boats	11/03	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 134,262	\$ 3,917,278	\$ 4,425,894	\$ 8,477,434			Active
4 Bandag	1/04, 4/04	\$ 381,345				\$ -			Active - see 2005
5 Rentech Boiler Systems	2/04	\$ -				\$ -			Active - see 2005
6 Sunoco Logistics	2/04	\$ -			\$ 79,453	\$ 79,453			Active
7 Crown Cork & Seal	3/04	\$ 8,929,500				\$ -			Purchased by Abtex Beverage
Purchase property at 4109 Vine (Affiliated Foods leases DCOA bldg & sublets to Ryder)									
8 Fehr Foods (own bldg & leased DCOA bldg)	3/04	\$ -	\$ 86,282	\$ 795,886	\$ 2,400,939	\$ 3,283,107			Active
9 Hirschfeld Steel (agreement canceled)	8/04	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 152,353	\$ 2,628,976	\$ 9,020,245	\$ 11,801,574			Active
10 Advanced Trailers	6/04	\$ 1,500,000				\$ -			Active
11 Enprotec/Hibbs & Todd (EHT)	9/04	\$ 339,800				\$ -			Closed
12 Glazer's Wholesale	5/04	\$ 531,000	\$ 124,967	\$ 385,560		\$ 510,527			Active
13 Eagle Aviation Services	5/04	\$ -				\$ 2,619,824			Active
14 Eagle Aviation Services	9/04	\$ -				\$ -			Active - see 2007
TOTAL		\$ 22,198,645	\$ 1,206,803	\$ 10,641,261	\$ 18,066,559	\$ 29,914,623	\$ 66,732,317		
FY 2005									
1 Transcend Services	11/04	\$ 600,000			\$ 56,313	\$ 56,313			Active but closed office
**Bandag, Inc. (former Cummins Sign)	12/04	\$ 400,000	\$ 31,113	\$ 1,079,098		\$ 1,110,211			Active
3 Glazer's Wholesale Drug	1/05	\$ -	\$ 135,128	\$ 1,017,470	\$ 1,467,226	\$ 2,619,824			Active
4 Highland Campus Health	1/05	\$ 250,000			\$ 87,483	\$ 87,483			Active
5 Rentech Boiler Systems	2/05	\$ -	\$ 161,540	\$ 3,127,190	\$ 1,132,427	\$ 4,421,157			Active
6 Sears Methodist Retirement	4/05	\$ -				\$ -			Active

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital		Actual Tax Roll			Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	Status
		Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Actual Tax Roll Value - Buildings	Actual Tax Roll Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total		
7 Robinson Fans Air Technical Systems	4/05	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 18,295	\$ 611,496	\$ 2,049,937	\$ 2,679,728		Active
8 (agreement canceled)	7/05	\$ -				\$ -		Active Active (tax exempt)
9 TTU Pharmacy School Lauren Eng. & Const (550 S	7/05	\$ 11,000,000				\$ -		
10 18th & 901 S 1st)	9/05	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 105,196	\$ 804,189	\$ 1,327,867	\$ 2,237,252		Active
TOTAL		\$ 15,250,000	\$ 451,272	\$ 6,639,443	\$ 6,121,253	\$ 13,211,968	\$ 79,944,285	
FY 2006								
1 Teleperformance USA (leased bldg)	11/05	\$ 500,000	\$ 196,848	\$ 1,223,993	\$ 1,229,271	\$ 2,650,112		Active
2 Shelter Distribution (Project BP) PWP Industries-Phase 1 (lease	1/06	\$ 213,300			\$ 621,988	\$ 621,988		Active
3 DCOA bldg) Integrated Clinical Research	2/06	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 120,717	\$ 2,780,556	\$ 12,662,489	\$ 15,563,762		Active
4 (delayed) Incineration Recycling (Proj. TT	3/06	\$ 1,604,500				\$ -		Active
5 canceled)	3/06	\$ 750,000				\$ -		Active
6 Genesis Networks Solutions		\$ 813,000				\$ -		Active
TOTAL		\$ 12,880,800	\$ 317,565	\$ 4,004,549	\$ 14,513,748	\$ 18,835,862	\$ 98,780,147	
FY 2007								
TTU School of Pharmacy (addn'l funding)	10/07	\$ -				\$ -		Active (tax exempt)
Coca Cola Bottling (addn'l funding)	11/06	\$ -				\$ -		Active
Eagle Aviation Services (7th dock line)	12/06	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,418,473	\$ 14,119,000	\$ 19,537,473		Active
Abtex Beverages (Project KM)	12/06	\$ 3,160,960	\$ 169,489	\$ 3,871,365	\$ 11,874,036	\$ 15,914,890		Active
Texas Metals (RWL Recycling)	12/06	\$ 425,000	\$ 48,381	\$ 645,160	\$ 407,820	\$ 1,101,361		Active
Integrated Clinical Research (addn'l funds)	12/06	\$ -				\$ -		
Receptor Logic (Project JW)	06/07	\$ 2,000,000				\$ -		Active

Table A1: DCOA Capital Outlays and Property Tax Base Creation

Project Name	Date Approved	Projected Capital Investment by Co.	Actual Tax Roll Value - Land	Actual Tax Roll Value - Buildings	Actual Tax Roll Value - Equipment & Inventory	Actual Tax Roll Value - Total	Actual Tax Roll Value - Cumulative	Status
Senior Safe at Home (Project SSH)	07/07	\$ 800,000				\$ -		Active
TTU Center for Immunotherapeutic Research	07/07	\$ 2,871,000				\$ -		Active (tax exempt)
TOTAL		\$ 9,256,960	\$ 217,870	\$ 9,934,998	\$ 26,400,856	\$ 36,553,724	\$ 135,333,871	
GRAND TOTAL		\$ 241,667,138	\$ 3,708,041	\$ 67,183,647	\$ 90,094,089	\$ 135,333,871	\$ 135,333,871	

Notes:

* Values excluded from totals (tax exempt)

