ChatGPT

Global Survey of Urban Wealth Funds and Community Trusts

Introduction

Local and regional governments around the world have established **urban wealth funds**, **community trusts**, and similar liquid endowments to benefit their populations. These are pools of capital (often derived from natural resource royalties, public land sales, or one-time windfalls) that are **invested for long-term public benefit**. In many cases, the funds' earnings are used to pay **direct dividends to residents** or to **finance universal public services** – thereby reducing the financial burden on citizens. Some communities have also benefited from **philanthropic trusts** that function like endowments, providing broad-based benefits (such as education, housing, or healthcare subsidies) to nearly all residents in a geographic area. Below, we survey notable examples from the United States, United Kingdom, European Union, Australia, and Asia, describing each fund's structure, funding sources, governance, benefit mechanisms, and outcomes.

United States

The United States hosts several prominent sub-national wealth funds. Many were seeded with **natural resource revenues** (oil, gas, minerals) or public land assets and are managed as **permanent trusts** whose investment income supports public programs or direct payments. Key examples include state-level funds (like Alaska's oil fund and Texas's education endowments), as well as municipal trusts and private community foundations benefiting local residents.

Alaska Permanent Fund (State of Alaska)

Established in 1976 via a constitutional amendment, the **Alaska Permanent Fund (APF)** is a state-owned **sovereign wealth fund** that captures a share of Alaska's oil revenues [1] [2]. At least 25% of all mineral lease royalties are deposited into the fund's principal, which is invested globally by the semi-independent Alaska Permanent Fund Corporation [3] [4]. The principal is protected in perpetuity, while the **investment earnings** are used to benefit citizens. The primary benefit mechanism is the **Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD)** – an equal cash payment to every eligible Alaskan resident each year. As of 2019 the fund's value was about $64 billion, and it has paid out an average of ~$1,600 per person annually (inflation-adjusted) [5]. These dividends represent a unique form of basic income, frequently cited as a real-world example of universal income from shared wealth [5].

Governance of the APF is insulated from day-to-day politics: a board of trustees oversees investments, and the state legislature can appropriate only the fund's earnings (not the principal) for dividends or other uses. Notably, in recent years a portion of earnings (via a structured draw) has also been used to support Alaska's state budget [5]. **Outcomes:** The APF has succeeded in converting finite oil wealth into a renewable financial asset for future generations. The annual PFD boosts household incomes and has measurably reduced poverty and inequality in Alaska, especially in rural areas. The fund's existence also spurred global interest in resource-based citizen dividend schemes.

Texas Permanent School Fund and University Fund (State of Texas)

Texas, rich in lands and oil, has two notable public endowments benefiting education. The **Permanent School Fund (PSF)**, created in 1854, is a perpetual fund for public K-12 education. It was seeded with public lands and later fueled by **oil and gas royalties** from those lands [6] [7]. Managed by the State Board of Education and the General Land Office, the PSF has grown to roughly **$47 billion** in assets [6]. Only investment income is distributed – the fund provides roughly **$1–2 billion per year** to public schools, helping pay for textbooks and classroom materials and equalizing school district resources [6]. It also guarantees local school bonds, lowering borrowing costs for districts [6]. This structure eases the burden on local taxpayers and provides a stable funding source for education across Texas.

Similarly, the **Permanent University Fund (PUF)** (established 1876) is a trust funded by millions of acres of West Texas land. Revenues from oil, gas, and land leases are invested, and earnings support the University of Texas and Texas A&M university systems [8] [9]. The PUF, valued around $30–$40 billion, has financed the growth of UT Austin and other public higher education institutions, giving Texas a competitive advantage in research and education infrastructure [10]. **Governance:** The PSF and PUF are constitutionally or statutorily protected, with oversight by public boards (education officials and university regents). **Outcomes:** These funds have helped **educate generations of Texans** with resources derived from common natural wealth, effectively converting oil in the ground into human capital development.

Other State Permanent Funds in the U.S.

Many other U.S. states, especially in the West, have similar **sovereign trust funds** that provide broad public benefits:

- **Wyoming Permanent Mineral Trust Fund (PMTF)** – Established in 1975 to save a portion of severance taxes on coal, oil, and gas, it has grown to about **$9–10 billion** in assets [11] [12]. The fund is managed by the state treasurer and functions as an endowment for Wyoming. **Only earnings (interest, dividends, capital gains)** can be spent – roughly 5% of the fund's value annually – which go into Wyoming's general budget [13] [14]. Today the PMTF covers a significant share of state expenditures, helping to **fund public services and stabilize the budget** against boom-bust resource cycles [15] [16]. This ensures that future generations benefit from today's mineral wealth.

