

**DRAFTER'S NOTE**  
**FROM THE**  
**LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRB-2922/2dn  
PJK:lmk:rs

February 27, 2006

I did not add "future" before "cash balance" in s. 260.20 (5) (a) (intro.). I think it is more or less implicit, because of the phrase, "is likely to be," and exactly when the cash balance is expected to be insufficient will be indicated by the year or years stated in the information given to the governor and legislature. Additionally, leaving out "future" gives you more flexibility: it could include the current year.

Pamela J. Kahler  
Senior Legislative Attorney  
Phone: (608) 266-2682  
E-mail: [pam.kahler@legis.state.wi.us](mailto:pam.kahler@legis.state.wi.us)