** Only counted new bldg since company has been in business in Abilene for so long.

**DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF ABILENE
STATUS OF FUNDS @ FEBRUARY 29, 2008**

	Amount Obligated	Prior Years Disbursed	Current Month Disbursed	Current Year Disbursed	Amount Encumbered	Balance
BALANCE OF OBLIGATED PROGRAMS						
Business Services Division	\$ 617,070.00	\$ -	\$ 42,715.68	\$ 256,192.01	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 340,877.99
DCOA Annual Contracts	227,470.00	-	8,841.56	40,267.31	-	187,202.69
Abilene Industrial Foundation (4950)	731,950.00	-	45,562.10	200,767.77	531,182.23	-
TTU Small Business Dev Cntr (4951)	195,000.00	-	22,050.00	76,518.75	118,481.25	-
Chamber Military Affairs (4952)	70,000.00	-	-	-	70,000.00	-
Airport Business Dev Mgr (4953)	137,045.00	-	16,250.10	58,875.00	78,169.90	0.10
EASI Records Const. 4990	2,506,297.00	2,440,442.58	-	-	65,854.42	(0.00)
Murf Systems 4998	151,665.00	151,665.00	-	-	-	-
Bandag Training 5203	842,220.00	516,334.72	-	29,135.48	296,749.80	-
Rentech 5207	335,360.00	335,360.00	-	-	-	-
Sunoco Logistics 5208	177,000.00	143,544.00	-	-	33,456.00	-
EASI 04 5213	3,272,938.00	1,020,937.66	-	324,300.00	1,927,700.00	0.34
EHT 5216	98,300.00	98,300.00	-	-	-	-
Fehr Food 5220	1,045,020.00	521,670.00	-	523,350.00	-	-
Research Ins 5221	500.00	500.00	-	-	-	-
Advanced Trailer 5224	34,141.00	29,750.00	-	4,391.67	-	(0.67)
Transcend Services 5227	326,394.00	280,157.82	-	46,235.32	-	0.86
Bandag Building Improv 5228	44,260.00	-	-	-	44,259.24	0.76
Glazers Ph III 5229	91,000.00	26,280.00	-	-	64,720.00	-
Highland Campus Health 5231	552,209.00	128,791.66	-	60,950.00	362,466.67	0.67
Rentech 5232	48,800.00	48,800.00	-	-	-	-
Tige Infrastructure 5233	218,636.00	144,397.68	74,238.00	74,238.00	-	0.32
Robinson Fan 5237	595,876.00	126,482.00	-	-	469,394.09	(0.09)
Reg Website 5240	5,000.00	4,317.07	-	-	682.93	-
TTU Pharmacy School 5242	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lauren Holdings 5245	628,952.00	259,770.00	-	369,182.00	-	-
18/36 Business Park 5246	35,000.00	23,800.00	-	-	11,200.00	-
Teleperformance USA 5247	757,000.00	88,040.00	-	-	668,960.00	-
Prospect 06	1,225.00	-	-	1,225.00	-	-
BCBSTX Reroof Construction 5249	830,720.00	781,098.40	-	-	49,621.60	-
Shelter Distribution 5250	92,842.00	44,724.96	-	-	48,117.04	-
PWP (Project LF) 5251	2,847,463.00	610,993.77	-	-	2,236,469.23	-
Abilene Internet 5252	59,340.00	59,340.00	-	-	-	-
Integrated Clinic Research 5253	695,502.00	-	-	3,040.00	692,462.00	-
SBIR/STTR 5255	23,284.00	23,283.51	-	-	-	0.49
Coca Cola 5256	300,000.00	300,000.00	-	-	-	-
Welder Training Program 5257	179,424.00	141,824.36	6,655.94	6,655.94	30,944.06	(0.36)
Genesis Network 5258	680,633.00	353,533.33	-	42,000.00	285,100.00	(0.33)
URS Consultants 5259	15,127.00	-	-	13,752.00	-	1,375.00
Carter Burgess 5260	349,320.00	222,323.88	3,486.29	33,402.63	93,593.49	-
Fehr Foods 5261	118,092.00	118,091.53	-	-	-	0.47
TMAC 5262	60,000.00	30,000.00	-	7,500.00	22,500.00	-
SBIR/STTR 5263	271,400.00	37,612.59	183.75	13,122.75	220,664.66	-
EASI 7th Doc 5265	275,000.00	86,119.14	2,856.70	37,137.10	151,743.66	0.10
BMWT Leasing 5266	25,000.00	-	-	25,000.00	-	-
ABTEX Beverage 5267	1,599,040.00	-	-	-	1,599,040.00	-
MSSC Training 5269	146,115.00	35,479.08	3,749.16	24,325.16	86,310.84	(0.08)
Receptor Log 5270	2,000,000.00	57,404.62	242,194.71	376,893.90	1,565,392.58	308.90
Sr. Safe at Home (Project SSH) 5271	402,455.00	-	-	-	402,455.00	-
WTCIC 5272	33,164.00	16,582.00	-	-	16,582.00	-
TTU HS Research 5273	3,000,000.00	-	-	490,000.00	2,510,000.00	-
Accelerator A/E 5274	351,800.00	8,164.39	9,796.00	117,060.88	226,574.73	-
Spec 2 Expansion 5275	6,377,345.00	-	625,575.11	724,806.61	5,652,538.39	-
Spec 3 Construction 5276	5,736,500.00	-	163,301.25	163,301.25	5,573,198.75	-
ACU 08 SpringBoard 5277	5,000.00	-	5,000.00	5,000.00	-	-
Prospect Development 08 5278	35,000.00	-	-	-	-	35,000.00
Accelerator Land 5280	325,000.00	-	22,187.06	22,187.06	302,812.94	-
Prior Year Program	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Activities 2785	354,189.86	354,189.86	-	-	-	-
BALANCE OF OBLIGATED PROGRAMS	\$ 40,935,083.86	\$ 9,670,105.61	\$ 1,294,643.41	\$ 4,170,813.59	\$ 26,529,397.50	\$ 564,767.16
Contingent Liabilities						\$ -
UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE						\$ 6,395,576.69

(unencumbered balance less obligated programs and contingent liabilities)

DCOA Board approved projects waiting for signed contracts	EXPIRATION DATE
Venture Dr. in Five Pts. 5279	07/29/2008
Spec 2 Expansion Addn'l Funds 5275	08/26/2008
1,289,360.00	

Table A3: 4A development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Lubbock, Lubbock Economic Development Alliance Inc.	DNE	199,564	-
Corpus Christi, City of Corpus Christi	\$12,795,237	277,454	\$46.12
Amarillo, Amarillo EDC	\$11,790,264	173,627	\$67.91
Abilene, DC of Abilene, Inc.	\$6,712,922	115,930	\$57.90
Harlingen, Harlingen EDC, Inc.	\$3,998,149	57,564	\$69.46
Longview, Longview EDC	\$3,372,087	73,344	\$45.98
Odessa, Odessa DC	\$2,965,033	90,943	\$32.60
Edinburg, Edinburg EDC	\$2,404,543	48,465	\$49.61
Sherman, Sherman EDC	\$2,339,736	35,082	\$66.69
Pharr, Pharr EDC, Inc.	\$2,301,979	46,660	\$49.34
Rockwall, Rockwall EDC	\$2,174,540	17,976	\$120.97
Port Arthur, Port Arthur EDC	\$2,044,907	57,755	\$35.41
Kilgore, Kilgore EDC	\$1,740,191	11,301	\$153.99
Weslaco, EDC of Weslaco	\$1,675,053	26,935	\$62.19
Terrell, Terrell EDC	\$1,599,027	13,606	\$117.52
Marshall, Marshall EDCO	\$1,523,049	23,935	\$63.63
Sulphur Springs, Sulphur Springs - Hopkins County EDC	\$1,203,592	14,551	\$82.72
Brownwood, Brownwood EDC	\$1,162,480	18,813	\$61.79
Marble Falls, Marble Falls EDC	\$1,154,888	4,959	\$232.89
Denison, Business and Industrial Corp. of Denison	\$1,061,282	22,773	\$46.60
Big Spring, Moore Development for Big Spring	\$994,048	25,233	\$39.39
Paris, Paris EDC	\$963,798	25,898	\$37.22
Athens, Athens EDC	\$956,194	11,297	\$84.64
Copperas Cove, Copperas Cove EDC	\$930,000	29,592	\$31.43
Mount Pleasant, Mount Pleasant Industrial DC	\$929,545	13,935	\$66.71
Jasper, Jasper EDC	\$847,430	8,247	\$102.76
Decatur, Corp. for Economic Development-City of Decatur	\$830,982	5,201	\$159.77
Bellmead, Bellmead EDC	\$772,496	9,214	\$83.84
La Marque, La Marque Industrial DC	\$739,559	13,682	\$54.05
Henderson, Henderson EDC	\$704,555	11,273	\$62.50
Borger, Borger EDC	\$653,145	14,302	\$45.67
Bridgeport, Bridgeport EDC	\$649,791	4,309	\$150.80
Belton, DC of Belton	\$646,236	14,623	\$44.19
Seguin, Seguin EDC	\$645,051	22,011	\$29.31
Taylor, Taylor EDC	\$632,016	13,575	\$46.56
Sweetwater, Sweetwater Enterprise for Economic Development	\$498,055	11,415	\$43.63
Perryton, Community DC of Perryton	\$496,317	7,774	\$63.84
Silsbee, Silsbee EDC	\$487,059	6,393	\$76.19
Snyder, DC of Snyder	\$450,125	10,783	\$41.74
South Padre Island, South Padre Island EDC	\$437,925	2,422	\$180.81
Little Elm, Little Elm EDC	\$423,300	3,646	\$116.10
Vernon, Business DC of Vernon	\$420,427	11,660	\$36.06
Levelland, Levelland EDC	\$415,710	12,866	\$32.31
Greenville, Greenville 4A EDC	\$410,686	23,960	\$17.14
Hereford, Hereford EDC	\$373,144	14,597	\$25.56

