

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

David Marimon: Hello, my name is David Marimon. I'm a policy analyst with the National Criminal Justice Association. I would like to welcome you to Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements. This webinar is part of a larger series of webinars from the National Criminal Justice Association and the National Congress of American Indians designed to keep those involved in tribal justice issues apprised of trends and best practices within the field.

Before I go any further, I would like to thank everyone in the audience for joining us today and for the Bureau of Justice Assistants for making this webinar possible.

At this time, I would like to introduce our speakers for today's webinars. First and foremost, we have Regina Holyan. Regina is an enrolled member of the Navajo Nation and currently a principal attorney with the Navajo Nation Department of Justice, in Window Rock, Arizona. She has drafted cross commission agreements for the Navajo Police Department with the Arizona Department of Public Safety, the New Mexico Department of Public Safety, Navajo County Arizona, and the San Juan County in Utah.

In addition, we have Major Larry Scarber of the Arizona Department of Public Safety. He is currently of the Southern Highway Patrol Bureau in Commander in Tucson, Arizona. He is a member of the Arizona Indian Country Intelligence Network and secretary of the Indian Country Law Enforcement Section of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. In addition to his Southern Bureau duties, Major Scarber serves as a tribal liaison for the Department of Public Safety.

At this time, I will turn the presentation over to Regina.

Regina Holyan: Thank you.

David Marimon: Regina, you now have control of the slides.

Regina Holyan: Okay. Yep, good afternoon. This is Regina Holyan. I am legal counsel to the Navajo Division of Public Safety and I advise them on public safety agreements with states and counties. This afternoon, we will give an overview of the public safety agreements that the Navajo Nation has entered into with Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah are not Public Law 280 states.

The Navajo Nation reservation goes into three states. Most of it is in northeastern Arizona, a part into Utah, and then a portion of it into northwestern New Mexico. The definition of the territory of Navajo Nation that we use in these agreements is the Indian Country definition at 18 USC Section 1151, which includes all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation, all dependent Indian communities, and all Indian allotments. The Indian titles to which have not been extinguished.

The New Mexico portion of our reservation is the portion of the reservation that

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

includes allotments and dependent Indian communities. More so than that in Arizona and Utah. The orange portion on this slide is the trust land, the reservation area. The red are what we call the checkerboard area, which includes some dependent Indian communities and allotments in portions of trust land here and there. Directly south of Gallup is McKinley County and to the southeast is Cibola County, directly east, I believe is Bernalillo County, and to the north is San Juan County. And these are the counties that we work with closely in law enforcement, also now shown on this map are three other Navajo Indian Country communities. Directly south of Gallup is Ramah Navajo community, which sits mainly in Cibola County. Then we have directly west of Albuquerque, maybe about 10, 15 miles west is Athuachale in Navajo community. Then west of Socorro, which is south of Albuquerque, we have the Alamo community and there the Socorro County agreement takes in the Alamo community.

Here we have a list of five factors that contribute toward the necessity to enter into agreements with the Navajo Nation. The first factor is the continuous traffic between the Navajo Reservation and border towns. By border towns, we mean those towns that are right off the reservation and near the boundary. For example, Gallup in New Mexico, Flagstaff in Arizona, and Blanding in Utah. The roads that crisscross the Navajo Reservation are owned and maintained by the Navajo Nation, the Bureau of Indian affairs, state, counties, and this of course affects, which government has law enforcement authority on a particular road.

Also, the issue of sovereign immunity. It turns out some of the sheriffs whose counties are contiguous to the reservation have concerns about sovereign immunity and they believe incorrectly that the Navajo Nation should first agree to be sued, before they would consider entering such agreements. These agreements do not waive sovereign immunity, and in the case of the Nation, we already do have the sovereign immunity act where in the Nation has set for these kinds of lawsuits, we can be sued and the suits would be in tribal court. Really, the sovereign immunity issue should be a non-issue as we do not require waiver of it for the state or for the Nation to enter into these agreements.

