

# Tribal Law Enforcement in Mille Lacs County

From 1953-2016

## Pre-1953

- Federal criminal jurisdiction was primary in tribal areas
- Federal criminal jurisdiction was the *only* jurisdiction for “major crimes.”
- Tribes had the ability to criminally prosecute tribal members for minor offenses
- Tribes had no infrastructure or court systems to hold tribal members accountable
- There is a growing problem of criminal activity in tribal areas and offenders not being held accountable by either federal authorities or the tribes.
- Concern leads to Congressional action.

1953

- Public Law 280 is passed
- This law is primarily meant to address the lawlessness in tribal areas. *See Bryan v. Itasca County*, 426 U.S. 373, 379-80, 96 S.Ct. 2102, 2106-07, 48 L.Ed.2d 710 (1976).
- Purpose of the law was to give criminal jurisdiction to the states and hold more offenders accountable.
- All tribal lands in Minnesota are Public Law 280, except for Red Lake, which is still considered a “closed” reservation.
- Federal justice system’s role in Public Law 280 jurisdictions is the same as in any other state; there is no special federal jurisdiction on tribal lands.

1987

- United States Supreme Court issues major tribal criminal justice opinion, *California v. Cabazon*.
- California, like Minnesota, was a Public Law 280 state, so criminal jurisdiction had been delegated to the state.
- California sought to enforce criminal gambling statutes to prevent high-stakes Bingo provided by a tribe on its reservation.
- United States Supreme Court clarified:
- “[I]f the intent of a state law is generally to **prohibit certain conduct**, it falls within Pub.L. 280’s grant of **criminal jurisdiction**, but if the state law generally permits the conduct at issue, subject to regulation, it must be classified as **civil/regulatory and Pub.L. 280 does not authorize its enforcement on an Indian reservation**. The shorthand test is whether the conduct at issue violates the State’s public policy.”

1987-1990

- A debate takes place in Minnesota and other states about how best to conduct law enforcement on tribal lands with the new *criminal prohibitory / civil regulatory* distinction
- Minnesota considers a range of potential solutions
- Ultimately, it is determined that it is not in Minnesotans' best interests to have two different sets of laws enforced over the same people in the same geographic area.
- A statutory solution is sought to codify this to benefit public safety and create consistent expectations for Minnesota citizens

1990

- Tribal Police Department is created.
- A former Mille Lacs County Deputy is hired to be the Mille Lacs Band's Police Chief.
- He is the only employee of the Mille Lacs Band Police Department
- The Tribal Police Chief fully understands that he is not a "peace officer" and has the same powers as any other citizen under Minnesota law.

1991

- Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 is passed and becomes law.
- Applies only to the Mille Lacs Band and Mille Lacs County.
- This statute is the result of a delicate compromise so as not to disadvantage either Mille Lacs Band or Mille Lacs County in longstanding boundary dispute.
- Both parties agree that the 1855 Treaty created a reservation. The long-held position of Mille Lacs County and the State of Minnesota is that that reservation was subsequently diminished or disestablished by the Nelson Act of 1889 and other Federal actions, and the Mille Lacs Band's **sovereignty is limited to lands held in trust** by the Federal government pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.
- Mille Lacs County and the Mille Lacs Band "agree to disagree" about the boundary to benefit public safety for all Mille Lacs County residents.

Minn. Stat.  
sec. 626.90  
(1991)

- Band Police Department is given the “powers of a law enforcement agency” under state law if certain conditions are met
- Band must waive sovereign immunity as to the acts of its police department and agree to the same limit of insurance as any other municipality
- Officers must be licensed under Minnesota’s Board of Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST Board)
- Band agrees that its police department will be subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act
- **Band must enter into a Cooperative Agreement with the Mille Lacs County Sheriff to define and regulate its law enforcement services and define the trust property involved in the agreement.**
- Mille Lacs County Attorney is the **sole prosecuting authority.**

Where did  
Minn. Stat.  
sec. 626.90  
apply?  
(1991)

- If all of the conditions were followed, and the powers of a state law enforcement agency were granted to the Mille Lacs Band, it's police department had jurisdiction in three circumstances. Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90(2)(c).
  - #1 - over all persons in the geographical boundaries of the property held by the United States in trust for the Mille Lacs Band or the Minnesota Chippewa tribe
  - #2 - over all Minnesota Chippewa tribal members within the boundaries of the Treaty of February 22, 1855, 10 Stat. 1165, in Mille Lacs County, Minnesota
  - #3 - concurrent jurisdiction over any person who commits or attempts to commit a crime in the presence of an appointed band peace officer within the boundaries of the Treaty of February 22, 1855, 10 Stat. 1165, in Mille Lacs County, Minnesota.
- 
- Petty Misdemeanors are not a crime. Minn. Stat. sec. 609.02(4a).

