

1 [Opposing Propositions 94, 95, 96, and 97]

2

3 **Resolution opposing Propositions 94, 95, 96, and 97 on the February 5th General**
4 **Election.**

5

6 WHEREAS, New compacts ratified by the Legislature would benefit four of the state’s
7 wealthiest tribes at the expense of cities, counties, taxpayers and other tribes; and,

8

9 WHEREAS, the 2006 Indian gaming policy of the California State Association of
10 Counties states, “CSAC supports legislation and regulations that preserve—and not impair—
11 the abilities of counties to effectively meet their governmental responsibilities, including the
12 provision of public safety, health, environmental, infrastructure, and general welfare services
13 throughout their communities”; and,

14

15 WHEREAS, In 2006 the League of Cities adopted policy and guiding principles that
16 “require adequate compensation from the tribes to the local agency providing the government
17 services that are required by the tribal casino or related businesses”; and,

18

19 WHEREAS, The Big 4 compacts are in direct conflict with the stated policies of both
20 the California State Association of Counties and the California League of Cities; and,

21

22 WHEREAS, The new compacts set a dangerous precedent for future agreements
23 between Tribes and the State; and,

24

25 WHEREAS, The new compacts represent a dramatic shift in Indian gaming policy; and,

26

27 WHEREAS, They authorize one of the largest expansions of casino gambling in history
28 and would make California home to some of the largest casinos in the world with more than
29 twice the number of slot machines as the biggest casinos in Las Vegas; and,

30

31

1 WHEREAS, The compacts allow thousands of new slot machines without consulting
2 local officials, without any local community support and without doing anything to mitigate the
3 added traffic and public safety impacts; and,

4 WHEREAS, The impact of these huge casinos can never truly be mitigated; and,

5 WHEREAS, Just four of California’s more than 100 Indian tribes would get about one-
6 third of the state’s casino gambling pie, while negatively impacting other tribes; and,

7 WHEREAS, These gambling initiatives fail to provide taxpayers a fair and accountable
8 share of revenues by letting the tribes themselves tell the state what revenues they’ll share;
9 and,

10 WHEREAS, Californians should have a chance to vote on whether or not to allow this
11 change in state policy and the rapid expansion of casino gambling; now, therefore, be it

12 RESOLVED, That Board of Supervisors urges the Governor and the Legislature to go
13 back to the negotiating table and make sure these compacts provide taxpayers with a fair and
14 accountable share of revenues; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors opposes
16 Propositions 94, 95, 96, and 97 on the February 2008 ballot.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25