Table A3: 4A development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
El Campo, City DC of El Campo, Inc.	\$372,268	10,945	\$34.01
Crockett, Crockett Economic & Industrial DC	\$363,076	7,141	\$50.84
Gilmer, City of Gilmer	\$347,959	4,799	\$72.51
Commerce, Commerce EDC	\$325,671	7,669	\$42.47
Hidalgo, Hidalgo EDC, Inc.	\$321,629	7,322	\$43.93
Fairfield, Fairfield Industrial DC	\$318,478	3,094	\$102.93
Burnet, Burnet Industrial DC	\$310,389	4,735	\$65.55
Prosper, Prosper EDC	\$306,042	2,097	\$145.94
Kaufman, Kaufman EDC	\$301,716	6,490	\$46.49
Lamesa, Lamesa EDC	\$280,728	9,952	\$28.21
Breckenridge, DC of Breckenridge, Inc.	\$275,486	5,868	\$46.95
Graham, Graham EDC Inc.	\$274,843	8,716	\$31.53
Brownfield, Brownfield Industrial DC	\$270,337	9,488	\$28.49
Hempstead, Hempstead EDC	\$265,891	4,691	\$56.68
Mercedes, DC of Mercedes	\$265,332	13,649	\$19.44
Eastland, Eastland Economic Development, Inc.	\$249,620	3,769	\$66.23
New Boston, New Boston Special Industrial DC	\$246,612	4,808	\$51.29
Lindale, Lindale EDC	\$236,536	2,954	\$80.07
Gladewater, Gladewater EDC	\$230,944	6,078	\$38.00
Monahans, Monahans EDC	\$228,465	6,821	\$33.49
Raymondville, DC of Raymondville, Inc.	\$217,966	9,733	\$22.39
Childress, Childress EDC	\$215,083	6,778	\$31.73
Hillsboro, DC of Hillsboro	\$197,290	8,232	\$23.97
Meadows Place, Meadows EDC	\$195,113	4,912	\$39.72
Cameron, Cameron Industrial DC	\$191,664	5,634	\$34.02
Early, Early EDC	\$191,191	2,588	\$73.88
Littlefield, Littlefield EDC	\$173,800	6,507	\$26.71
Waller, City of Waller EDC	\$149,099	2,092	\$71.27
Stamford, DC of Stamford, Inc.	\$146,848	3,636	\$40.39
Muleshoe, Muleshoe EDC	\$142,604	4,530	\$31.48
Nash, Nash Industrial DC	\$140,400	2,169	\$64.73
Brady, Brady EDC	\$139,582	5,523	\$25.27
Comanche, Comanche Texas EDC	\$134,152	4,482	\$29.93
Pecos, Pecos EDC	\$130,722	9,501	\$13.76
Coleman, Coleman EDC	\$128,888	5,127	\$25.14
Slaton, Slaton EDC	\$127,863	6,109	\$20.93
Clarksville, Clarksville EDC	\$127,030	3,883	\$32.71
Rusk, Rusk EDC	\$120,450	5,085	\$23.69
Canadian, Canadian-Hemphill County EDC	\$109,856	2,233	\$49.20
Palmview, Palmview EDC	\$101,181	4,107	\$24.64
Hitchcock, Hitchcock Industrial DC	\$98,985	6,386	\$15.50
Palacios, City of Palacios EDC	\$98,856	5,153	\$19.18
Hutto, Hutto EDC	\$98,841	1,250	\$79.07
Olney, Olney Industrial DC	\$85,864	3,396	\$25.28
Haskell, EDC of Haskell, Inc.	\$84,576	3,106	\$27.23
Quanah, Quanah EDC	\$84,309	3,022	\$27.90

Table A3: 4A development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Denver City, Denver City EDC	\$80,417	3,985	\$20.18
Kountze, Kountze EDC	\$77,656	2,115	\$36.72
Shamrock, Shamrock EDC	\$74,141	2,029	\$36.54
Hamlin, Hamlin EDC	\$72,936	2,248	\$32.44
Sour Lake, Sour Lake EDC	\$68,504	1,667	\$41.09
Ranger, Ranger EDC	\$68,455	2,584	\$26.49
Wills Point, Wills Point EDC	\$67,569	3,496	\$19.33
Overton, Overton EDC	\$60,960	2,350	\$25.94
Northlake, Town of Northlake 4A EDC	\$60,653	921	\$65.86
Memphis, Memphis EDC	\$59,591	2,479	\$24.04
Hooks, Hooks Special Industrial Corp.	\$56,643	2,973	\$19.05
Tatum, Tatum EDC	\$54,878	1,175	\$46.70
Jewett, Jewett EDC	\$50,662	861	\$58.84
Tolar, Tolar EDC	\$48,287	504	\$95.81
West Tawakoni, West Tawakoni EDC	\$47,675	1,462	\$32.61
Dripping Springs, City of Dripping Springs EDC	\$43,880	1,548	\$28.35
Edgewood, Edgewood EDC	\$42,757	1,348	\$31.72
Wellington, Wellington EDC	\$40,018	2,275	\$17.59
Booker, Booker EDC, Inc.	\$39,774	1,315	\$30.25
Progreso, City of Progreso	\$39,000	4,851	\$8.04
De Kalb, DeKalb Industrial Foundation, Inc.	\$37,416	1,769	\$21.15
Panhandle, Panhandle EDC	\$36,875	2,589	\$14.24
Rotan, Rotan EDC	\$34,338	1,611	\$21.31
Menard, Menard Industrial DC	\$33,222	1,653	\$20.10
Baird, DC of Baird	\$24,000	1,623	\$14.79
Munday, DC of Munday, Inc.	\$18,141	1,527	\$11.88
Hale Center, Hale Center EDC, Inc.	\$17,525	2,263	\$7.74
Crowell, Crowell Industrial DC	\$14,549	1,141	\$12.75
Maud, City of Maud	\$10,000	1,028	\$9.73
De Leon, DeLeon Industrial DC	\$0	2,433	\$0.00
exclusively-4A taxes collected, per capita			\$51.32

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Lufkin, Lufkin EDC	DNE	32,709	-
South Houston, City of South Houston EDC	DNE	15,833	-
Canyon, Canyon Development Corp	DNE	12,875	-
Highland Village, Highland Village Community DC	DNE	12,173	-
Hondo, City of Hondo	DNE	7,897	-
Sullivan City, Sullivan City EDC	DNE	3,998	-
Stanton, Stanton EDC	DNE	2,556	-
Westworth Village, Westworth Redevelopment Authority	DNE	2,124	-
Archer City, Archer City Growth & Development Corp	DNE	1,848	-
Kerens, Kerens EDC	DNE	1,681	-
Plains, Plains Economic Development	DNE	1,450	-
Brownsboro, Brownsboro DC	DNE	796	-
Nevada, Nevada EDC	DNE	563	-
Webberville, Webberville EDC	DNE	530	-
Alba, City of Alba EDC	DNE	430	-
Round Rock, Round Rock Transportation System DC	\$12,160,742	61,136	\$198.91
McAllen, DC of McAllen, Inc.	\$11,400,484	106,414	\$107.13
Tyler, Tyler One-Half Cent Sales Tax Corp., Inc.	\$9,280,487	83,650	\$110.94
Mesquite, Mesquite Quality of Life Corp.	\$8,746,665	124,523	\$70.24
Grand Prairie, Grand Prairie Sports Facilities DC, Inc.	\$7,934,242	127,427	\$62.26
Pasadena, Pasadena Second Century Corp.	\$6,189,302	141,674	\$43.69
Conroe, Conroe Industrial DC	\$5,343,218	36,811	\$145.15
Victoria, Victoria Sales Tax DC	\$5,091,591	60,603	\$84.02
San Angelo, San Angelo DC	\$4,896,478	88,439	\$55.37
Lewisville, Lewisville DC	\$4,177,801	77,737	\$53.74
North Richland Hills, North Richland Hills Park & Rec. Fac. DC	\$4,107,934	55,635	\$73.84
Hurst, City of Hurst	\$3,669,838	36,273	\$101.17
Galveston, Galveston Industrial DC	\$3,326,568	57,247	\$58.11
Pearland, Pearland EDC	\$3,015,119	37,640	\$80.10
Texas City, Texas City EDC	\$3,002,136	41,521	\$72.30
Stafford, Stafford EDC	\$2,961,546	15,681	\$188.86
Southlake, Southlake Parks DC	\$2,661,692	21,519	\$123.69
Coppell, Coppell Recreation DC	\$2,606,635	35,958	\$72.49
Webster, Webster EDC	\$2,522,413	9,083	\$277.71
New Braunfels, New Braunfels Infrastructure/Improvement Corp.	\$2,460,171	36,494	\$67.41
Eules, Eules DC	\$2,320,606	46,005	\$50.44
Mission, Mission EDC	\$2,220,163	45,408	\$48.89
Georgetown, Georgetown Transportation Enhancement Corp.	\$2,118,443	28,339	\$74.75
Kerrville, City of Kerrville Economic Improvement Corp.	\$2,093,947	20,425	\$102.52
Bedford, Bedford Street Improvement EDC	\$2,005,439	47,152	\$42.53

