Bieraugel made contact with Chairman Lewis Taylor of the St. Croix tribe, and began an ongoing process of sharing information about the opposition with Taylor. Taylor sent his tribal attorney, Howard Bichler, to meet with the Better Future for Hudson group.

Though the Four Feathers partners alleged that much of the community opposition to the Hudson proposal was generated by wealthy gaming tribes that opposed the expansion of gaming in the Twin Cities market, our investigation did not develop evidence to support this claim. The community opposition appears to have been largely genuine and locally based.

c. Responses by Wisconsin and Minnesota Tribal Governments and Associations

1) Tribal Opposition to the Hudson Application Was Led by the Minnesota Indian Gaming Association

As in the case of the earlier casino proposal contemplated by the track owners and the St. Croix tribes, the Minnesota tribes learned of the Four Feathers proposal before the fee-to-trust application was filed with the Department of the Interior; they immediately commenced opposition efforts. At their Oct. 27, 1993, meeting – more than two months before the MAO solicited comments – MIGA Chairman Myron Ellis opened discussions about the three Wisconsin tribes purchasing the Hudson dog track. Because the group went into executive session for discussion of this issue at its next meeting at the suggestion of attorney Kurt BlueDog, no recordings or minutes of this discussion exists, and no witnesses now recall what was discussed.

Following another discussion about Hudson at a MIGA meeting on Nov. 23, 1993, the tribes agreed that Executive Director McCarthy should re-submit MIGA Resolution No. 92-3,