

urged Skibine to recommend denial of the application, complaining that the Ho-Chunk received limited information about the proposal. Accordingly, the Ho-Chunk resorted to using an assumption that the proposed facility would be comparable to the Ho-Chunk facility in Wisconsin Dells (with 1,000 to 2,000 slot machines and approximately 50 blackjack tables) in analyzing the effect of the Hudson proposal. Utilizing a survey conducted by the Ho-Chunk, the letter asserted that a Hudson casino would draw away approximately 10 percent of the customers at the Ho-Chunk's Majestic Pines casino. In the survey, more than half of the respondents stated that they would visit a Hudson casino if one were to open, but the letter did not indicate whether they were asked whether the existence of a Hudson casino would result in fewer visits by them to the Majestic Pines facility.

Duffy replied to the Ho-Chunk on May 31, in a letter asserting that IGMS had responded to the Ho-Chunk's request for data "to the extent permitted by law," and stating that the proposal would be considered carefully by the gaming staff. Duffy noted as well that the Ho-Chunk tribe's earlier response to the MAO consultation letter had not cited the grounds for opposition that were now relied upon.

E. Tribal Opponents' Continuing Lobbying Efforts (Feb. 9, 1995 - June 8, 1995)

On Feb. 9, 1995, the day after the meeting in Congressman Oberstar's office, O'Connor & Hannan's Thomas Corcoran called Penny Coleman, a senior attorney at the National Indian Gaming Commission, and formerly an attorney in the DOI Solicitor's Office. Billing records indicate he also met with Coleman the next day, Feb. 10. Corcoran said he contacted Coleman to find out what the administrative procedures were regarding DOI's consideration of fee-to-trust land transfers for gaming purposes. Corcoran recalls Coleman informed him that there was no