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Lake Jackson, Lake Jackson DC	\$1,905,229	26,386	\$72.21
Haltom City, Haltom City EDC	\$1,875,829	39,018	\$48.08
Waxahachie, Waxahachie Community DC, Inc.	\$1,851,768	21,426	\$86.43
Tomball, Tomball EDC	\$1,833,593	9,089	\$201.74
Duncanville, Duncanville Community & EDC	\$1,626,164	36,081	\$45.07
Cleburne, Cleburne 4B EDC	\$1,604,850	26,005	\$61.71
Rosenberg, Rosenberg DC	\$1,587,941	24,043	\$66.05
Keller, Keller DC	\$1,434,788	27,345	\$52.47
Dickinson, Dickinson EDC	\$1,332,943	17,093	\$77.98
Watauga, Watauga Parks DC	\$1,160,286	21,908	\$52.96
Lake Worth, Lake Worth EDC	\$1,148,174	4,618	\$248.63
Ennis, Ennis EDC	\$1,138,183	16,045	\$70.94
Live Oak, City of Live Oak EDC	\$1,075,634	9,156	\$117.48
White Settlement, White Settlement EDC	\$1,057,571	14,831	\$71.31
La Porte, La Porte EDC	\$997,827	31,880	\$31.30
Bastrop, Bastrop EDC	\$874,922	5,340	\$163.84
Colleyville, Colleyville EDC	\$873,626	19,636	\$44.49
Brenham, Brenham Community DC	\$870,280	13,507	\$64.43
Shenandoah, Shenandoah Industrial DC	\$853,175	1,503	\$567.65
San Benito, San Benito EDC	\$842,327	23,444	\$35.93
Schertz, Schertz EDC	\$837,976	18,694	\$44.83
Bay City, Bay City Community DC	\$834,470	18,667	\$44.70
Angleton, Angleton Better Living Corp.	\$828,457	18,130	\$45.70
Jacksonville, Jacksonville DC	\$826,126	13,868	\$59.57
Kemah, Kemah Community DC	\$763,365	2,330	\$327.62
League City, City of League City 4B Industrial DC	\$758,888	45,444	\$16.70
Orange, Orange EDC	\$751,018	18,643	\$40.28
Nederland, Nederland EDC	\$740,907	17,422	\$42.53
Palestine, Palestine EDC	\$712,117	17,598	\$40.47
Gainesville, Gainesville EDC	\$688,206	15,538	\$44.29
Liberty, Liberty Community DC	\$681,934	8,033	\$84.89
Richmond, DC of Richmond	\$658,125	11,081	\$59.39
Beeville, Beeville Economic Improvement Corp.	\$652,878	13,129	\$49.73
Pflugerville, Pflugerville Community DC	\$647,299	16,335	\$39.63
Rio Grande City, Rio Grande City EDC	\$622,990	11,923	\$52.25
Benbrook, Benbrook EDC	\$609,426	20,208	\$30.16
Gun Barrel City, Gun Barrel City EDC	\$605,727	5,145	\$117.73
Canton, Canton EDC	\$591,196	3,292	\$179.59
Sachse, Sachse EDC	\$555,776	9,751	\$57.00
Forest Hill, Forest Hill Community DC	\$548,678	12,949	\$42.37
Universal City, Universal City Industrial DC	\$546,152	14,849	\$36.78
Wharton, Wharton EDC	\$511,065	9,237	\$55.33
Pantego, Pantego EDC	\$509,598	2,318	\$219.84
Freeport, Freeport EDC	\$508,361	12,708	\$40.00
Mexia, Mexia EDC	\$505,019	6,563	\$76.95
Sealy, Sealy EDC	\$499,337	5,248	\$95.15

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Alamo, Alamo Industrial DC	\$493,460	14,760	\$33.43
Dumas, Dumas EDC	\$484,144	13,747	\$35.22
Richland Hills, Richland Hills DC	\$479,450	8,132	\$58.96
Robstown, Robstown Improvement DC	\$460,351	12,727	\$36.17
Clute, City of Clute 4B EDC	\$457,437	10,424	\$43.88
Portland, Portland Community Center DC	\$449,079	14,827	\$30.29
Mineola, Mineola Development, Inc.	\$444,002	4,550	\$97.58
San Juan, San Juan EDC	\$438,331	26,229	\$16.71
Bonham, Bonham EDC	\$414,629	9,990	\$41.50
Lumberton, City of Lumberton Industrial DC	\$410,794	8,731	\$47.05
Corinth, Corinth EDC	\$409,879	11,325	\$36.19
Lockhart, Lockhart EDC	\$405,712	11,615	\$34.93
Seagoville, Seagoville EDC	\$405,480	10,823	\$37.46
Buda, City of Buda 4B EDC	\$384,360	2,404	\$159.88
La Grange, La Grange EDC	\$375,661	4,478	\$83.89
Giddings, Giddings EDC	\$358,017	5,105	\$70.13
Port Aransas, Port Aransas Recreational DC	\$357,021	3,370	\$105.94
Gonzales, Gonzales EDC	\$354,563	7,202	\$49.23
Groves, Groves EDC	\$352,400	15,733	\$22.40
Santa Fe, City of Santa Fe 4B EDC	\$348,044	9,548	\$36.45
Port Isabel, Port Isabel EDC	\$345,007	4,865	\$70.92
Port Neches, Port Neches EDC	\$342,773	13,601	\$25.20
Cleveland, Cleveland EDC	\$340,857	7,605	\$44.82
Kennedale, Kennedale EDC	\$340,668	5,850	\$58.23
Clear Lake Shores, Clear Lake Shores EDC	\$333,333	1,205	\$276.62
Hickory Creek, Hickory Creek EDC	\$321,335	2,078	\$154.64
Converse, City of Converse EDC	\$312,418	11,508	\$27.15
Oak Ridge North, Oak Ridge North EDC	\$299,455	2,991	\$100.12
Forney, Forney EDC	\$297,653	5,588	\$53.27
Columbus, Columbus Community & Industrial DC	\$296,599	3,916	\$75.74
Hill Country Village, Hill Country Village EDC	\$290,072	1,028	\$282.17
Elgin, Elgin EDC	\$282,174	5,700	\$49.50
Dayton, Dayton Community DC	\$277,577	5,709	\$48.62
Dalhart, Dalhart EDC	\$275,509	7,237	\$38.07
Cuero, Cuero DC	\$274,345	6,571	\$41.75
Pittsburg, Pittsburg EDC	\$265,645	4,347	\$61.11
Burkburnett, Burkburnett DC	\$260,367	10,927	\$23.83
Crowley, Crowley EDC	\$255,306	7,467	\$34.19
Windcrest, City of Windcrest EDC	\$246,477	5,105	\$48.28
Bee Cave, Bee Cave DC	\$244,381	656	\$372.53
Seminole, Seminole EDC	\$243,952	5,910	\$41.28
Mabank, Mabank EDC	\$237,112	2,151	\$110.23
Hutchins, Hutchins EDC	\$222,779	2,805	\$79.42
Roma, Roma EDC	\$216,458	9,617	\$22.51
Llano, Llano EDC	\$199,920	3,325	\$60.13
Montgomery, Montgomery Industrial DC	\$198,467	489	\$405.86