- **New Mexico Land Grant Permanent Fund** – Originating from lands granted at statehood and fueled by oil, gas, and mineral leases, this fund now exceeds **$28 billion** in assets [17]. It is one of the largest educational endowments in the U.S., distributing ~5% of its value each year to fund New Mexico public schools, universities, and more [17]. This revenue (nearly $1 billion annually in recent years) substantially supplements the state's education budget, reducing the need for taxes. In 2022, voters approved tapping a portion of additional earnings for early childhood education, expanding the fund's social impact.

- **North Dakota Legacy Fund** – A newer fund (approved 2010) that receives 30% of the state's oil and gas tax revenue. It accumulated a **balance of about $8–10 billion by the mid-2020s** [18]. Initially, principal and earnings were restricted from use for five years. Now the legislature can use the interest income for strategic investments (infrastructure, tax relief, etc.), while the principal remains intact as a lasting legacy of the Bakken oil boom [18]. The Legacy Fund aims to diversify the state's wealth beyond oil and provide long-term fiscal stability.

Note: Other states like **Alabama, Montana, Utah, Colorado, and Alaska's own local governments** have also created permanent trusts (using resource revenues or one-time settlements). For example, Alabama's **Trust Fund** invests offshore gas royalties to generate income for state needs, and Colorado's **Permanent Trust** (from mineral leases) funds school construction. While structures vary, the common theme is **saving non-renewable wealth in a renewable financial form** to benefit citizens over the long term.

Municipal and Community Trusts in the U.S.

At the local level, a few cities and counties have likewise created investment funds or trusts to benefit their residents:

- **Fairbanks North Star Borough Permanent Fund (Alaska)** – In 1996 the City of Fairbanks sold its municipal utility system and placed the proceeds into a **permanent fund** [19]. The fund is invested, and a portion of earnings support city services and capital projects, ensuring that the one-time asset sale yields ongoing community dividends. Several other Alaskan municipalities benefitted from one-time oil-related windfalls in the 1980s–90s and set up similar "mini-permanent funds" to fund local services (for instance, the **North Slope Borough** uses oil property tax revenues to provide free utilities and public facilities for its residents, effectively sharing resource wealth through services).

- **Housing and Infrastructure Trusts:** Many U.S. cities have dedicated **housing trust funds** to support affordable housing (e.g. **Seattle's Housing Levy fund, Washington D.C.'s Housing Production Trust**). These are typically funded by local taxes or fees and provide ongoing subsidies for low-cost housing, reducing housing cost burdens for thousands of residents. While not always structured as large endowments, a few accumulate reserves that function like an endowment for community development. For example, **Burlington, Vermont's Housing Trust Fund** (est. 1988) invests dedicated tax revenues and uses the interest to fund affordable housing programs [20].

- **Community Foundations:** A uniquely American model is the **community foundation**, a philanthropic endowment intended to broadly improve quality of life in a specific city or region. The first and most famous is the **Cleveland Foundation** (founded 1914), which pools donor gifts into a permanent fund (now over $2.5 billion) and grants the earnings to local educational, cultural, and social initiatives. Today, hundreds of U.S. cities have such foundations. While they don't pay cash to every resident, they **provide universal community benefits** – for example, funding public parks, libraries, scholarships, healthcare clinics, and arts programs that anyone can access. Community foundations are privately endowed but often work closely with local governments on shared civic goals.

- **Kalamazoo Promise (Michigan)** – An innovative example of a private trust providing near-universal benefit is the Kalamazoo Promise. In 2005, a group of anonymous donors endowed a fund to cover **college tuition for every graduate of the Kalamazoo public school system** [21]. Eligible students receive up to 100% of tuition to any public college in Michigan, as a "Promise" of educational opportunity. This effectively acts as a community scholarship for *all* local students, an enormous economic relief for families. The program is structured as a long-term trust (estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars) and has inspired similar “Promise” scholarships in other communities [21]. **Outcomes:** Kalamazoo’s college enrollment rates and youth retention have improved, and the city has attracted new families seeking the tuition benefit. It demonstrates how philanthropic wealth can be turned into a broad-based social dividend.

United Kingdom

Unlike some resource-rich regions, the UK did not establish a national sovereign wealth fund from North Sea oil (in contrast to Norway). However, there are **local examples of community wealth funds**. Notably, certain local governments in the UK negotiated benefits from natural resources, and historic charitable trusts play a role in providing public benefits. The focus is on funds that cover wide populations (beyond typical local government budgets or targeted welfare programs).