Increased criminal activities on reservation and off, for example drug smuggling, sexual assaults, domestic violence call for increased activities by law enforcement both state, county, and the Navajo Nation. Then finally, the Navajo Nation Council, our governing body, has several committees, standing committees, and the Law & Order committee regularly consults with state and country law enforcement agencies. So we keep our eyes of what's going on with the other agencies and how that affects the cooperation and collaboration that we can plan.

The agreements that are the subject of this presentation are called different things. Cross-commission agreements, deputization, deputation, law enforcement. The purpose for these agreements regardless of what they're called is simply the commissioning of peace officers by one government to another. In other words,

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

government one commissions peace officers of government two to enforce government one's laws within government one's territory. This is the purpose of these cross-commission agreements because of course, normally without such agreements, peace officers can only enforce laws of their own government. Here, one government, government one can commission peace officers of government two to enforce government one's laws within government one's territory. To commission means to grant peace officers authority to enforce laws, to stop persons, to arrest, to take into custody, to investigate criminal conduct.

This slide shows the agreements that we have currently. The very first one was done in 1981 between Navajo Nation and the New Mexico Department of Public Safety. This has since been superseded by a recent agreement that was done in 2012. 2004 we made an agreement with Apache County in Arizona. 2007 McKinley County in New Mexico. 2009 Socorro County, New Mexico. 2011, we entered into an agreement with the Arizona Department of Public Safety. Just recently within the last week or two, we have entered into agreements with Navajo County, Arizona, and San Juan County, Utah. The agreement with Cibola County in New Mexico is currently pending.

The next slide, authority to enter into agreements. A government has to have two kinds of authorities to enter into these agreements. First, the government has to exercise its inherent authority to commission its own peace officers. For the Navajo Nation, this authority is established at two Navajo Nation code beginning section 1351. For New Mexico, it's New Mexico statute Annotated, beginning at section 29-2-1. For Arizona, it is at Arizona Revised statute section 41-1822.

The second authority necessary is that a government gives itself the authority to grant law enforcement commissions to peace officers of other government agencies. The Navajo Nation has this provision at 17 Navajo Nation Code section 102. For New Mexico, it is at New Mexico statute Annotated 29-1-11. For Arizona, Arizona Revised statute at 13-3874. In these agreements, we cite these authorities to show that they have been properly based on appropriate governmental authorities to enter into agreements.

The Navajo Nation enters into two types of agreements, cross commission agreements with New Mexico and Utah and law enforcement agreements with Arizona. The first type, cross commission agreements, are true cross commissions. Each government agency grants commissions to peace officers of the other agencies. As an example, the agreement with New Mexico Department of Public Safety, the New Mexico State Police in the agreement commissioned Navajo officers to enforce Navajo traffic and criminal laws and in turn, Navajo Division of Public Safety grants New Mexico officers commissions to enforce Navajo traffic and criminal laws. This type of agreement, the commissioning goes both ways. The agreements with Arizona, we call law enforcement agreements to distinguish them from the cross commission agreements because here the situation is different.

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

As it shows on the slide, Arizona has a statute that grants Indian tribal officers who, one, are tribal police officers, and then who meet the Arizona training standards. This statute grants such tribal officers all law enforcement powers of Arizona peace officers. The commissioning of Navajo police officers does not come through the agreement, it is already set by statute. What our agreement with Arizona does with the state of Arizona, DPS, and with Navajo County, Apache County, and Arizona, is that in these agreements, the Navajo Nation grants commissions to the Arizona peace officers to enforce Navajo traffic and criminal laws.

The next slide is on selected provisions in these agreements that the Nation has entered into with states and counties. Typically, our agreements have anywhere from 24 to 30 different provisions and as long as the parties agree to a provision and of course that it's lawful, just about any provision can be included. We will discuss here seven of them.