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Palmer, Palmer EDC	\$191,983	1,774	\$108.22
Emory, City of Emory DC	\$190,150	1,021	\$186.24
Winnsboro, Winnsboro EDC	\$184,931	3,584	\$51.60
Bellville, Bellville EDC	\$183,038	3,794	\$48.24
Sonora, Sonora Industrial DC	\$181,688	2,924	\$62.14
Ingleside, City of Ingleside DC	\$181,476	9,388	\$19.33
Trinity, Trinity EDC	\$180,552	2,721	\$66.36
Royse City, Royse City Community DC	\$179,306	2,957	\$60.64
Buffalo, Buffalo Community DC	\$177,300	1,804	\$98.28
Jacksboro, Jacksboro EDC	\$176,918	4,533	\$39.03
Nassau Bay, Nassau Bay EDC	\$176,453	4,170	\$42.31
Yoakum, Yoakum EDC	\$172,563	5,731	\$30.11
West Columbia, West Columbia EDC	\$170,235	4,255	\$40.01
White Oak, White Oak EDC	\$167,838	5,624	\$29.84
Luling, Luling EDC	\$166,958	5,080	\$32.87
Kenedy, Kenedy 4B Corp.	\$165,424	3,487	\$47.44
Lampasas, Lampasas EDC	\$161,646	6,786	\$23.82
Jeff erson, Jeff erson EDC	\$161,184	2,024	\$79.64
Brookshire, Brookshire EDC	\$158,645	3,450	\$45.98
Schulenburg, Schulenburg EDC	\$157,406	2,699	\$58.32
Helotes, City of Helotes EDC	\$155,665	4,285	\$36.33
Refugio, Refugio EDC	\$150,506	2,941	\$51.18
Clifton, Clifton EDC	\$144,598	3,542	\$40.82
Bandera, City of Bandera EDC	\$141,397	957	\$147.75
Everman, Everman EDC	\$140,664	5,836	\$24.10
McGregor, McGregor EDC	\$139,373	4,727	\$29.48
Post, Cap Rock DC	\$137,599	3,708	\$37.11
Alvarado, Alvarado EDC	\$135,827	3,288	\$41.31
Quitman, Quitman DC	\$135,293	2,030	\$66.65
Mount Vernon, Mount Vernon EDC	\$135,082	2,286	\$59.09
Pilot Point, Pilot Point EDC	\$134,400	3,538	\$37.99
Big Lake, Big Lake EDC	\$132,816	2,885	\$46.04
Princeton, Princeton Community DC	\$122,449	3,477	\$35.22
River Oaks, River Oaks EDC	\$120,849	6,985	\$17.30
Seven Points, Seven Points EDC	\$119,199	1,145	\$104.10
Morgan's Point, Morgan's Point DC	\$116,807	336	\$347.64
Hamilton, City of Hamilton EDC	\$113,234	2,977	\$38.04
Manvel, Manvel EDC, Inc.	\$110,440	3,046	\$36.26
Quinlan, Quinlan EDC	\$109,704	1,370	\$80.08
Groesbeck, Groesbeck EDC	\$103,865	4,291	\$24.21
Los Fresnos, Los Fresnos Community DC	\$101,901	4,512	\$22.58
Junction, Junction Texas EDC	\$101,609	2,618	\$38.81
Rollingwood, Rollingwood Community DC	\$100,650	1,403	\$71.74
Mathis, Mathis EDC	\$99,197	5,034	\$19.71
Teague, EDC of Teague, Inc.	\$94,476	4,557	\$20.73
Pottsville, Pottsville 4B Sales Tax Corp.	\$93,552	1,579	\$59.25

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Liberty Hill, Liberty Hill EDC	\$92,985	1,409	\$65.99
Goliad, Goliad Sales Tax DC	\$91,540	1,975	\$46.35
Spearman, Spearman EDC	\$91,033	3,021	\$30.13
Van Horn, Van Horn Texas EDC	\$90,495	2,435	\$37.16
Grand Saline, Grand Saline EDC	\$88,156	3,028	\$29.11
Weimar, Weimer EDC	\$88,089	1,981	\$44.47
Dublin, Dublin EDC	\$87,624	3,754	\$23.34
Chico, Chico EDC	\$86,199	947	\$91.02
Coffee City, Coffee City DC	\$85,121	193	\$441.04
Hollywood Park, Town of Hollywood Park EDC	\$84,935	2,983	\$28.47
Clyde, Clyde EDC	\$84,519	3,345	\$25.27
Electra, Business DC of Electra, Inc.	\$84,108	3,168	\$26.55
Argyle, Argyle EDC	\$83,126	2,365	\$35.15
Henrietta, Henrietta Growth Corp.	\$83,026	3,264	\$25.44
Aubrey, Aubrey EDC	\$82,948	1,500	\$55.30
Navasota, Navasota EDC	\$82,181	6,789	\$12.11
Krum, Krum EDC	\$81,913	1,979	\$41.39
Sundown, Sundown EDC	\$80,000	1,505	\$53.16
Dalworthington Gardens, Parks and Recreation Facility DC	\$79,425	2,186	\$36.33
Muenster, Muenster Industrial DC	\$78,379	1,556	\$50.37
San Saba, San Saba EDC	\$77,561	2,637	\$29.41
Cotulla, Cotulla EDC	\$77,343	3,614	\$21.40
Big Sandy, Big Sandy Community DC	\$73,855	1,288	\$57.34
Van, Van EDC	\$72,264	2,362	\$30.59
Sweeny, Sweeny EDC	\$71,642	3,624	\$19.77
Presidio, DCOP-DC of Presidio	\$69,757	4,167	\$16.74
Wake Village, Wake Village EDC	\$69,220	5,129	\$13.50
Iraan, Iraan 4B EDC	\$67,195	1,238	\$54.28
Hawkins, Hawkins Community DC	\$66,377	1,331	\$49.87
Crandall, Crandall EDC	\$65,262	2,774	\$23.53
Floydada, Floydada EDC	\$64,920	3,676	\$17.66
Hughes Springs, Hughes Springs EDC	\$63,996	1,856	\$34.48
Merkel, Merkel EDC	\$63,560	2,637	\$24.10
Friona, Friona EDC	\$62,068	3,854	\$16.10
Clarendon, Clarendon EDC	\$61,995	1,974	\$31.41
Shepherd, Shepherd EDC	\$61,644	2,029	\$30.38
Northlake, Northlake EDC	\$60,653	1,891	\$32.07
Needville, DC of Needville	\$60,249	2,609	\$23.09
McCamey, City of McCamey 4B EDC	\$59,553	1,805	\$32.99
Wolff orth, Wolff orth EDC	\$59,488	2,554	\$23.29
Centerville, Centerville EDC	\$59,434	903	\$65.82
La Joya, La Joya EDC	\$58,305	3,303	\$17.65
Taft, Taft 4B EDC	\$57,791	3,396	\$17.02
Chandler, Chandler One-Half Cent Sales Tax Corp., Inc.	\$56,599	2,099	\$26.96

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Lorena, Lorena EDC	\$54,312	1,433	\$37.90
Troup, Troup Community DC	\$53,732	1,949	\$27.57
Goldthwaite, Goldthwaite EDC	\$53,273	1,802	\$29.56
Karnes City, Karnes City EDC	\$52,934	3,457	\$15.31
Queen City, Queen City EDC	\$52,071	1,613	\$32.28
Marfa, Marfa EDC	\$52,064	2,121	\$24.55
Huntington, City of Huntington	\$49,586	2,068	\$23.98
Hico, Hico EDC	\$48,633	1,341	\$36.27
Bishop, Bishop EDC	\$47,380	3,305	\$14.34
Stratford, Stratford Sales Tax Corp.	\$46,453	1,991	\$23.33
Oyster Creek, Oyster Creek EDC	\$44,767	1,192	\$37.56
Lexington, Lexington EDC	\$44,401	1,178	\$37.69
Sansom Park, Sansom Park EDC	\$42,775	4,181	\$10.23
Odem, City of Odem 4B EDC	\$41,760	2,499	\$16.71
Venus, Venus Community Service DC	\$41,578	910	\$45.69
Frankston, Frankston EDC	\$40,556	1,209	\$33.55
Eden, Eden EDC	\$39,238	2,561	\$15.32
Italy, Italy EDC, Inc.	\$37,616	1,993	\$18.87
Hubbard, Hubbard DC	\$37,314	1,586	\$23.53
Arcola, Arcola 4B Corp.	\$35,847	1,048	\$34.21
Meridian, Meridian EDC	\$34,831	1,491	\$23.36
Rio Vista, Rio Vista EDC	\$33,649	656	\$51.29
Olton, Olton EDC	\$31,812	2,288	\$13.90
Fate, Fate EDC	\$31,754	497	\$63.89
Howe, Howe Community Facilities DC	\$31,622	2,478	\$12.76
Stinnett, Stinnett Community DC	\$30,963	1,936	\$15.99
Cross Plains, Cross Plains EDC, Inc	\$30,867	1,068	\$28.90
Wallis, City of Wallis DC	\$29,972	1,172	\$25.57
Itasca, Itasca EDC	\$29,102	1,503	\$19.36
Laguna Vista, Laguna Vista Community DC	\$28,352	1,658	\$17.10
Morton, Frontier Projects EDC	\$28,202	2,249	\$12.54
Sterling City, Sterling City EDC	\$28,077	1,081	\$25.97
Bertram, Bertram EDC	\$27,793	1,122	\$24.77
Wheeler, Wheeler EDC Inc.	\$26,874	1,378	\$19.50
Lockney, Lockney EDC	\$26,781	2,056	\$13.03
Gruver, Community DC of Gruver	\$26,190	1,162	\$22.54
Rankin, City of Rankin 4B EDC	\$26,165	800	\$32.71
Bartonville, Bartonville Community DC	\$25,848	1,093	\$23.65
Domino, Domino Economic Development Committee	\$25,788	52	\$495.92
Avinger, Avinger EDC	\$25,608	464	\$55.19
East Tawakoni, East Tawakoni EDC	\$25,114	775	\$32.41
Poth, Poth Economic Development	\$25,031	1,850	\$13.53
Rosebud, Rosebud EDC	\$24,953	1,493	\$16.71
Leonard, Leonard EDC	\$24,699	1,846	\$13.38
Caddo Mills, Caddo Mills EDC	\$24,605	1,149	\$21.41

