★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 96 ★

PROTECT HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS EACH YEAR IN OUR STATE BUDGET BY VOTING YES ON PROPS. 94, 95, 96, AND 97.

Under new Indian Gaming Revenue Agreements negotiated by the Governor and approved by bipartisan majorities of the Legislature, the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and three other Southern California tribes will pay a much higher percentage of their gaming revenues to the state.

At a time when California faces a budget crisis, these agreements will provide hundreds of millions of dollars in new revenues each year—billions in the years ahead to help pay for public safety, education, and other services.

Your YES vote on Props. 94 through 97 preserves these agreements and protects the new revenues they provide. Voting NO would undo the agreements and force our state to lose billions.

A YES VOTE IS ENDORSED BY A BROAD COALITION, including: • California Fire Chiefs Association • California Statewide Law Enforcement Association • California Association for Local Economic Development • Peace Officers Research Association of California, representing 60,000 police and sheriff officers • Congress of California Seniors • California Indian Tribes

OUR STATE FACES A BUDGET CRISIS—VOTING YES PROTECTS FUNDING FOR VITAL STATE SERVICES.

California faces mounting budget deficits. These agreements won't solve our budget problems, but they provide vitally needed help.

The last thing we need is to cancel these new agreements and put our state billions of dollars further in the hole.

"Voting YES protects billions in new revenues to fund public safety, education, and other vital services."—Sheldon Gilbert, President, California Fire Chiefs Association

VOTING YES KEEPS GAMING ON EXISTING TRIBAL LANDS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—WHILE PROVIDING BENEFITS TO OUR ENTIRE STATE.

Props. 94 through 97 will allow the tribes to add slot machines on their existing tribal lands in Riverside and San Diego Counties. In return, the tribes will pay increased revenues from these machines to the state to support services in communities statewide.

VOTING YES AUTHORIZES NEW PROTECTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, CASINO EMPLOYEES, AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES.

Key provisions in the agreements include: • Increased state regulatory oversight through audits and random inspections. • Strict new environmental standards for casino-related projects. • Binding mitigation agreements that increase coordination between tribes and local governments, including compensation for law enforcement and fire services. • Increased protections for casino workers, including the right to unionize.

VOTING YES BENEFITS CALIFORNIA TRIBES AND OUR ECONOMY.

The agreements will create thousands of new jobs for Indians and non-Indians.

Also, under the new agreements, these tribes will share tens of millions of dollars from their revenues with tribes that have little or no gaming.

"Tribes throughout California support these agreements. They provide the state with much-needed new revenues and provide smaller, non-gaming tribes with funding to help our people become self-reliant and to fund healthcare, education, and other services on our reservations."—Chairman Raymond Torres, Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians

PROTECT OUR STATE BUDGET. PROTECT CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS. PROTECT VITAL SERVICES.

VOTE YES on 94, 95, 96, and 97.

www.YESforCalifornia.com

GOVERNOR ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
JACK O'CONNELL, California Superintendent of Public Instruction
CHIEF GENE GANTT, Legislative Director
California Fire Chiefs Association

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 96 ★

The bottom line: The Big 4 gambling deals failed to include the accountability necessary to make good on their promises.

Other tribal-state compacts require easily verified, per slot machine payments to the state, but the Big 4 politically powerful tribes get to pick and choose which slot machines to count. It's a revenue formula ripe for manipulation.

"They allow the tribes themselves—instead of an independent auditor—to determine the amount of net winnings that would be subject to revenue sharing with the state."—San Francisco Chronicle

Even the independent Legislative Analyst has called their revenue promises unrealistic.

And the problems don't stop there . . .

Other compacts require slot machines be located on reservation lands. Proposition 96 gives Sycuan state permission to operate slots on land not currently part of their reservation.

Other compacts make it easier for casino workers to get decent wages and affordable health insurance. The Big 4 deals do not, at great expense to taxpayers. University professors studied one of the Big 4 tribes and found more than half of the children of their casino workers were forced to rely on taxpayer-funded health care. That's unacceptable.

These are terrible deals for California. They promise 4 wealthy tribes billions in profits, while shortchanging casino workers, our schools, our police and fire departments, other tribes, and our environment.

This is too low a standard to set for future tribal-state compacts. Let's force the Legislature to do better. Vote NO on 94, 95, 96, 97.

JOHN F. HANLEY, Fire Captain
Fire Fighters Local 798
DOLORES HUERTA, Co-Founder
United Farm Workers
MAURY HANNIGAN, Former Commissioner and Chief Executive Officer
California Highway Patrol

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 96 ★

It's amazing what millions of dollars in political contributions can get you in Sacramento these days. Just ask four of the wealthiest and most powerful tribes in the state—Pechanga, Morongo, Sycuan, and Agua Caliente.