Shetland Charitable Trust (Scotland)

A singular case in the UK is the **Shetland Charitable Trust (SCT)**, a fund benefiting the 23,000 residents of the remote Shetland Islands. When North Sea oil was discovered in the 1970s, Shetland’s council negotiated a deal: a special levy on every barrel of oil landed at Sullom Voe Terminal goes into a local trust as **compensation** for hosting the facility [22] [23]. Established in 1976–1978, the SCT amassed a **“war chest” of nearly £320 million** over 40 years [24]. The trust is governed by local trustees (initially councilors) and professionally invests its capital.

Benefit mechanism: Instead of paying cash to individuals, the SCT uses its investment income to fund a wide array of community services and projects in Shetland. It has **funded cultural associations, built leisure facilities (including** eight public swimming pools**), paid for care workers for the elderly and disabled, and constructed a state-of-the-art arts and recreation center** [24]. In essence, oil wealth was transformed into improved public amenities and services that **raise the quality of life for all Shetlanders** [24]. For many years, the islands could afford “icing on the cake” – amenities beyond what typical local budgets could fund – due to the trust’s support [25]. **Outcomes:** The SCT significantly improved social welfare on Shetland, maintaining services even through oil downturns. However, after oil prices fell in 2014, the trust’s income dropped, prompting discussions on sustainability. Shetland’s example remains unique in the UK and is often cited in debates about how other regions might handle resource wealth or renewable energy revenues.

Other UK Community Trusts and Funds

While Shetland’s oil fund is one-of-a-kind, the UK has other trusts that provide broad local benefits:

- **Community Wealth Fund (Proposed):** In recent years, UK civil society groups (e.g. Local Trust) have advocated a **national Community Wealth Fund** using dormant financial assets. The idea is to endow local “levelling-up” trusts that would invest funds and use the returns to support the **social infrastructure in left-behind communities** [20]. As of 2025, the government is considering allocating hundreds of millions from dormant bank accounts and other sources to such a fund, which would empower communities to fund facilities, training, and services. While not yet realized, it echoes the concept of a public endowment for community benefit.

- **Historic Philanthropic Trusts:** The UK boasts some large charitable trusts with quasi-public roles. One example is the **Peabody Trust** in London. Founded in 1862 by American philanthropist George Peabody, it was endowed to provide housing for London's working poor. Over 160 years, Peabody's endowment (augmented by reinvestment and mergers) has grown such that *Peabody is now one of London's largest not-for-profit housing associations, owning over 100,000 homes and housing 220,000 residents* [26] **. Rent from these homes is recycled to maintain and build more affordable housing. The effect is a** permanently endowed housing stock **that keeps rents below market for a substantial segment of Londoners, generation after generation. Similarly, trusts like** Joseph Rowntree Foundation/Trust **(housing and research) and** William Sutton Trust** have created thousands of affordable homes in the UK. These trusts alleviate housing costs (a major financial burden) for many families – a broad public benefit, albeit targeted by income.

- **Bridge House Estates (City of London)** – A medieval endowment that exemplifies a public-philanthropic trust: It was established in the 12th–17th centuries to maintain London's river bridges. The City of London Corporation still manages this fund, now worth over £1 billion. Surplus income beyond bridge upkeep is given as grants via the **City Bridge Trust** to charitable projects across Greater London. This centuries-old fund thus provides **universal public goods (free bridges) and charitable grants** without tax funding. It highlights how **public asset endowments** can last and adapt – today funding everything from youth services to arts in London – for broad benefit.

Europe (Continental Europe)

Across Europe, there are fewer cases of direct resident dividends, but several innovative **municipal wealth funds** and national funds exist. European cities have often leveraged **public commercial assets (land, real estate, utilities)** to create self-sustaining funds that finance infrastructure and social programs. Additionally, some European countries have national wealth funds (e.g. Norway's famous oil fund) that indirectly benefit citizens via public spending. Here we focus on sub-national examples, especially urban asset management funds.

Urban Asset Wealth Funds: Copenhagen, Hamburg, and Stockholm

Several European cities have pioneered **Urban Wealth Funds (UWFs)** – city-owned investment corporations that manage municipal assets to generate revenue for public investment [27] [28]. Rather than selling assets off and spending the cash, these cities retain ownership through a fund structure, **professionally manage the assets**, and reinvest the returns in city development.