First, the territorial application provision. These agreements need to set out the territory that will be covered by officers exercising their commissions. For example, in our agreement with Apache County, the Apache County deputies can act as Navajo officers enforcing Navajo traffic and criminal laws within the Navajo reservation portion of Apache County. Or in our agreement with San Juan County, Utah, Navajo officers can act as San Juan County deputies enforcing Utah traffic and criminal laws within the borders of San Juan County, Utah.

Another set of provisions sets our requirements to be met before commissions can be granted and the Navajo Nation requires that each applicant for a Navajo commission, whether they be state highway patrol or a county deputy, that each applicant must have a satisfactory criminal background check done within five years of the application. That the officer or deputy have a valid state driver's license, a valid peace officer commission granted by the state of the county, and they must participate in a two-day training provided by the Navajo Nation. And these agreements also set out what states and counties require for our Navajo officers to be commissioned by them.

Other provisions set out guidelines for procedures relating to arrests, issuing traffic citations, who can take custody, and these agreements do not set out the step by step details of these procedures. They simply provide guidelines. There's also a provision that each government agency supervises and controls its own officers and at all times, these officers and deputies remain employees of their own agencies. Then there is no waiver of sovereign immunity by either government agency. As I have said before, each agency does not waive its sovereign immunity. A seventh provision that's not listed on the slide but is a key provision, is these agreements allow hot pursuit or fresh pursuit. For example, on the Navajo Nation side, these agreements allow an exception to the Navajo Nation's extradition statute. Our extradition statute requires that any state or county law enforcement agency that

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

wants to arrest an Indian on our reservation for a state crime has to go through our extradition procedure. But these agreements provide an exception such that if a state officer or a county deputy who has a Navajo commission has probably cause to pursue an Indian into Navajo Indian Country for a state offense, that officer or deputy may arrest and take the Indian back onto state or county land.

I believe this is our last slide. The Nation has entered into so many agreements that we by now have a more or less standardized process. It begins with either the Navajo Police Department or a state or county expressing its desire to enter into such an agreement and Navajo Nation Department of Justice is involved in this process because we advise Navajo Police Department and we have developed two templates. One for cross commission agreements and the other for law enforcement agreements. The Department of Justice first adapts a template, the template that would be appropriate for the particular state or county, adapts it for that county or that state. Once we've completed that, we send it to our Navajo Police Department, to the Police Chief and to the executive director of NPD for them to review it and when they let us know it's okay, we then send the proposed agreement or the memorandum of agreement, the MOA, to the state or the county for its review.

Any questions and concerns that come up from them, we work it out among the three of us. A state of county, NPD, and Department of Justice. Once all three parties agree to the language, then that agreement is released to the state or county for it to process the MOA through its review and approval system. Sometimes the governor of the state has to be the last signatory on these agreements. Once the state or county completes its system, then usually three signed original are returned to the Navajo Nation and we then process it through our system. The last step in our system is approval by the budget and finance committee, which is a standing committee of our Navajo Nation Council. Once that approval is given by the budget and finance committee, we have an official MOA. Once we have that, then the state or the county work with ... We work with them to schedule a two-day training.

Finally, the commissions will be granted. Usually the state or county and the officers come to our capital here in Window Rock, Arizona, and their documentation is all here and accounted for. We make sure of that, and their photos are taken. They get their cards, which are signed by the Executive Director of the Navajo Division of Public Safety. The last step is the state highway officer or the county deputy takes his or her oath of office to serve as a Navajo police officer before a Navajo Nation District Court Judge or a Supreme Court Justice.

This concludes our brief and general overview of public safety agreements as done by the Navajo Nation. Now I will turn the presentation over to Major Larry Scarber.

David Marimon: Larry, you should now have control of the slides.

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

Larry, you gotta unmute yourself.