## What was the Compromise?

- Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90(7): “This section is limited to law enforcement authority only, and nothing in this section shall affect any other jurisdictional relationships or disputes involving the band or current reservation boundaries.”
- 2008 Cooperative Agreement: “Jurisdiction and Defenses Not Waived. . . . Nothing in this Agreement or its performance by the parties or their law enforcement officers shall prejudice the respective positions of the Band and the County regarding the current existence and status of the Mille Lacs Indian Reservation or the extent of Indian country in the County”

1991

- Mille Lacs County Sheriff Jules Zimmer signs the first Cooperative Agreement with the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe.
- Mille Lacs Band Police Department is granted the powers of a state law enforcement agency under Minnesota law.
- The entire department consists of one Chief of Police, a former Mille Lacs County Deputy.
- The concept of “inherent tribal criminal authority” is discarded from a practical perspective in favor of shared state criminal authority. This essentially remains the state of affairs for 16 years until 2007.

1996

- Dennis Boser is elected Mille Lacs County Sheriff. Sheriff Boser and Mille Lacs Band Police Chief Bruce Lindgren rewrite the cooperative agreement.
- This was more of a cleanup, not a substantive change.
- The statute and cooperative agreement are both silent on whether a change in sheriff requires a new cooperative agreement or not.
- The Mille Lacs Band Police Department is approximately 5-7 officers.

1997-99

- Minn. Stat. Secs. 626.91-93 are passed with provisions very similar to Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90.
- Applies to (1) Lower Sioux, (2) Fond du Lac, and finally (3) all “federally recognized Indian tribes”
- Regarding all other tribes, their jurisdiction was “the geographical boundaries of the tribe's reservation.”
- None of the other tribes in the State of Minnesota have a boundary dispute similar to the Mille Lacs Band and Mille Lacs County.

2002-04

- Mille Lacs County files a lawsuit for declaratory judgment to determine the boundary of tribal lands in Mille Lacs County.
- Mille Lacs County's position is that the reservation's boundary was diminished or disestablished by the Nelson Act of 1889, but the tribe would still have sovereignty over its lands held in trust by the Federal Government pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.
- The Mille Lacs Band's position is that 1855 reservation remains intact.
- Court ruling: **No decision** because the reservation boundary does not harm Mille Lacs County. The case is not "ripe."

2007

- Mille Lacs Band revokes the Mutual Aid Agreement
- This was primarily due to issues between the County Attorney and the Solicitor General. County Attorney is frustrated because not all police reports are provided for review as the sole prosecuting authority under Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90.
- The concept of inherent tribal criminal authority returns to the forefront. Mille Lacs Band asserts that it may prevent the County Attorney from seeing reports that are under inherent tribal criminal authority and not under Minnesota state law.
- Mille Lacs Band Police Department is now 15+ officers and continues to grow.
- Mille Lacs County is entirely unprepared for this revocation. County Board approves two additional deputies to provide increased coverage to replace the Mille Lacs Band Police Department.

2008

- A new Cooperative Agreement is signed.
- Mille Lacs County gives in to the Mille Lacs Band's demand to withhold police reports from the County Attorney. Mille Lacs County Attorney refuses to sign the 2008 Cooperative Agreement.
- Paragraph 6(d) is added to the 2008 Cooperative Agreement and allows for the independent exercise of inherent tribal criminal authority:
  - (i) No report to County Attorney
  - (ii) Report to Band's Police Chief and Solicitor General
  - (iii) May consult with Solicitor General about duties
  - (iv) "Nothing in this Agreement shall authorize, govern or limit the Band's exercise of its own law enforcement authority or the Band's prosecution of any crime or traffic offense within its prosecutorial jurisdiction."

2010

- Tribal Law and Order Act is passed.
- The main purpose of TLOA is underserved Indian communities that have *only* federal and tribal jurisdiction such as South Dakota and Nevada.
- Sponsored by North Dakota Senator Byron Dorgan.