- **Copenhagen City & Port Development Corporation (Denmark):** In the 1990s, Copenhagen faced a fiscal crisis and underused harbor land. The city and national government jointly created *CPH City & Port*, a publicly owned, privately-run corporation, to take over extensive waterfront and former industrial lands [29]. The corporation rezoned and leased/sold parcels for mixed-use redevelopment, turning derelict areas into vibrant districts. Crucially, the profits from land sales and leases were **reinvested to finance Copenhagen's** metro system expansion**, rather than going into private hands** [29] [30] **. By borrowing against the rising land values, City & Port provided an upfront ~$2 billion for metro construction** [31] **. This** self-financing model **allowed Copenhagen to build critical infrastructure** without burdening taxpayers **or incurring excessive debt** [32] [33] **.** Governance: **City & Port operates commercially but is publicly owned (initially 55% city, 45% state). It must meet profit goals *and* city-building objectives.** Outcomes: *Over 25 years, the model* *transformed Copenhagen's harbor into a wealthy, livable waterfront, while paying for public transit and amenities through land value capture* [34] [35]. Copenhagen is now cited as a leading UWF success story, demonstrating how unlocking public land value can fund urban renewal.

- **HafenCity Hamburg GmbH (Germany):** Hamburg undertook a similar approach with its **HafenCity** project – Europe's largest inner-city redevelopment. The city established HafenCity GmbH to own and develop the old port area (nearly 160 hectares). The company leases or sells sites to private developers for offices, housing, etc., and uses the proceeds to build streets, parks, a new U-bahn line, and even subsidize some housing. The project is largely **self-financing**, with **land sale revenues plowed back into infrastructure and public spaces** [36] [37]. Governance is via a city-owned corporation tasked with both profit and public interest goals. **Outcomes:** HafenCity (still ongoing through 2030) has dramatically expanded Hamburg's city center with new neighborhoods, without major taxpayer outlays. It's seen as a model of leveraging land assets for public benefit, although it also faced challenges (e.g. ensuring affordability and integration with the existing city).

- **Stockholm Stadshus AB (Sweden):** Stockholm's approach showcases both the potential and pitfalls of asset funds. The city has significant land and property holdings managed via **Stadshus AB**, a holding company for city-owned enterprises (including real estate, housing companies, and utilities). This fund structure has enabled efficient management of assets and provided dividend income to the city budget [38]. However, critics note that aggressive commercialization – such as selling public housing to raise revenues – contributed to housing shortages and higher rents in Stockholm [39] [40]. This underscores a tension in UWFs: **maximizing financial returns vs. preserving public goods**. **Outcomes:** Stockholm's asset management has generally improved city finances and allowed investment in public projects, but the city continues to work on balancing profit with residents' needs (e.g. maintaining affordable housing stock).

National and Regional Wealth Funds in Europe

- **Norway's Government Pension Fund Global (GPFG)** – While national (not regional), no survey of wealth funds is complete without mentioning Norway's model. Created in 1990 to invest surplus petroleum revenues, it has grown into the world's largest sovereign wealth fund (over **$1.3 trillion**). The GPFG is invested globally and only a small, sustainable portion of returns (currently 3% of fund value) is used in Norway's budget each year. This approach has **shielded the domestic economy from oil volatility** and will fund public pensions and services for generations [41]. Norway's success highlighted what the UK could have done with North Sea oil – and indeed inspired Shetland's local fund. It remains a gold standard for transparently turning resource wealth into broad public prosperity (indirectly, via strong social welfare funded in part by the fund's returns).

- **Irish Sovereign Investment Fund (ISIF)** – Ireland converted its national pension reserve into ISIF in 2014, with a mandate to invest for long-term domestic economic benefit (infrastructure, SMEs, etc.). While not directly paying citizens, it aims to strengthen the economy for the public good. Other EU countries like France and Italy have state investment funds focused on strategic sectors, though these operate more like development banks than citizen wealth funds.

- **Regional Renewable Energy Funds:** As Europe transitions to renewable energy, some regions are considering community wealth funds for wind or solar revenues. For instance, in parts of Scotland and Germany, wind farm income is placed into local trusts that then fund village improvements, lower electricity bills for residents, or pay small dividends. These are emerging and smaller in scale, but carry forward the principle of **local shared wealth** into the renewable era.

Australia

Australia has seen the creation of **public wealth funds at the state and federal level**, though typically aimed at future budget stability rather than direct citizen payouts. Additionally, a tradition of **philanthropic trusts and community foundations** exists, though usually not universal-benefit trusts of the scale seen elsewhere.

- **Australian Future Fund (Federal):** Established in 2006, the Future Fund is a national sovereign wealth fund seeded with budget surpluses and proceeds from the privatization of Telstra (the telecom company). Its purpose is to cover future public service pension liabilities. The Future Fund has grown to over AUD $250 billion, investing globally. By covering pension costs, it **relieves future taxpayers of that burden**, indirectly benefiting all Australians by bolstering long-term fiscal health. The federal government later added related funds (for healthcare, education, drought, etc.), collectively managing public savings for specified future needs. **Outcome:** The Future Fund's strong returns have meant Australia's retired civil servants' pensions are financially secure without drawing on current revenues – an intergenerational benefit.

