

Ackley about the proposed facility. In his response to remarks about Hudson – and to other issues raised – the Secretary noted that off-reservation gaming applications were controversial and that the issue would be reviewed.¹⁷³ Babbitt has testified that he thinks he first learned about the Hudson matter in connection with a trip to Wisconsin in the fall 1994, but he recalls speaking publicly about it at the tribal dialogue.

6. Additional Comments Submitted to DOI on the Hudson Proposal

After Duffy's March 27, 1995, letter advising tribes of the April 30 deadline to submit additional information, the Department received several responses regarding the Hudson application, most in the form of objections.

a. New Materials Indicating Changes In Support by Local Governments and Other Officials

Among the responses the Department received were materials reflecting the views of state and local officials and local residents, now mostly in opposition to the casino plan. In Hudson, Mayor Redner was unseated in an election which also caused the pro-track/pro-casino majority on the city council to lose support. Local business people, Cranmer and Bieraugel lobbied the mayor and council members to pass a resolution opposing the casino and on Feb. 6, the Hudson

¹⁷³Before the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, Secretary Babbitt testified that he told the attendees at the tribal dialogue "in some detail" that DOI "was not willing to cram casinos down the throats of unwilling communities." Babbitt House Test. at 803. There is no evidence from the transcript of the tribal dialogue or any other source that Babbitt made such a statement. In his Grand Jury testimony, the Secretary conceded that this was an overstatement or "hyperbole." Grand Jury Testimony of Bruce Babbitt, June 30, 1999, at 133-135 (hereinafter "Babbitt G.J. Test., June 30, 1999").