After wining and dining the Legislature, the Big 4 tribes cut a deal for ONE OF THE LARGEST EXPANSIONS OF CASINO GAMBLING IN U.S. HISTORY—far beyond the modest increase voters were promised. *It's a sweetheart deal for the Big 4 tribes, but a raw deal for other tribes, taxpayers, workers, and the environment.*

Fortunately, nearly 3 million referendum signatures were submitted to demand the opportunity voters now have to OVERTURN THESE LEGISLATIVE GIVEAWAYS.

We urge you to take advantage of this hard fought opportunity to VOTE NO on 94, 95, 96, and 97. Ask the tough questions and get the facts.

How much gambling expansion are we talking about? Add up all the slot machines at a dozen big Vegas casinos, including the Bellagio, MGM Grand, Mirage, and Mandalay Bay, and they still wouldn't total the 17,000 additional slot machines these deals authorize. Sycuan could more than double their current 2,000 maximum number of slot machines to 5,000. California would become home to some of the largest casinos in the world.

Why do other tribes oppose these deals? Just 4 of California's 108 tribes would get UNFAIR CONTROL OVER ONE-THIRD OF THE STATE'S INDIAN GAMING PIE, with dominant casinos that could ECONOMICALLY DEVASTATE SMALLER TRIBES.

Who would calculate how much revenue goes to the state? The Big 4 tribes themselves. The deals include an EASILY MANIPULATED REVENUE SHARING FORMULA that lets THE BIG 4 DECIDE WHICH SLOT MACHINES TO COUNT AND HOW MUCH TO PAY THE STATE. In short: The deals let the Big 4 tribes off the hook for fair revenue sharing with taxpayers.

Why do they promise more education revenues when NOT ONE PENNY OF IT IS GUARANTEED TO OUR SCHOOLS? That's what the California Federation of Teachers would like to know. They're opposed to these deals.

Why do labor unions oppose the Big 4 deals? The deals would shower 4 wealthy tribes with billions in profits, but FAIL TO ENSURE THE MOST BASIC RIGHTS FOR CASINO WORKERS, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE.

Why didn't the Big 4 deals include strict environmental protections? Unlike previous compacts with other tribes, the BIG 4 DEALS FAILED TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE THAT TRULY MIRRORS THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT to give citizens a meaningful voice on casino expansion projects that threaten our environment.

The Big 4 tribes went to great expense to try to prevent you from having a say on their deals. That's because they know that their UNFAIR, POLITICAL DEALS will not stand up to voter scrutiny.

Join public safety officials, educators, tribes, taxpayers, labor unions, senior groups, civil rights and environmental organizations, and VOTE NO on 94, 95, 96, and 97. *Force them back to the drawing board to come up with a better plan that's fair to other tribes, taxpayers, and workers.*

MARTY 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

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 96 ★

The campaign against the Indian Gaming Revenue Agreements (Props. 94, 95, 96, 97) is funded and led by a Las Vegas casino owner and a few gambling interests that don't want competition. They are making false claims. Here are the facts.

FACT: THE AGREEMENTS INCREASE STATE OVERSIGHT AUTHORITY.

"These agreements contain tough fiscal safeguards—including audits of gaming revenues by state regulators. Props. 94–97 will provide our state with hundreds of millions each year in essential new revenues."—Alan Wayne Barcelona, President, California Statewide Law Enforcement Association

FACT: GAMING UNDER THESE AGREEMENTS IS LIMITED TO FOUR EXISTING INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

"Props. 94-97 simply allow four tribes in Riverside County and San Diego County to have a limited number of additional slot machines in gaming facilities on their existing lands." —Carole Goldberg, Professor of Law and Native American Studies

FACT: THE AGREEMENTS BENEFIT TRIBES ACROSS CALIFORNIA.

"The agreements will provide important revenues to tribes with little or no gaming."—Chairwoman Lynn Valbuena, Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations

FACT: THE AGREEMENTS INCREASE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.

"These agreements contain strict new environmental safeguards for tribal gaming projects, including provisions that mirror the California Environmental Quality Act."—Linda Adams, Secretary, California Environmental Protection Agency

FACT: BILLIONS WILL GO TO PUBLIC SERVICES, INCLUDING EDUCATION.

"Voting YES provides California with billions available for education, children's health, and many other state services. Voting NO would take away billions, making our budget problems worse."—Jack O'Connell, California Superintendent of Public Instruction

YES on 94, 95, 96, and 97.

LINDA ADAMS, Secretary
California Environmental Protection Agency
CHIEF GENE GANTT, Legislative Director
California Fire Chiefs Association
ALAN WAYNE BARCELONA, President
California Statewide Law Enforcement Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.