- **State "Future" or Development Funds:** Resource-rich states in Australia have created their own funds:

- **Western Australia Future Fund:** Created in 2012, it set aside a portion of iron ore royalties during the mining boom. By 2019 it held about AUD $1.3 billion, which was then repurposed into a **Future Health Research & Innovation Fund** – using investment earnings (~$50 million/yr) to finance medical research and health programs in WA [42] [43]. This approach converts non-renewable resource income into ongoing funding for public health (a universal benefit).
- **New South Wales Generations Fund (NGF):** Launched in 2018, the NGF is a **debt retirement fund** aimed at lowering NSW's debt over time [44] [45]. It had ~$15 billion by 2022 [46]. The NGF also includes a "Community Services Fund" component for local projects, but primarily its benefit is to strengthen the state's finances (thus preserving funding for services and reducing future tax pressure).

- **Queensland Future Fund:** Initiated in 2020, similarly used state assets (like the titles registry) to create a fund to offset state debt. While these funds don't pay dividends to individuals, the **universal public benefit** is in greater budgetary stability, funding infrastructure and services in the long run without as much taxpayer money.

- **Community Benefit Trusts (Mining):** In mining regions of Australia, it's become common for governments or companies to establish local trusts to ensure communities benefit from nearby resource projects. For example, the **Broken Hill Community Foundation** was funded in part by mining companies and government to support economic diversification of that mining town. In Queensland's Bowen Basin, some coal mining companies contribute to community development funds that invest in local education, health, and infrastructure. These are typically not huge endowments, but they play a role in **mitigating the boom-bust impacts** on communities and leaving a lasting benefit (like improved town facilities or scholarships) after the mines close.

- **Philanthropic and Community Foundations:** Australia's major cities have charitable foundations (e.g. **Lord Mayor's Charitable Foundation** in Melbourne, founded 1923) that act like community endowments. They fund a wide range of community programs – from homelessness reduction to environmental projects – via investment income from donations. While not as large as their U.S. counterparts, they provide a flexible source of funding for universal community needs. For instance, the Lord Mayor's fund (A$250 million+ corpus) made grants benefiting thousands of residents (such as community housing upgrades, youth employment programs, etc.). Such foundations, though private, reflect the principle of **local wealth being pooled for public good**.

Asia

Asia offers a diverse range of wealth funds and community trusts at various levels. Some city-states and regions have amassed large sovereign funds that support broad-based welfare, while others directly share wealth through dividends. We highlight a few prominent cases in East Asia alongside smaller examples.

Singapore – Sovereign Funds for Public Wealth

The city-state of **Singapore** stands out for its strategic use of sovereign wealth funds. Singapore manages its national savings through two main entities: **GIC** (Government Investment Corporation, managing foreign reserves) and **Temasek Holdings** (a state-owned holding/investment company). Though national in scope, Singapore is effectively an urban state, so these funds serve the city's population of ~5.6 million.

- **Temasek Holdings:** Established in 1974, Temasek initially held stakes in government-linked companies but evolved into a global investor. As of 2024, Temasek's portfolio is **S$389 billion** (USD $285 billion) [47] [48]. It is wholly owned by Singapore's Ministry of Finance. Rather than funding a specific program, Temasek's role is to generate returns for the shareholder (the government). Notably, Temasek **pays annual dividends to the Singapore government**, and along with GIC, its returns feed into the budget under a rule called the Net Investment Returns Contribution (NIRC) [49] [50]. **Benefit mechanism:** Under the NIRC policy, up to **50% of long-term expected returns** of Singapore's sovereign funds can be used each year for government spending [51]. This means that earnings from Temasek and GIC help fund public services like education, healthcare, housing subsidies, and infrastructure for Singaporeans [49]. In recent budgets, investment returns have covered over 20% of annual government expenditures – effectively **offsetting what would otherwise be taxes**. The remaining returns are reinvested to grow the funds (classified as past reserves). **Outcomes:** Singapore's funds have enabled high levels of public housing (over 80% of residents in subsidized HDB flats), quality healthcare and education, and even periodic **"Growth Dividends"** – cash bonuses to citizens in surplus years – all while keeping taxes relatively low. The funds also provide a nest egg for crises: in 2020, Singapore drew on past reserves (with presidential approval) to finance COVID-19 relief measures, demonstrating the value of the endowment for rainy days.

- **Governance:** Singapore's model is often praised for its **strong governance and long-term discipline**. GIC and Temasek operate independently with professional management, and transparency is maintained via annual reports. However, the specific investment strategies are not fully disclosed to the public, leading to some debate on accountability. Overall, these funds have exemplified how a city-state with no natural resources can still build a massive public endowment

(Singapore funneled budget surpluses and land sale proceeds into these funds for decades) and use it to underpin widespread economic security for its residents.

