

Treasure State Endowment Program

EXHIBIT 1
DATE 2/16/09
 526,208
 HB 11

Estimated Beginning Fund Balance (7/01/2005) ³		
Revenue Projections ¹		
2006 Investment Earnings	8,578,934	
2007 Investment Earnings	9,071,959	
2007 Biennium Revenues		17,650,893
Proposed Expenditures ²		
Administration - Commerce	(1,003,590)	
Administration - DNRC	(56,000)	
Emergency Grants	(100,000)	
Pre-engineering - SA	(600,000)	
Total Expenditures		(1,759,590)
Terminated Grants (recommended in HB 11) ⁴		238,184
Total Funds Available for Grants		\$16,155,695

Rank	HB 11	Applicant	Requested	Recommended	HB 11	
Order	Page	Line				
1	2	10	St. Ignatius	500,000	\$500,000	\$16,155,695
2		11	Rudyard District	441,950	524,503	15,655,695
3		12	Carter District	500,000	500,000	15,131,192
4		13	Cascade	500,000	500,000	14,631,192
5		14	Madison County	179,911	179,911	14,131,192
6		15	Lewis & Clark County	299,802	288,757	13,951,281
7		16	Stillwater County	399,853	399,853	13,662,524
8		17	Seeley Lake District	500,000	500,000	13,262,671
9		18	Dodson	427,500	427,500	12,762,671
10		19	Conrad	500,000	500,000	12,335,171
11		20	Sweet Grass County	144,989	144,989	11,835,171
12		21	Havre	500,000	500,000	11,690,182
13		22	Powell County	158,348	158,348	11,190,182
14		23	Mineral County	80,090	80,090	11,031,834
15		24	Glacier County	500,000	500,000	10,951,744
16		25	Malta	500,000	500,000	10,451,744
17		26	Crow Tribe	500,000	500,000	9,951,744
18		27	Libby	500,000	500,000	9,451,744
19		28	Big Horn County	142,500	142,500	8,951,744
20		29	Custer District	500,000	500,000	8,809,244
21		30	Hill County	450,750	450,750	8,309,244
22	3	1	Glasgow	500,000	500,000	7,858,494
23		2	Valier	500,000	500,000	7,358,494
24		3	Sheridan	500,000	500,000	6,858,494
25		4	Beaverhead County	84,886	84,886	6,358,494
26		5	Whitefish	457,500	457,500	6,273,608
27		6	Richland County	453,841	453,841	5,816,108
28		7	Upper-Lower River Road District	500,000	500,000	5,362,267
29		8	Laurel	500,000	500,000	4,862,267
30		9	Ennis	204,894	204,894	4,362,267
31		10	Choteau	500,000	500,000	4,157,373
32		11	Missoula County	275,172	275,172	3,657,373
33		12	Miles City	500,000	500,000	3,382,201
34		13	Yellowstone County	187,800	187,800	2,882,201
35		14	Ranch District	500,000	360,000	2,694,401
36		15	Hysham	470,920	462,359	2,334,401
37		16	Carbon County	97,100	97,100	1,872,042
38		17	Spring Meadows District	500,000	487,500	1,774,942
39		18	Woods Bay District	500,000	500,000	1,287,442
40		19	Circle	500,000	500,000	787,442
41		20	Fairfield	500,000	126,000	287,442
42		21	Sun Prairie District	500,000	500,000	161,442
43			Ryegate	394,081	394,081	(338,558)
44			Chester	200,000	200,000	(732,639)
45			Shelby	250,000	250,000	(932,639)
46			Bearcreek	249,787	87,641	(1,182,639)
47			Bigfork District	500,000	262,500	(1,270,280)
			Total Recommendations	\$18,551,674	\$17,688,475	(\$1,532,780)

Amend name in bill

¹ HJR 2 Revenue Projections

² Executive Proposal

³ "Other" appropriations, not expended in 2005 biennium

⁴ Terminated grant awards (Chapter 435, Laws of 2001) from Florence County Water and Sewer Dist., \$500,000, and Essex Water and Sewer Dist., \$225,000. Total terminated grants are reduced by amounts required to complete grant appropriations for the 2005 biennium [(\$500,000 + \$225,000) - \$486,816 = \$238,184] .

Long Range Planning Issues
(issues not related to projects)

HB 5

1. Expenditure limitation and effective dates (Terry Johnson, Principal Fiscal Analyst)
2. Interim study on funding of state building maintenance
3. State maintenance responsibility for University buildings (make statutory?)
 - a. Academic uses
 - b. Classrooms
 - c. Labs
 - d. Libraries

HB 6

1. Account use issue.

HB 7

1. Account use issue.
2. Problems with "petroleum cleanup" fund
 - a. Does not address problems like Harlem
 - b. Does this require changes in statute?

HB 9

1. Requirements for testimony
2. Need for additional HB 2 support of grant program

HB 11

1. TSEP administrative questions
 - a. Requirement of maximum funding (\$7,500/hshld)
 - b. Maximum funding of \$500,000
2. Annual funding
3. The Department is still looking for guidance regarding how to handle hardship requests in the future when the applicant otherwise meets the requirements for a hardship grant, but there are other factors that should possibly be taken into account to deny the request, such as: undeveloped lots, seasonal homes, and a high MHI of an area. This is the key issue that the Department is looking to the committee to for guidance.
4. The biggest issue was how much is expected to be available and how many projects can be awarded funds. Related issues are:
 - a. Whether to only award funds on a contingency basis to some projects and how many,
 - b. If there are remaining funds after funding all projects, what to do with that remaining amount, and
 - c. is there "one-time" general funds available for awarding to projects, and if there is, which projects should it be given to.
5. Interim committee (Finance Interim Committee subcommittee?)
 - a. Address TSEP funding allocation
 - b. Contingent funding

MT Historic Society

1. Recommendations from committee on how to handle the situation
2. Committee bill???? (as stated in 2/7 Helena Independent Record)