2011-12

- Department of Justice starts quarterly meetings about public safety in Indian Country
- TLOA and all of its implications are first described to law enforcement throughout Minnesota
- Mille Lacs Band Police Chief Dwight Reed publicly opposes implementation of federal concurrent jurisdiction in Mille Lacs County under TLOA, stating that it would be a “land grab”
- White Earth is the first tribe in the nation to apply for federal concurrent prosecutorial jurisdiction under TLOA
- Mille Lacs Band Solicitor General Todd Matha states that Mille Lacs Band has no intention of applying for federal concurrent jurisdiction under TLOA

2013

- March 15, 2013—White Earth’s application for federal concurrent prosecutorial jurisdiction is granted, to be effective January 1, 2014
- First tribe in the nation to receive this federal concurrent jurisdiction
- White Earth is a reservation with defined boundaries.
- The additional TLOA jurisdiction theoretically applies to a very limited subset of cases—violent and serious crimes that are **not** related to guns, gangs, and drugs.
- Weeks after White Earth’s application is approved, Mille Lacs Band applies for TLOA jurisdiction.

## 2013 (continued)

- Mille Lacs County opposes federal concurrent jurisdiction
- Extensive arguments are made by Mille Lacs County and the Mille Lacs Band about the adequacy of law enforcement and prosecution in Mille Lacs County
- Mille Lacs County meets with representatives from Governor's Office in 2013 to explain the boundary issue and the State's longstanding position.
- Mille Lacs County receives letter from the Governor stating that "the State of Minnesota's longstanding position has been, and continues to be, that the boundaries of the Mille Lacs Reservation are limited to approximately 4,000 acres of land held in trust by the federal government for the Mille Lacs Band."
- This is important to TLOA because any approved jurisdiction will necessarily have to consider the geographic area over which this concurrent jurisdiction is applied.

April 26, 2013

Mr. Tracy Toulon  
Director  
Office of Tribal Justice  
United States Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Re: Mile Lacs Band of Ojibwe Tribal Request for Federal Concurrent Criminal Jurisdiction

Dear Mr. Toulon:

This letter responds to your March 12, 2013, notice concerning the Mile Lacs Band of Ojibwe's request for Federal concurrent criminal jurisdiction over approximately 61,000 acres of land located in Mile Lacs County.

Federal law states that the United States may accept concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction within areas of Indian Country. The State of Minnesota's longstanding position has been, and continues to be, that the boundaries of the Mile Lacs Reservation are limited to approximately 4,000 acres of land held in trust by the federal government for the Mile Lacs Band.

Thank you for your consideration.



Mark Dayton  
Governor

2013-15

- Mille Lacs Band's application for federal concurrent jurisdiction under TLOA is on indefinite hold for over 2 ½ years.
- Mille Lacs Band Police Chief Dwight Reed is removed from his position and a new Police Chief is appointed.

2015

- There is a marked shift in the direction of the Mille Lacs Band Police Department under the new Chief of Police. There appears to be “toe-testing” the boundaries in Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90.
- There is an intentional effort to exclude the Mille Lacs County Sheriff’s Office from MLBPD investigations, including a death investigation.
- MLBPD Search warrants are withheld from the Mille Lacs County Sheriff in violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 626.13.
- A demonstrably false press release is issued regarding a vehicular homicide case that contradicts existing police reports of multiple agencies
- One felony drug offense was submitted to the County Attorney’s Office where the report states the drug evidence was “destroyed.”
- Over 50 Mille Lacs Band police reports are marked as sensitized and hidden from the Sheriff’s Office.

June 2015

- Mille Lacs Band and other tribal entities enter into a cooperative agreement that appeared similar to a Joint Powers Agreement, but did not cite any state law.
- Instead, the authority cited was inherent tribal authority “from time immemorial.”
- Purpose was to create a Intertribal Violent Offenders Task Force
- This entity was funded with seed and training money by the Office of Justice Programs through the Violent Crimes Coordinating Council without any oversight provision.
- This entity does not exist under State law and is not directly overseen by the VCCC.
- The Agreement was not shared with Mille Lacs County or any other county before it was executed.

July-  
September,  
2015

- Mille Lacs Band Police Department states its desire to have other tribal police officers provide law enforcement services within Mille Lacs County.
- County Attorney issues an opinion discussing this issue stating that the JPA should be formally amended to comply with the requirements of State Law and the Mille Lacs County Attorney's Office will supply a proposed amendment.
- A very brief Addendum and Memorandum of Understanding are sent to the Mille Lacs Band on September 17, 2015, clarifying as follows:
  - This is a joint powers agreement pursuant to 471.59, not a joint powers entity
  - All law enforcement activity by any officers under this joint powers agreement is pursuant to 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement, including the required waiver of sovereign immunity and complying with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act.