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Encinal, City of Encinal	\$24,396	629	\$38.79
Throckmorton, Throckmorton EDC	\$24,351	905	\$26.91
Paradise, Paradise EDC	\$23,600	459	\$51.42
Paducah, Paducah EDC	\$23,500	1,498	\$15.69
Stockdale, City of Stockdale 4B EDC	\$23,085	1,398	\$16.51
Ropesville, Ropesville EDC	\$22,215	517	\$42.97
Rocksprings, Edwards County EDC	\$22,207	1,285	\$17.28
Santa Anna, Santa Anna EDC	\$22,005	1,081	\$20.36
Round Top, Round Top EDC	\$21,888	77	\$284.26
Ponder, Ponder DC	\$21,594	507	\$42.59
Trenton, Trenton Community DC	\$21,262	662	\$32.12
Gorman, Gorman EDC	\$21,136	1,236	\$17.10
Strawn, DC of Strawn, Inc.	\$21,067	739	\$28.51
Alvord, City of Alvord	\$19,727	1,007	\$19.59
Fritch, Fritch at Lake Meridith EDC	\$19,646	2,235	\$8.79
Corral City, Corral City DC	\$19,117	89	\$214.80
Oak Ridge (Cooke), Oak Ridge EDC	\$18,732	224	\$83.63
Runaway Bay, Runaway Bay EDC	\$18,722	1,104	\$16.96
Gunter, Gunter DC	\$18,478	1,230	\$15.02
Trinidad, Trinidad EDC	\$17,831	1,091	\$16.34
Bovina, Bovina EDC	\$16,639	1,874	\$8.88
Crawford, Crawford EDC	\$16,267	705	\$23.07
Windthorst, Windthorst EDC	\$16,256	440	\$36.95
Hawley, Hawley EDC-4B	\$16,183	646	\$25.05
Lott, Lott EDC	\$15,886	724	\$21.94
McLean, McLean EDC Inc.	\$14,912	830	\$17.97
Mount Enterprise, Mount Enterprise EDC	\$14,865	525	\$28.31
Point, Point Economic and Park DC	\$14,219	792	\$17.95
Driscoll, Driscoll Improvement DC	\$13,992	825	\$16.96
Groom, Groom EDC	\$13,256	587	\$22.58
Yorktown, Yorktown DC	\$12,681	2,271	\$5.58
Snook, Snook 4B DC	\$12,381	568	\$21.80
Rising Star, Rising Star EDC	\$12,292	835	\$14.72
Sudan, Sudan EDC, Inc.	\$11,600	1,039	\$11.16
Quitaque, Quitaque EDC	\$10,740	432	\$24.86
Thorndale, Thorndale EDC	\$10,537	1,278	\$8.24
Malone, Malone EDC	\$9,087	278	\$32.69
Oak Leaf, City of Oak Leaf	\$8,721	1,209	\$7.21
Redwater, Redwater Industrial DC	\$8,396	872	\$9.63
Penitas, Penitas EDC	\$8,075	1,167	\$6.92
Whiteface, Whiteface DC	\$7,455	465	\$16.03
Turkey, Turkey EDC	\$7,143	494	\$14.46
Sunset, Sunset EDC	\$7,000	339	\$20.65
Cuney, Cuney EDC	\$6,269	145	\$43.23
New Deal, New Deal EDC	\$6,135	708	\$8.67
Gordon, DC of Gordon	\$5,870	451	\$13.02

Table A4: 4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	fund	population	per capita tax
Balморhea, Balморhea DC	\$5,768	527	\$10.94
Yantis, Yantis EDC	\$5,015	321	\$15.62
Gustine, EDC of Gustine	\$4,933	457	\$10.79
Lavon, Lavon EDC	\$4,322	387	\$11.17
Douglasville, Douglasville DC	\$1,974	175	\$11.28
Fort Worth, FW Sports Authority	\$0	534,694	\$0.00
Arlington, Arlington Sports Facilities Dev. Authority, Inc.	\$0	332,969	\$0.00
College Station, College Station Business DC	\$0	67,890	\$0.00
exclusively-4B taxes collected, per capita			\$47.43

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5,
 November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)

Table A5: 4A-4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	4A-4B fund	population	per capita tax
Frisco, Frisco EDC	\$12,992,580	33,714	\$385.38
McKinney, McKinney Community DC	\$9,086,396	54,369	\$167.12
Sugar Land, Sugar Land 4B Corp.	\$7,331,174	63,328	\$115.77
Midland, Midland DC	\$7,198,174	94,996	\$75.77
Allen, Allen EDC	\$7,064,601	43,554	\$162.20
Brownsville, Brownsville Community Improvement Corp.	\$6,355,978	139,722	\$45.49
Wichita Falls, Wichita Falls 4B Sales Tax Corp.	\$5,965,537	104,197	\$57.25
Mansfield, Mansfield Park Facilities DC	\$4,461,291	28,031	\$159.16
Cedar Hill, Cedar Hill Community DC	\$4,329,778	32,093	\$134.91
Cedar Park, City of Cedar Park Community DC	\$3,701,560	26,049	\$142.10
Burleson, Burleson Community Services DC	\$3,517,974	20,976	\$167.71
The Colony, The Colony Community DC	\$2,126,540	26,531	\$80.15
Lancaster, Lancaster EDC	\$1,681,147	25,894	\$64.92
Roanoke, Roanoke Community and EDC	\$1,553,340	2,810	\$552.79
DeSoto, DeSoto Park DC	\$1,485,274	37,646	\$39.45
Wylie, Wylie Parks & Recreation Facilities DC	\$1,406,017	15,132	\$92.92
Midlothian, Corp. for ED of Midlothian	\$1,287,884	7,480	\$172.18
Seabrook, Seabrook EDC I	\$1,068,566	9,443	\$113.16
Westlake, Westlake 4B DC	\$868,043	207	\$4,193.44
Balch Springs, Balch Springs Community & EDC	\$740,972	19,375	\$38.24
Atlanta, Atlanta City DC	\$728,616	5,745	\$126.83
Sunnyvale, Sunnyvale 4A DC	\$672,608	2,693	\$249.76
Center, Center EDC	\$665,255	5,678	\$117.16
Red Oak, Red Oak EDC	\$645,641	4,301	\$150.11
Bowie, Bowie 4B Sales Tax Corp.	\$606,230	5,219	\$116.16
Carthage, Carthage EDC	\$559,500	6,664	\$83.96
Donna, DC of Donna, INC	\$542,184	14,768	\$36.71
Melissa, Melissa Industrial DC	\$475,580	1,350	\$352.28
Willis, Willis Community DC	\$438,654	3,985	\$110.08
Lake Dallas, Lake Dallas Community Development	\$435,370	6,166	\$70.61
Sanger, Sanger Texas Industrial DC	\$400,456	4,534	\$88.32
Hallettsville, Hallettsville 4A Manufacturing DC	\$387,180	2,345	\$165.11
Trophy Club, Trophy Club EDC	\$386,707	6,350	\$60.90
Magnolia, Magnolia Community DC	\$383,378	1,111	\$345.07
Murphy, Murphy Community DC	\$374,286	3,099	\$120.78
Sinton, Sinton 4A DC	\$357,024	5,676	\$62.90
Joshua, City of Joshua 4B EDC	\$355,090	4,528	\$78.42
La Feria, La Feria EDC	\$347,064	6,115	\$56.76
Fort Stockton, Fort Stockton EDC	\$336,914	7,846	\$42.94

