by nearby tribes because a new casino would compete with their existing facilities was insufficient.[152]

The one staffer who took exception to the conclusion of "no detriment" was Slagle. He believed the environmental assessment was inadequate. He suggested that a more extensive, environmental impact statement should be required.[153] Among his criticisms were that the NEPA analysis did not mention the potential impact of the project on the St. Croix Riverway, although it had generally noted the absence of a wild and scenic riverway assessment required by statute.

2. The Feb. 8, 1995 Meeting of Opponent Tribal Representatives and DOI Officials at Congressman Oberstar's Office

As a result of congressional requests spurred by tribal lobbying, senior Interior gaming officials met with legislators and tribal opponents on Capitol Hill to discuss the Hudson application on Feb. 8, 1995. There were actually two meetings concerning the Hudson casino application held in Rep. Oberstar's office on that date. In the first meeting, tribal leaders and lobbyists met with several members of the Minnesota delegation and their staff to review strategy prior to meeting with officials from Interior. In the second meeting, John Duffy and George Skibine joined the group of tribal leaders and lobbyists already convened in Oberstar's office,

---

[152]Hartman told investigators that his understanding that "detriment" required factual evidentiary support was the result of a conversation with Manuel and his own views. Manuel said that her working interpretation of the term when she was IGMS director was that factual support – more than bald allegations – was necessary to establish "detriment."

[153]Slagle recalled that Ramirez told him that an environmental impact statement was not going to be required, regardless of his analysis. He said that this was consistent with his experience throughout his tenure at IGMS and not unique to the Hudson application. *See* n. 375, *infra*.