Larry Scarber: Good day. It's an honor to be presenting today and particularly to be presenting with Regina Holyan. Regina was the driving force behind the law enforcement mutual aid agreement between Arizona DPS and the Navajo Nation and additionally last year, she and Navajo Police Sergeant Mark Keams provided training on tribal law, procedures and culture to nearly 50 Arizona DPS officers as part of our process to obtain tribal commission cards.

I wish I'd have the advantage of that training 25 years ago when I was a new highway patrolman just assigned to duties on the Navajo Nation.

My topic today is law enforcement collaboration between state or local and tribal agencies. Why should we collaborate? If I'm with the state, I may suppose the tribes don't need anything from me, after all, they have all that gaming money. And besides, the Federal Government takes care of everything they need. If I'm with a tribe, I may think, well the state has no need of us, they have more resources than they know what to do with. They certainly wouldn't want to train with us. What could we offer that they don't already have?

Anyone who's taken the effort to look at state and tribal law enforcement in and around Indian Country will quickly recognize that both viewpoints are flawed. Neither the tribes, nor the adjacent state or local agencies have all the resources they need to provide adequate law enforcement services to the citizens they serve.

The biggest reason for collaboration and the biggest reason to identify the obstacles and challenges to collaboration and then do all we can to overcome them, is the human cost if we do nothing. President Obama recognized this as he supported and continues to support the implementation of the Tribal Law and Order Act. In the language of the Act itself, Congress finds that quote "Domestic and sexual violence against American Indian and Alaskan Native women has reached epidemic proportions. 34% of American Indian and Alaskan Native women will be raped in their lifetimes and 39% of American Indian and Alaskan Native women will be subject to domestic violence," close quote.

If I were a Native American father raising a daughter in Indian Country, I would be terrified by those numbers and I'd be outraged. As most of you well know, domestic and sexual violence are not the only crimes you deal with in Indian Country. As we also know, criminals do not respect the invisible line separating Indian Country from the states. Criminals don't discriminate. The same people who victimize the residents of Indian Country also victimize those outside of Indian Country, which is why we must work together.

Sections 221 and 222 of the Tribal Law and Order Act refer respectively to state

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

criminal jurisdiction and resources and state tribal and local law enforcement cooperation. As a state officer, I was immediately interested to see what the Act might require of us. Section 221 refers only to providing concurrent jurisdiction at the request of tribes in public law 280 states. Section 222 authorizes the attorney general to provide technical and other assistance to state, local, and tribal governments who enter into cooperative agreements to improve law enforcement effectiveness and public safety in Indian Country.

The TLOA creates no demands upon the states, nor does it provide specific incentives, which might entice the states and try to work together cooperatively. The primary reason to work together goes back to reducing the human costs and improving the quality of life by improving public safety on and around Indian Country.

Working together between state and tribal law enforcement agencies should be a natural fit. Often we attend the same police academies, or if not the same academies, we receive generally equivalent training. We dress similarly, we talk on the same types of radios using the same types of radio codes, and utilize much of the same equipment and tactics. While the laws we enforce may be different, they are not entirely dissimilar. We have a state traffic law regarding driving under the influence of alcohol. Every tribal community or nation around which I've worked also has some variation of a DUI law.

Yet sometimes, tribal police agencies are seen as different. Secretive, under-trained, even backward by their state and local peers. Too often this is due to a failure by both sides to communicate and interact. Most of the studies I've reviewed about improving public safety in Indian Country agree on the need for cross jurisdictional cooperation. Jurisdiction in Indian Country is very complex. Cross jurisdictional agreement, whether it's cross deputization, mutual aid, or whatever form it may take, cuts through some of that jurisdictional maze by empowering the officer at the scene regardless of the uniform he or she may wear to take effective enforcement action regardless of the race of the offender.