Table A5: 4A-4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	4A-4B fund	population	per capita tax
Hearne, Hearne 4A EDC	\$274,974	4,690	\$58.63
Haslet, Haslet 4A EDC	\$268,354	1,134	\$236.64
Iowa Park, Iowa Park Community DC	\$258,994	6,431	\$40.27
Justin, Justin Community Development 4B Corp.	\$223,201	1,891	\$118.03
Nocona, Nocona Economic Development	\$216,234	3,198	\$67.62
Heath, Heath EDC	\$206,970	4,149	\$49.88
Cisco, Cisco DC	\$200,114	3,851	\$51.96
Farmersville, Farmersville Community DC	\$197,036	3,118	\$63.19
Whitesboro, Whitesboro Industrial DC	\$192,316	3,760	\$51.15
Godley, City of Godley 4A EDC	\$190,502	879	\$216.73
Tye, Tye EDC	\$165,544	1,158	\$142.96
Alton, City of Alton Community DC	\$147,652	4,384	\$33.68
Keene, Keene Community DC	\$134,478	5,003	\$26.88
Crystal City, Crystal City 4A EDC	\$132,038	7,190	\$18.36
Albany, Albany DC	\$127,381	1,921	\$66.31
Newton, Newton Community DC-4B	\$121,372	2,459	\$49.36
Celina, Celina DC	\$121,200	1,861	\$65.13
Prairie View, Prairie View 4B EDC	\$118,685	4,410	\$26.91
Franklin, Franklin Community DC-4A	\$117,878	1,470	\$80.19
Van Alstyne, Van Alstyne Community DC 4B	\$113,483	2,502	\$45.36
Linden, Linden 4B EDC	\$113,030	2,256	\$50.10
Anna, Anna EDC	\$110,451	1,225	\$90.16
Knox City, Knox City Community DC	\$99,644	1,219	\$81.74
Whitewright, Whitewright Community DC	\$94,334	1,740	\$54.21
Grandview, Grandview 4A EDC	\$93,560	1,358	\$68.90
Anson, Anson DC, Inc.	\$89,088	2,556	\$34.85
Elsa, Elsa EDC 4B	\$85,916	5,549	\$15.48
Somerset, Somerset 4A EDC	\$81,648	1,550	\$52.68
Bells, Bells 4A EDC	\$64,880	1,190	\$54.52
Groveton, Groveton EDC	\$59,340	1,107	\$53.60
Bremond, Bremond EDC-4A	\$58,082	876	\$66.30
Aspermont, Aspermont EDC	\$56,742	1,021	\$55.57
Rio Hondo, City of Rio Hondo	\$54,464	1,942	\$28.05
Joaquin, Joaquin EDC	\$47,060	925	\$50.88
Edcouch, City of Edcouch	\$46,576	3,342	\$13.94
Bronte, Bronte EDC	\$45,702	1,076	\$42.47
Wortham, Wortham EDC-A	\$43,722	1,082	\$40.41
Tioga, Tioga EDC	\$41,556	754	\$55.11
Robert Lee, Robert Lee EDC 4A	\$38,082	1,171	\$32.52
Collinsville, Collinsville EDC	\$35,782	1,235	\$28.97
Roscoe, Roscoe Industrial DC	\$30,619	1,378	\$22.22
Saint Jo, Saint Jo EDC	\$30,274	977	\$30.99
Blue Ridge, City of Blue Ridge Economic Development Board	\$27,548	672	\$40.99

Table A5: 4A-4B development corporations, sorted by size of economic development fund

Name	4A-4B fund	population	per capita tax
Matador, Matador EDC	\$21,928	740	\$29.63
Roaring Springs, Roaring Springs EDC	\$20,510	265	\$77.40
Beasley, Beasley EDC	\$19,615	590	\$33.25
Miami, Miami Community EDC	\$18,528	588	\$31.51
Orchard, Orchard EDC	\$9,555	408	\$23.42
Grandfalls, Grandfalls Community and EDC - 4A	\$9,334	391	\$23.87
4A-4B taxes collected, per capita			\$99.56

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)

Table A6: 4A-4B development corporations

Name	fund	population	type
Albany, Albany DC	\$62,337	1,921	4B
Albany, DC of Albany	\$65,044	1,921	4A
Allen, Allen Community DC	\$3,532,301	43,554	4B
Allen, Allen EDC	\$3,532,300	43,554	4A
Alton, City of Alton Community DC	\$73,826	4,384	4B
Alton, City of Alton DC	\$73,826	4,384	4A
Anna, Anna Community DC	\$62,619	1,225	4B
Anna, Anna EDC	\$47,832	1,225	4A
Anson, Anson DC, Inc.	\$44,544	2,556	4B
Anson, Industrial DC of Anson, Inc.	\$44,544	2,556	4A
Aspermont, Aspermont EDC	\$27,875	1,021	4B
Aspermont, Aspermont Industrial DC	\$28,867	1,021	4A
Atlanta, Atlanta City DC	\$364,308	5,745	4B
Atlanta, Atlanta EDC	\$364,308	5,745	4A
Balch Springs, Balch Springs Community & EDC	\$370,486	19,375	4B
Balch Springs, Balch Springs Industrial and EDC	\$370,486	19,375	4A
Beasley, Beasley EDC	\$8,478	590	4A
Beasley, Community DC City of Beasley	\$11,137	590	4B
Bells, Bells 4A EDC	\$32,440	1,190	4A
Bells, Bells 4B EDC	\$32,440	1,190	4B
Blue Ridge, City of Blue Ridge Economic Development Board	\$13,774	672	4B
Blue Ridge, City of Blue Ridge Industrial Development Board	\$13,774	672	4A
Bowie, Bowie 4B Sales Tax Corp.	\$303,115	5,219	4B
Bowie, Bowie EDC	\$303,115	5,219	4A
Bremond, Bremond EDC-4A	\$29,041	876	4A
Bremond, Bremond Infrastructure/ Improvement Corp.-4B	\$29,041	876	4B
Bronte, Bronte EDC	\$22,851	1,076	4A
Bronte, Bronte EDC	\$22,851	1,076	4B
Brownsville, Brownsville Community Improvement Corp.	\$3,177,989	139,722	4B
Brownsville, Greater Brownsville Incentives Corp.	\$3,177,989	139,722	4A
Burleson, Burleson 4A EDC	\$1,770,987	20,976	4A
Burleson, Burleson Community Services DC	\$1,746,987	20,976	4B
Calvert, Calvert EDC	DNE	1,426	4A
Calvert, Calvert EDC	\$22,500	1,426	4B
Carthage, Carthage EDC	\$279,750	6,664	4A
Carthage, Carthage Improvements Corp.	\$279,750	6,664	4B
Cedar Hill, Cedar Hill Community DC	\$2,164,889	32,093	4B
Cedar Hill, Cedar Hill EDC	\$2,164,889	32,093	4A
Cedar Park, City of Cedar Park Community DC	\$1,850,780	26,049	4B
Cedar Park, City of Cedar Park EDC	\$1,850,780	26,049	4A
Celina, Celina DC	\$40,221	1,861	4B
Celina, Celina EDC	\$80,979	1,861	4A

Table A6: 4A-4B development corporations

Name	fund	population	type
Center, Center EDC	\$221,752	5,678	4A
Center, City of Center EDC	\$443,503	5,678	4B
Cisco, Cisco DC	\$100,057	3,851	4B
Cisco, Cisco EDC	\$100,057	3,851	4A
Collinsville, Collinsville EDC	\$17,891	1,235	4B
Collinsville, Collinsville Industrial DC	\$17,891	1,235	4A
Crystal City, Crystal City 4A EDC	\$44,013	7,190	4A
Crystal City, Crystal City EDC	\$88,025	7,190	4B
DeSoto, DeSoto EDC	\$1,114,281	37,646	4A
DeSoto, DeSoto Park DC	\$370,993	37,646	4B
Donna, DC of Donna, INC	\$271,092	14,768	4B
Donna, Donna EDC-4A	\$271,092	14,768	4A
Edcouch, City of Edcouch	\$23,288	3,342	4A
Edcouch, Edcouch 4B EDC	\$23,288	3,342	4B
Elsa, Elsa EDC 4B	\$42,944	5,549	4B
Elsa, Elsa Industrial DC	\$42,972	5,549	4A
Fairview, Fairview EDC	DNE	2,644	4A
Fairview, Town of Fairview Community DC	DNE	2,644	4B
Farmersville, Farmersville Community DC	\$98,517	3,118	4B
Farmersville, Farmersville EDC	\$98,519	3,118	4A
Floresville, Floresville EDC	DNE	5,868	4A
Floresville, Floresville EDC	\$234,106	5,868	4B
Fort Stockton, Fort Stockton EDC	\$168,457	7,846	4A
Fort Stockton, Fort Stockton EDC	\$168,457	7,846	4B
Franklin, Franklin Community DC-4A	\$58,939	1,470	4A
Franklin, Franklin Community DC-4B	\$58,939	1,470	4B
Frisco, Frisco Community DC	\$6,568,987	33,714	4B
Frisco, Frisco EDC	\$6,423,593	33,714	4A
Godley, City of Godley 4A EDC	\$95,251	879	4A
Godley, City of Godley 4B EDC	\$95,251	879	4B
Grandfalls, Grandfalls Community and EDC - 4A	\$4,667	391	4A
Grandfalls, Grandfalls EDC - 4B	\$4,667	391	4B
Grandview, Grandview 4A EDC	\$46,454	1,358	4A
Grandview, Grandview 4B EDC	\$47,106	1,358	4B
Groveton, Groveton EDC	\$29,670	1,107	4A
Groveton, Groveton EDC	\$29,670	1,107	4B
Hallettsville, Hallettsville 4A Manufacturing DC	\$193,590	2,345	4A
Hallettsville, Hallettsville 4B Business DC	\$193,590	2,345	4B
Haslet, Haslet 4A EDC	\$134,177	1,134	4A
Haslet, Haslet Community & Economic Development	\$134,177	1,134	4B
Hearne, Hearne 4A EDC	\$137,487	4,690	4A
Hearne, Hearne Infrastructure/Improvement Corp.-4B	\$137,487	4,690	4B
Heath, Heath EDC	\$95,090	4,149	4A
Heath, Heath Municipal Benefits Corp.	\$111,880	4,149	4B

