

## Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 – Indian Casino Agreements

Referendums

### The way it is now:

California only allows slot machines on Indian lands. The State Constitution allows the Governor to negotiate agreements with Indian tribes – called “compacts” – about how many slot machines they can operate. The State Legislature accepts or rejects these compacts. The U.S. government reviews them to make sure they are consistent with federal law and gives the final approval.

In 1999, the state of California and 58 tribes made agreements setting a limit of 2,000 slot machines per tribe. In recent years, the Governor and some tribes have made changes to their agreements to allow more slot machines in return for more money coming into the state’s General Fund. Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 are changes to casino agreements for four Southern California tribes. The Legislature approved these changes, but signatures were gathered to put these casino amendments to a vote of the people.

For each of these propositions, if a tribe’s amended agreement does not win voter approval, the tribe will continue to operate casinos under their 1999 compact.

### What Prop 94, 95, 96 and 97 would do if they pass:

These propositions would approve (“ratify”) amendments to Indian casino agreements that were negotiated by the Governor and approved by the Legislature.

The amendments extend the agreements by 10 years to 2030 and allow the following increases in slot machines:

**Prop 94** - the Pechanga tribe in Riverside County could operate up to 7,500 slot machines

**Prop 95** - the Morongo tribe in Riverside County could operate up to 7,500 slot machines

**Prop 96** - the Sycuan tribe in San Diego County could operate up to 5,000 slot machines

**Prop 97** - the Agua Caliente tribe in Riverside County could operate up to 5,000 slot machines

Each tribe would make larger payments to the state, including a percentage of their revenues from the new slot machines.

### Fiscal effect on government:

Each tribe would pay tens of millions more to the state each year under their amended agreement. If voters approve all four propositions, the increased annual revenue to the state will be roughly \$200 million in the next few years and may increase to the low to mid hundreds of millions of dollars in future years.



### People for Prop 94, 95, 96 and 97, say:

- Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 will create thousands of new jobs for Indians and non-Indians and add protections for the environment, local communities and casino employees.
- Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 will share tens of millions of dollars from revenues with tribes that have little or no gaming and provide the state with much-needed new revenues.

#### Signers of the Argument for Prop 94, 95, 96 and 97:

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Jack O’Connell, *California Superintendent of Public Instruction*  
Chief Gene Gantt, *Legislative Director, California Fire Chiefs Association*

[www.YESforCalifornia.com](http://www.YESforCalifornia.com)



### People against Prop 94, 95, 96 and 97, say:

- Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 would give unfair control of California’s Indian gaming revenue to just four tribes, which would economically harm many of the State’s other 102 tribes.
- Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 do not include adequate environmental protection measures and would make California home to some of the largest casinos in the world.

#### Signers of the Argument against

#### Prop 94, 95, 96 and 97:

Mary Hittelman, *President, California Federation of Teachers*  
John A. Gomez, Jr., *President, American Indian Rights and Resources Organization*  
Lenny Goldberg, *Executive Director, California Tax Reform Association*

[www.nounfairdeals.com](http://www.nounfairdeals.com)

Please visit the *Easy Voter Guide* Project website, [www.easyvoter.org](http://www.easyvoter.org), for more information.