Certainly there are other reasons in addition to the victimization of our citizens to support collaboration. Most agencies are understaffed. Many states and communities are just now starting to see flickers of light following a long, dark recession. Employees, including public safety employees, have been laid off or vacancies have been carried unfilled in order to balance budgets. Many tribal police agencies have been chronically understaffed for years, long before the recession. Add to that, the vast and often remote areas that make up much of Indian Country, and it's easy to see the advantage of sharing our personnel. Tribal officers backing up state officers on call and vice versa.

Budget cuts highlight the benefits of shared resources. An excellent example I'm familiar with is the Yuma Regional Communication System. Two tribes, the county,

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

and several municipal agencies have pooled their resources into a single state-of-the-art communication system, which provides reliable communications and interoperability for all participants. Indian lands share and sometimes cross international boundaries, both on our northern and southern borders. With hostile nations and individuals threatening our citizens, our infrastructure, even our way of life, it is incumbent upon us to secure those borders as best we can. That make take the efforts of multiple agencies, federal, state, tribal, and local.

Finally, as budgets decline, police training tends to suffer. Joint training not only maximizes the use of limited resources, it better prepares officers from various agencies to work together under stressful conditions. A good example of this is the active shooter training, which prepares officers to respond to an armed threat in a school or business. One of the keys to a successful response is to have the first two, three, or four officers responding to a scene team up to make a rapid entry. Something that they are much better prepared to do if they've trained together previously.

With all of those advantages, it would seem to be a no-brainer. We should just collaborate, but what gets in the way? Well, generally we do, often with the personal baggage we carry. Baggage such as distrust, some of that distrust may be based on our history, both personal and cultural. It may be based on continued attacks on sovereignty or on taxation issues or the unwillingness of a tribe to share criminal justice information with the state. Sometimes the distrust may be due to a lack of understanding. I may be dealing with the same issue you're dealing with, but if I think I'm doing okay, why should I cross the road or the fence or imaginary line to see how you are doing. But if I don't, I'll never know that we might have been able to solve some of our problems by working on them together.

Prejudice is another barrier to collaboration. Unfortunately, we have not yet arrived at that dream for a day by Dr. King, when we would not judge people by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character. In addition to personal prejudice, there is organization prejudice, where an agency is judged by their staffing, or equipment, or facilities, or simply by a stereotype. Agencies may avoid collaboration because they think it may cost them money or resources. Or someone in our agency, several administrations ago, may have had a bad experience with someone at the state or at the tribe, and because of that bad experience, often repeated and sometimes exaggerated, we refuse to reach out again.

Another obstacle can be impatience. Both the tribes and the states have their levels of bureaucracies, which require patience to waive through, particularly if a formal agreement is required to execute the collaboration. For example, the mutual aid agreement Regina and I and many others worked to establish between the state of Arizona and the Navajo Nation started with a meeting in Window Rock on July 14, 2011. The final signature, which made the agreement effective,

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

occurred nearly five months later on December 9, 2011. That seemed like a long time to the DPS officers who were living on the Navajo Nation and who could not take enforcement actions on Native Americans following the suspension of all the commission cards pending that agreement. But in fact it was one of the quickest agreements with which I had been involved.

Let's use the Navajo agreement to look at some of the common denominators of successful collaboration. Historically, Arizona DPS had a long history of working with the Navajo Nation, over four decades. It was my first time [inaudible 00:32:36] over 25 years ago. At that time, we received commission cards from the chief of the tribal police shortly after our arrival to the nation. But there was no formal agreement. When the tribal council passed a law or a requirement that required formal mutual aid agreements and suspended the commission cards, there was a recognized need for collaboration. We had several hundred miles of state and federal highways within the nation's boundaries to patrol and we had officers residing in several Navajo communities. It was beneficial to the state to have officers stationed in that corner of the state and it was beneficial to the Navajo Nation to have a continued close working relationship with Arizona DPS. With an area that large, larger than some of the eastern states, everyone in uniform was a friend and a shared resource. Because of the need, Regina for the Nation, and Annie Foster, and the legal advisor to DPS at the Arizona Attorney General's Office, drove the effort to get a satisfactory agreement quickly.