Hong Kong – Public Asset Management and Resident Dividends

Hong Kong, a Special Administrative Region of China, does not have a single named "wealth fund" for citizens, but it effectively manages public wealth through mechanisms that benefit residents:

- **Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Corporation:** Hong Kong's metro system is run by MTR Corp, which is **majority government-owned** and operates on a unique "**Rail plus Property**" model. The government grants MTR development rights for land around stations, and MTR earns substantial revenue by developing and leasing those properties. This cross-subsidy makes the transit system financially self-sustaining and even profitable [52]. MTR pays dividends back to the government (as a shareholder) and reinvests in network expansion. The result is one of the **world's few profitable public transit systems**, with high service quality and affordable fares [53]. In essence, **land value (a public asset) is harnessed to fund a universal service (public transportation)** [53]. **Outcomes:** Hong Kong enjoys a top-class metro and the government has earned revenue (used in budgets or infrastructure funds) – a win-win for public welfare and finances.

- **Fiscal Reserves & One-time Dividends:** Hong Kong maintains large fiscal reserves (often invested via the Exchange Fund) which provide financial stability. While no routine citizen dividend exists, during exceptionally large surpluses the government has occasionally given one-off payments. For example, in 2011 Hong Kong disbursed a HK$6,000 (≈US$770) cash handout to all adult permanent residents from surplus funds. More regularly, Hong Kong budgets provide **indirect dividends** by waiving or reducing public fees (e.g. 15 years of free education, healthcare subsidies, public housing for 45% of population). These subsidies are enabled by the government's strong revenue base (land lease income, etc.), which is akin to drawing on communal wealth.

Hong Kong's approach shows how a city can **leverage public assets (land and capital)** to deliver broad benefits (transport, housing, services) without creating a standalone "fund" that cuts checks to individuals.

Macau – Annual Cash Shares of Casino Wealth

The neighboring SAR of **Macau** provides a vivid example of direct wealth sharing. Since 2008, the Macau government has run the **Wealth Partaking Scheme**, an annual **cash disbursement to all Macau residents** [54]. Funded by the region's massive casino gambling revenues, this scheme's goal is to *"share the results of economic development with the people and mitigate inflation effects."* [54] Every year, permanent residents and non-permanent residents of Macau receive equal lump sums (the amount varies by year and residency status). For instance, in 2023 the payout was MOP $10,000 (≈US $1,250) for each permanent resident [55] [56]. These payments function as a **no-strings-attached dividend from Macau's casino-boom prosperity**.

Structure and governance: The Wealth Partaking Scheme is not an invested endowment but rather a budgetary allocation annually approved by the government, based on casino tax receipts. Macau does, however, maintain large fiscal reserves; effectively it can afford the payouts due to years of surplus. **Outcomes:** Over 17 years, the cash handouts have put money directly in residents' pockets, boosting consumption and public satisfaction. While relatively modest per person, it has been especially helpful for low-income residents in coping with living costs (and politically it reinforced support for the government). During economic downturns (e.g. COVID-19's hit to tourism), Macau continued the payments, though it is now tightening eligibility to ensure only true residents benefit [57]. Macau's model is often contrasted with Hong Kong's – the latter invests in services, the former opts for direct cash – each reflecting different public preferences.

Other Notable Asian Examples

- **Mongolia's Human Development Fund:** Mongolia, during a mining boom around 2010, experimented with an Alaska-style sovereign fund for its copper and coal revenues. The Human Development Fund was supposed to invest resource earnings and pay **citizen dividends**. In practice, the government began issuing *cash transfers to citizens* (and even shares in a state mining company) immediately. Around 2010–2012, Mongolians received several one-off cash distributions (totaling a few hundred dollars each) from mining proceeds. However, the boom turned to bust and the payouts proved unsustainable. The fund was largely depleted and later replaced with targeted social programs. **Lesson:** It showed both the popularity of cash sharing and the difficulty of sustaining it without strong fiscal discipline. It remains a case study in managing expectations around resource dividends.

- **Gulf States and Others:** Several Asian and Middle Eastern jurisdictions also have sub-national funds. For example, **Abu Dhabi** (part of the UAE) has the **ADIA sovereign fund** which, at the emirate level, invests oil wealth; citizens of Abu Dhabi (and the UAE broadly) benefit through cradle-to-grave free services and occasional **citizen grants (stipends, housing plots, etc.)** funded by investment income. In **Iran**, the government in 2010 diverted oil subsidy savings into cash transfers, effectively giving ~US$40 per person per month – a universal basic income funded by oil. Though not structured as an endowment, it was an *alternative mechanism of sharing national wealth*. These examples, while not the core focus regions requested, underscore the global appeal of **using collective wealth to provide broad-based financial benefits**.

