outcome of the Hudson decision on July 14,[519] even though Kitto has testified that he learned of the decision before he met O'Connor for lunch that day in Minneapolis. Both of them insist that they learned of the outcome only after the denial letter had been released, and not due to any early leak or intelligence.

There is no clear evidence of when O'Connor and Fowler first spoke about the Hudson outcome, but phone records reflect a three-minute call from O'Connor's Minneapolis home to Fowler's office early on Tuesday, July 18, four days after the decision. The next day, O'Connor billed the St. Croix for "discussions with Chairman Donald Fowler regarding Department of Interior decision to reject an application for a casino at the Hudson, WI dog track," and for faxing Fowler copies of two news articles from the Minneapolis Star Tribune concerning the Hudson decision which contained allegations of political pressure in the decision-making. One of the articles was a July 10 piece detailing "intense" lobbying over the then-pending proposal.[520]

The second article O'Connor faxed was published July 15, the day after the decision. It quoted Mark Goff as saying:

---

[519]In his earlier testimony, O'Connor never addressed the issue of whether he first learned of the decision on the day it was published.

[520]*Lobbying intense over Hudson casino plan*, Minneapolis Star Tribune, July 10, 1995, at 1B. The article quoted Kitto at length, who stated:

> We have carried on an intensive effort to stop this. This is a very serious matter for Minnesota and Wisconsin tribes. The president of the United States is aware of this, and I don't say that flippantly.

Id. Kitto was further quoted as saying that Minnesota congressmen had discussed the matter with Secretary Babbitt and White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta. Kitto also described the April 28 meeting with Fowler as an effort "to help communicate to the White House the urgency of this issue." *Id.*