Table A6: 4A-4B development corporations

Name	fund	population	type
Iowa Park, Iowa Park Community DC	\$129,497	6,431	4B
Iowa Park, Iowa Park EDC	\$129,497	6,431	4A
Joaquin, Joaquin EDC	\$23,530	925	4B
Joaquin, Joaquin Public Safety DC	\$23,530	925	4A
Joshua, City of Joshua 4B EDC	\$177,545	4,528	4B
Joshua, City of Joshua EDC	\$177,545	4,528	4A
Justin, Justin Community Development 4B Corp.	\$76,709	1,891	4B
Justin, Justin EDC 4A	\$146,492	1,891	4A
Keene, Keene Community DC	\$66,090	5,003	4B
Keene, Keene EDC	\$68,388	5,003	4A
Kemp, Kemp EDC	DNE	1,133	4B
Kemp, Kemp EDC	\$10,747	1,133	4A
Knox City, Knox City Community DC	\$49,822	1,219	4B
Knox City, Knox City EDC	\$49,822	1,219	4A
La Feria, La Feria EDC	\$173,532	6,115	4B
La Feria, La Feria Industrial DC Inc.	\$173,532	6,115	4A
Lake Dallas, Lake Dallas Community Development	\$217,685	6,166	4A
Lake Dallas, Lake Dallas Community Development	\$217,685	6,166	4B
Lancaster, Lancaster EDC	\$560,382	25,894	4A
Lancaster, Lancaster Recreational DC	\$1,120,765	25,894	4B
Linden, Linden 4B EDC	\$56,515	2,256	4B
Linden, Linden EDC	\$56,515	2,256	4A
Magnolia, City of Magnolia EDC	\$255,585	1,111	4A
Magnolia, Magnolia Community DC	\$127,793	1,111	4B
Mansfield, Mansfield EDC	\$2,505,830	28,031	4A
Mansfield, Mansfield Park Facilities DC	\$1,955,461	28,031	4B
Matador, Matador Community DC	\$10,966	740	4B
Matador, Matador EDC	\$10,962	740	4A
McKinney, McKinney Community DC	\$4,543,198	54,369	4B
McKinney, McKinney EDC	\$4,543,198	54,369	4A
Melissa, Melissa Community and EDC	\$275,580	1,350	4B
Melissa, Melissa Industrial DC	\$200,000	1,350	4A
Miami, Miami Community EDC	\$9,264	588	4B
Miami, Miami EDC	\$9,264	588	4A
Midland, Midland DC	\$3,599,087	94,996	4A
Midland, Midland Football & Soccer, Baseball Complex Dev.	\$3,599,087	94,996	4B
Midlothian, Corp. for ED of Midlothian	\$643,942	7,480	4A
Midlothian, Midlothian Community DC	\$643,942	7,480	4B
Murphy, Murphy Community DC	\$187,143	3,099	4B
Murphy, Murphy EDC	\$187,143	3,099	4A
Newton, Newton Community DC-4B	\$60,686	2,459	4B
Newton, Newton EDC-4A	\$60,686	2,459	4A
Nocona, Nocona Economic Development	\$108,117	3,198	4A
Nocona, Nocona EDC	\$108,117	3,198	4B
Orchard, City of Orchard Industrial DC	\$9,555	408	4A

Table A6: 4A-4B development corporations

Name	fund	population	type
Orchard, Orchard EDC	\$0	408	4B
Prairie View, Prairie View 4A EDC	\$59,737	4,410	4A
Prairie View, Prairie View 4B EDC	\$58,948	4,410	4B
Red Oak, Red Oak EDC	\$322,820	4,301	4B
Red Oak, Red Oak Industrial DC	\$322,821	4,301	4A
Rio Hondo, City of Rio Hondo	\$27,230	1,942	4B
Rio Hondo, Rio Hondo Industrial DC, Inc.	\$27,234	1,942	4A
Roanoke, Roanoke Community and EDC	\$776,670	2,810	4A
Roanoke, Roanoke Community and EDC	\$776,670	2,810	4B
Roaring Springs, Roaring Springs EDC	\$10,255	265	4A
Roaring Springs, Roaring Springs EDC	\$10,255	265	4B
Robert Lee, Robert Lee EDC 4A	\$19,041	1,171	4A
Robert Lee, Robert Lee EDC 4B	\$19,041	1,171	4B
Roscoe, Roscoe Community DC	\$20,413	1,378	4B
Roscoe, Roscoe Industrial DC	\$10,206	1,378	4A
Saint Jo, Saint Jo EDC	\$14,998	977	4A
Saint Jo, Saint Jo Municipal EDC 4B	\$15,276	977	4B
Sanger, Sanger Texas DC	\$200,562	4,534	4B
Sanger, Sanger Texas Industrial DC	\$199,894	4,534	4A
Seabrook, Seabrook EDC I	\$534,283	9,443	4A
Seabrook, Seabrook EDC II	\$534,283	9,443	4B
Sinton, Sinton 4A DC	\$178,512	5,676	4A
Sinton, Sinton DC	\$178,512	5,676	4B
Somerset, Somerset 4A EDC	\$40,824	1,550	4A
Somerset, Somerset 4B EDC	\$40,824	1,550	4B
Sugar Land, Sugar Land 4B Corp.	\$3,665,587	63,328	4B
Sugar Land, Sugar Land DC	\$3,665,587	63,328	4A
Sunnyvale, Sunnyvale 4A DC	\$336,304	2,693	4A
Sunnyvale, Sunnyvale 4B DC	\$336,304	2,693	4B
The Colony, The Colony Community DC	\$1,063,270	26,531	4B
The Colony, The Colony EDC	\$1,063,270	26,531	4A
Tioga, Tioga EDC	\$19,899	754	4B
Tioga, Tioga Industrial DC	\$21,657	754	4A
Trophy Club, Trophy Club EDC	\$193,354	6,350	4A
Trophy Club, Trophy Club EDC	\$193,353	6,350	4B
Tye, Tye EDC	\$82,772	1,158	4B
Tye, Tye Industrial DC	\$82,772	1,158	4A
Van Alstyne, Van Alstyne Community DC 4B	\$56,741	2,502	4B
Van Alstyne, Van Alstyne EDC	\$56,742	2,502	4A
Westlake, Westlake 4A Corp.	\$434,023	207	4A
Westlake, Westlake 4B DC	\$434,020	207	4B
Whitesboro, Whitesboro EDC	\$128,211	3,760	4B
Whitesboro, Whitesboro Industrial DC	\$64,105	3,760	4A
Whitewright, Whitewright Community DC	\$47,167	1,740	4B
Whitewright, Whitewright EDC	\$47,167	1,740	4A
Wichita Falls, Wichita Falls 4B Sales Tax Corp.	\$2,956,939	104,197	4B

Table A6: 4A-4B development corporations

Name	fund	population	type
Wichita Falls, Wichita Falls EDC	\$3,008,598	104,197	4A
Willis, Willis Community DC	\$219,327	3,985	4B
Willis, Willis EDC	\$219,327	3,985	4A
Wortham, Wortham EDC-A	\$21,861	1,082	4A
Wortham, Wortham EDC-B	\$21,861	1,082	4B
Wylie, Wylie EDC	\$707,127	15,132	4A
Wylie, Wylie Parks & Recreation Facilities DC	\$698,890	15,132	4B

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Economic Development Corporation Report, FY 2004-5, November 2006 (<http://www.window.state.tx.us/lga/edcr0005/>)