Comparison of Selected Wealth Funds and Trusts

The table below summarizes key features of some prominent urban wealth funds, community trusts, and similar endowments discussed above:

Fund/Trust	Location (Level)	Established	Funding Source	Approx. Assets	Benefit Mechanism
Alaska Permanent Fund	Alaska, USA (State)	1976	25% of oil royalties (North Slope) [4]	~$65 billion (2019) [5]	Annual **cash dividend** to all residents (avg. ~$1,600/ person) [5]; also supports state budget.

Fund/Trust	Location (Level)	Established	Funding Source	Approx. Assets	Benefit Mechanism
Texas Permanent School Fund	Texas, USA (State)	1854	Land grants; oil & gas royalties 6 7	~$47 billion 6	**Education endowment** – investment earnings fund K-12 public schools (textbooks, budgets) 6 .
Shetland Charitable Trust	Shetland, UK (Local)	1976–1978	Levy on oil flowing through Sullom Voe terminal 22 23	~£320 million 24	**Community trust** – funds local services, facilities (pools, care homes, cultural centers) for all residents 24 .
Copenhagen City & Port Dev.	Copenhagen, Denmark (City)	1992 (Ørestad)[1]	Transfer of city/ state **land assets** (harbor, etc.); real estate lease/sale revenues 29	(Assets revalued to finance ~$2 billion metro expansion) 31	**Urban asset corporation** – leases/sells land; reinvests profits in infrastructure (e.g. metro) **instead of taxes** 32 .
Hong Kong MTR Corporation	Hong Kong, China (City)	1979 (corp. 2000)	Government land grants; property development; transit fares 52	HK$282 billion market cap (2023)[2]	**Transit & property fund** – profitable transit system funded by real estate; pays dividends to gov't, keeps fares low 53 .

Fund/Trust	Location (Level)	Established	Funding Source	Approx. Assets	Benefit Mechanism
Western Australia Future Fund	Western Australia (State)	2012	Portion of mining (iron ore) royalties; Royalties for Regions transfers [42] [43]	~A$1.4 billion (2019)	**Future endowment** – now FHRI Fund; investment earnings (~A$50m/yr) finance health research and innovation (public health benefits).
Singapore Temasek Holdings	Singapore (City-State)	1974	Government equity stakes; fiscal reserves; land sale proceeds	S$389 billion (2024) [47] [48]	**Sovereign fund** – invests globally; ~50% of returns support national budget (defence, education, healthcare subsidies) [49] [50] .
Macau Wealth Partaking Scheme	Macau, China (SAR)	2008	Annual casino tax budget surplus (no fixed fund principal) [54]	(N/A – pay-as-you-go)	**Universal dividend** – yearly cash payout to all ID-card holders (e.g. MOP 10k per resident in 2023) [55] [56] .

Fund/Trust	Location (Level)	Established	Funding Source	Approx. Assets	Benefit Mechanism
Peabody Housing Trust	London, UK (Charity)	1862	Philanthropic endowment (George Peabody) + reinvested rental income	£8+ billion in assets (est.)[3]	**Affordable housing trust** – owns 100k+ homes [26] for low-income residents; rents recycled to maintain and expand housing (lowers housing costs citywide).
Kalamazoo Promise	Kalamazoo, MI, USA (Private)	2005	Endowment by anonymous donors (local philanthropists) [21]	(Undisclosed ≈ $500+ million)	**Educational trust** – pays up to 100% college tuition for all local high school graduates (universal scholarship) [21].

<small>[1] *The Copenhagen model evolved from the Ørestad Development Corporation (1992) to CPH City & Port (2007).*</small>
<small>[2] *Market capitalization of MTR Corp, which is ~75% owned by Hong Kong Government.*</small>
<small>[3] *Peabody's housing assets (100k units) estimated by multiplying units by average social housing asset value.*</small>

Conclusion

Over the past century, a variety of **urban wealth funds and community trusts** have demonstrated ways to turn **collective assets into long-term benefits for citizens**. Whether through direct cash dividends (as in Alaska and Macau), **endowments funding education and services** (Texas PSF, Wyoming PMTF, Shetland Trust), or **investment of public assets to finance infrastructure** (Copenhagen's City & Port, Hong Kong's MTR), these mechanisms illustrate the power of **shared wealth**. Key factors in success include strong governance (to protect the fund for future generations), a stable funding source (e.g. dedicated resource revenues or assets), and a clear mandate aligning with public interests (be it reducing residents' costs, improving services, or saving for the future).