As small problems popped up, such as the length of the training required for commission cards, or how to handle suspects arrested in a court district, which extended into New Mexico, we worked to resolve them in a manner, which was satisfactory to all parties. As we worked together closely toward a common goal, the barriers fell and trust was established.

Here's some example of some successful collaborations that I'm familiar with. In 2002, Arizona peace officers standards and trainings and the Arizona Indian Country Intelligence Network developed and transmitted statewide a teleconference with an included resource guide about Indian Country history and jurisdictional issues. In September 2011, the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center, or ACTIC, conducted a week-long, all tribal, terrorism liaison officer training course on the Gila River Indian Community. 16 law enforcement and fire employees representing nine different tribes attended. Additionally, the Tahoma Authom police chief, Joseph Delgado, was a member of the ACTIC Executive Board and the Gila River Police Department has a terrorism liaison officer assigned directly to the ACTIC. For several years, the Arizona Indian Country Gang Summit has drawn police, corrections and probation officers from tribal, federal, state, and municipal agencies, along with prosecutors and tribal officials to learn about gang trends, intelligence, investigations, education and prevention measures.

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

Approximately a decade ago, a Fort McDowell officer called for assistance in a domestic violence call and Arizona DPS refused to respond due to lack of jurisdiction. Fortunately the officer was not hurt, but the incident highlighted the need for a cooperative agreement. Fort McDowell is a fairly small nation of about 40 square miles with a well-trained and well-equipped police department. They don't want or need DPS officers patrolling regularly within their community. However, occasionally, they have need or potential need for additional resources, such as back up officers, hazmat personnel, or even a SWAT team, so our agreement was tailored for those situations. The agreement between the Navajo Nation and DPS is more comprehensive. DPS officers working on the Navajo Nation are expected to patrol a vast area and are commissioned to cite violators into tribal courts, book suspects into tribal jails, and testify in tribal courts.

Similar to their safe streets initiatives for urban areas, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has established a number of safe trails initiatives in Indian Country, including two in Arizona. Working as a task force, officers from several agencies, work under the auspices of the FBI to investigate violent crime in Indian Country. In recent years, laws were passed to enable many of the Arizona tribes to enroll their police officers in the state, public safety retirement system. There was a large initial investment by the participating tribes to enroll their officers, but this has had the effect of allowing officers to move from state to tribal, to municipal agencies without losing retirement benefits. I believe that movement has been generally healthy and has led to the breaking down of some of the [inaudible 00:36:48] surrounding tribal law enforcement.

Best practices are those, which enable an officer at the scene to take effective law enforcement action regardless of the race of the offender and that requires shared or cooperative authority. It can take the form of a formal written agreement, which is beneficial because it spells out the power, expectations, duties and limitations upon recipients of that authority. It can clarify extradition, hot pursuit, reporting, and other requirements.

Cross deputization is when each sovereign grants law enforcement powers to all or selected officers of the other sovereign, just as Regina explained. Tribal commissions are granted to individual officers to empower them to enforce tribal laws. And the Bureau of Indian Affairs Special Law Enforcement Commission empowers tribal and sometimes state officers to act as federal officers in the enforcement of serious federal crimes.

Other best practices are those things, which encourage the breaking down of barriers to collaboration. Joint training is an efficient and effective use of resources and if hosted by a tribe, as many training sessions are in Arizona, is an effective way of exposing state and local officers to tribal resources and culture and begins making friends of strangers.

