## DRAFTER'S NOTE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-4242/P2dni MES/JTK/RC/JK...:...

- 1. Per our discussion of January 14, this draft, in proposed s. 229.823, establishes a district's jurisdiction in such a way that there is no scenario that envisions a relocated stadium. Therefore, if for any reason the current thinking shifts on this point, the district will not have jurisdiction to become involved. We do not think this necessarily impairs the open class because the draft still permits a new stadium to be sited potentially in any county having a population of 150,000 or more.
- 2. Under proposed ss. 77.54 (45) (c), 229.824 (13) and 229.826 (5), we have substituted references to fees or other charges for the right to purchase "admission" rather than "tickets". Though the difference is subtle, it seemed to us that the concept of a public entity deciding who may purchase tickets to a privately produced event is potentially awkward. We were more comfortable with the concept of an admissions fee.
- 3. There are several references in the draft to municipalities contained within a district's jurisdiction. Because under current Wisconsin law, a municipality may be located in more than one county (and over 40 of them are), we have changed these references to municipalities that are *wholly or partly* contained within a district's jurisdiction. This is just an effort to maintain an open class by dealing with every potential situation. You could, if you wish, substitute references to municipalities that are *wholly* contained within a district's jurisdiction.