Importantly, even **philanthropic and private trusts** can achieve near-universal public benefits when designed with a broad mission – such as housing trusts that keep rents affordable for tens of thousands, or scholarship funds guaranteeing college access to all local youth. These complement government initiatives and often partner with public programs.

As communities worldwide face economic transitions – from fossil fuels to renewables, from public asset privatization debates, or managing one-time windfalls (like tech booms or real estate spikes) – the examples in this survey provide models for **sustaining prosperity**. Urban wealth funds and community trusts offer a path to **inclusive wealth-sharing**, turning ephemeral or concentrated wealth into lasting, widely distributed benefits. By studying these precedents, policymakers and civic leaders can craft innovative solutions that ensure **local wealth enriches all residents, now and for generations to come**.

---

1 2 3 4 5 Alaska Permanent Fund - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alaska_Permanent_Fund

6 7 Future-Proofing Texas School Funding - Texas 2036
https://texas2036.org/future-proofing-texas-school-funding/

8 Permanent University Fund (PUF) - UTIMCO
https://www.utimco.org/funds-managed/endowment-funds/permanent-university-fund-puf/

9 The discourse surrounding state-endowed oil fields, investments
https://thedailytexan.com/2024/04/22/the-energy-of-the-future-the-discourse-surrounding-state-endowed-oil-fields-investments/

10 UT System oil money is a gusher for its administration
https://www.texastribune.org/2017/08/21/ut-system-oil-money-gusher-its-administration-and-trickle-students/

11 12 13 14 15 16 Permanent Wyoming Mineral Trust Fund (PWMTF): Overview
https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/permanent-wyoming-mineral-trust-fund.asp

17 New Mexico Land Grant Permanent Fund - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Mexico_Land_Grant_Permanent_Fund

18 Oil and natural gas: Powerhouse for ND's economy - Minot Daily News
https://www.minotdailynews.com/opinion/local-columnists/2023/03/oil-and-natural-gas-powerhouse-for-nds-economy/

19 Permanent Fund Dividend: Alaska Department of Revenue
https://pfd.alaska.gov/

20 Explainer: Affordable Housing Trusts and Community Land Trusts
https://www.cityhealth.org/resource-center/affordable-housing-trusts-and-community-land-trusts/

21 The effects of the Kalamazoo Promise Scholarship on college ...
https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-effects-of-the-kalamazoo-promise-scholarship-on-college-enrollment-persistence-and-completion/

22 23 24 25 41 Scotland confronts energy transition, by Lou-Eve Popper (Le Monde diplomatique - English edition, October 2022)
https://mondediplo.com/2022/10/03scotland

26 Peabody Trust - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peabody_Trust

[27] [28] [29] [30] [32] [33] [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] [52] [53] Urban Wealth Funds: A New Approach to City Financing | City-County Observer
https://city-countyobserver.com/september/

[31] [PDF] THE COPENHAGEN CITY AND PORT DEVELOPMENT ...
https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/csi_20170601_copenhagen_port_paper.pdf

[34] [35] The Copenhagen City and Port Development Corporation: A model for regenerating cities
https://www.brookings.edu/articles/copenhagen-port-development/

[42] [43] Future Health Research and Innovation Fund - FHRI Fund Act
https://fhrifund.health.wa.gov.au/About-us/FHRI-Fund-Act

[44] NSW Generations Funds Act 2018 No 37 - NSW Legislation
https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/whole/html/inforce/current/act-2018-037

[45] [46] NSW Generations Fund | NGF | NSW Budget 2019-2020
https://www.budget.nsw.gov.au/nsw-generations-fund

[47] Performance and Portfolio - Temasek Review 2024
https://www.temasekreview.com.sg/performance-and-portfolio.html

[48] Singapore's Temasek reports worst returns in 7 years
https://www.ft.com/content/20ea0155-4e71-4b9c-9bb6-bc24c098e0f8

[49] [50] [51] Ins & Outs of Temasek - Temasek
https://www.temasek.com.sg/en/our-financials/ins-outs-temasek

[54] Wealth Partaking Scheme - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wealth_Partaking_Scheme

[55] Cash distribution scheme introduces residency criteria to limit eligibility
https://www.macaubusiness.com/cash-distribution-scheme-introduces-residency-criteria-to-limit-eligibility/

[56] Gov't enforces restrictions on cash handouts to exclude some not ...
https://macaudailytimes.com.mo/govt-enforces-restrictions-on-cash-handouts-to-exclude-some-not-living-in-macau.html

[57] For the first time in 17 years, the government is making changes to ...
https://www.facebook.com/Canal.Macau/videos/for-the-first-time-in-17-years-the-government-is-making-changes-to-who-can-recei/24251928377726670/