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

Joint enforcement and task forces and special enforcement details is another method of developing relationships and it shows the public that law enforcement, regardless of the agency, is united and serious about public safety. Sometimes just a phone call or getting together for lunch may be the best strategy for creating or strengthening ties between agencies. It's much easier to call on someone for a favor or to offer assistance if you know the person from previous face to face context. Many states have statewide or regional law enforcement associations, which may support professional development, information sharing, and training. Several states have associations of tribal police executives. Participation in these organizations may be beneficial and reduce the isolation in agency or an agency executive may feel. Expanding professional contacts and linking people with similar concerns and challenges. It may be harder but provide even more benefits when state executives reach out to tribal organizations and when tribal executives reach out and involve themselves with state or regional organizations.

We know that public safety does not exist in a vacuum. It's not a sealed container into which only law enforcement personnel may enter. Crime creates social problems and social issues beget crime. The most successful collaborations reach out to resources, state and tribal, that can help address these social issues. Coincidentally, the March 2013 issue of *Police Chief*, the publication of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has an excellent article entitled "How Multidisciplinary Teams Achieve Success in Indian Country." It deals with the benefits of multidisciplinary teams in dealing with child abuse cases in Indian Country. This is certainly not an exhaustive list but has served as a good starting point for me when I need to find something out about Indian Country resources, services, challenges and initiatives.

First of course, are our sponsors of today's webinar, the National Congress of American Indians and the National Criminal Justice Association, as well as the Bureau of Justice Assistants, a component of the US Department of Justice. Next I've included the website for the International Association of Chiefs of Police, followed by the National Conference of State Legislatures, an organization that provides research and technical assistance directed towards state legislators and includes the number of publications about collaboration between the state and tribal government.

The next site I listed is the Tribal Court ClearingHouse, a website maintained by the Tribal Law and Policy Institute based in California, and, which has a wealth of links, publications, and other resources. And last of course, is the US Department of Justice website with emphasis on their tribal resources.

In his book, *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, the late Stephen Covey, focused on assessing and then increasing our level of pro-activity. He showed a circle, which he called our circle of concern. Within that circle are all the things, which concern us. Our health, our families, our work problems, national debt, war,

State-Tribal Collaboration Webinar Series

Enhancing Cooperation: Tribal-State Public Safety Agreements

crimes and famine. Then he added a smaller circle within the circle of concern. The smaller circle he called the circle of influence. Included in the circle of influence are those things over which we have some control or that we can do something about. Dr. Covey suggested that each of us analyze, which of the two circles is the focus of most of our time and energy. He wrote quote "Proactive people focus their efforts in the circle of influence. They work on the things they can do something about," end quote.

My friend, Chief Bill Danke, of the Sichuan Tribal Police in California, in his testimony before the Indian Law and Order Commission, noted an attempt several years ago to seek legislation through the state to grant California peace officer status to qualified tribal police officers. Ultimately, the effort failed. As Chief Danke explained, quote, "In hindsight, it was probably too big and broad of a step to take," end quote. At least perhaps at that time, but rather than give up, his agency moved ahead with some smaller collaborative agreements. With the Bureau of Indian Affairs and with local agencies including obtaining special law enforcement commissions from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for qualified tribal officers, gaining access to a regional communications system, and shared law enforcement training. Chief Danke focused on those things he could do something about and with positive results for all the involved agencies.

We can either wring our hands at the funding problems that plague nearly all law enforcement agencies, the lack of staffing, the issues surrounding interoperability, or the seeming lack of political will in some of our leaders. Or we can roll up our sleeves and go to work on solving problems that are within our grasp. Out of small things perceived that which is great. If after joining us in today's webinar, you do nothing different, your time has probably been wasted. Reach out to your counterpart, either in state or tribal government. Go to lunch, discuss your agency's greatest challenges. I suspect you will find you have more in common than is different. You may find that you'll already have solutions for one another's challenges or you can work together on common solutions. Even if you don't come up with a tangible result, you will have furthered your understanding of your own issues and their understanding of your issues and gained an understanding of someone else's.

If you think about it, shoot me an email. I'd love to hear some of your success stories because those boost my resolve as well. With that, I will end mine and turn this back over the host. Thank you.