November  
20, 2015

- Solicitor General of the United States Department of the Interior issues Opinion M-37032, "Opinion on the Boundaries of the Mille Lacs Reservation."
- Conclusion was that "the Mille Lacs Reservation, as it was established by the 1855 Treaty, remains intact."
- M Opinion concludes that "evidence regarding state jurisdiction does not heavily weigh one way or another because state law has recognized and deferred to tribal authority in some contexts." The support for this citation is Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement with Mille Lacs County. This is inconsistent with the compromise in Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement.
- This Opinion is not provided to Mille Lacs County upon its issuance.

November  
25, 2015

- US Attorney Andy Luger writes a letter to the Office of Tribal Justice providing his comments regarding federal concurrent jurisdiction pursuant to TLOA.
- Notes “Minimal communication with all the impacted parties” to date
- Predicts that granting jurisdiction may cause “the USAO to expend considerable resources litigating the issue of what is Indian Country . . . [and] the USAO would require significant support and financial resources to address a challenge to jurisdiction if the USAO accepted prosecution for a crime occurring in the disputed land.”

Dec. 2015-  
May, 2016

- Mille Lacs Band advocates several times to change Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90.
- Each time, Mille Lacs County discovered the proposed change after being informed by a third party
- The purpose of the bill was to remove the statutory requirement that Mille Lacs Band have a Cooperative Agreement with the Mille Lacs County Sheriff.
- Mille Lacs County formally opposes these statutory changes by resolution.
- Legislative session ends, and no bill passes changing the statutory language.

January 8,  
2016

- After over 2 ½ years, federal government grants the Mille Lacs Band's application for concurrent federal jurisdiction under TLOA.

February  
2016

- Mille Lacs County Attorney requests a meeting to discuss implementation of TLOA.
- Mille Lacs County Attorney and Mille Lacs County Sheriff attend the meeting and request clarification regarding the geographic area that will apply to the assumption of federal concurrent jurisdiction.
- Karen Schommer and Deidre Aanstad from the US Attorney's Office say that they have no information or documentation regarding the affected geographic area.
- M Opinion is not provided to Mille Lacs County at this time.

May 7, 2016

- Mille Lacs County discovers the M Opinion on the Department of the Interior's website. The M Opinion was never given to Mille Lacs County by the Mille Lacs Band or the US Attorney's Office.
- Mille Lacs County Attorney calls Deidre Aanstad, who is surprised that Mille Lacs County has seen the M Opinion. AUSA Aanstad says that the USAO has had the M Opinion, but was forbidden from sharing it with Mille Lacs County "on orders from Washington, D.C."
- Mille Lacs County promptly informs the Attorney General's Office of the M Opinion and its ramifications.

# The M Opinion (revisited)

- Solicitor General of the United States Department of the Interior issues Opinion M-37032, “Opinion on the Boundaries of the Mille Lacs Reservation.”
- Conclusion was that “the Mille Lacs Reservation, as it was established by the 1855 Treaty, remains intact.”
- M Opinion concludes that “evidence regarding state jurisdiction does not heavily weigh one way or another because state law has recognized and deferred to tribal authority in some contexts.” The support for this citation is Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement with Mille Lacs County. This is inconsistent with the compromise in Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement.

May 7, 2016-  
June 21,  
2016

- Mille Lacs County thoughtfully considers the current relationship and lack of communication between the county and the Mille Lacs Band regarding law enforcement.
- Mille Lacs County determines that the Cooperative Agreement is no longer cooperative.
- Mille Lacs Tribal Police participate in a federal “Click it or Ticket” campaign during which approximately 80 hours of officer time is spent patrolling highways outside of federal trust lands, including petty misdemeanor traffic stops of non-natives, which is in violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and the Cooperative Agreement. Mille Lacs County learns of this from the Tribal Police Facebook feed.
- United States Attorney’s Office reiterates that Mille Lacs Band may self-refer cases directly to the USAO under the assumption of federal jurisdiction under TLOA.
- Cases sensitized from the Sheriff in 2015-16 near 100.

June 21,  
2016

- On June 21, 2016, Mille Lacs County passes Resolution No. 6-21-16-2 revoking the Cooperative Agreement signed in 2008.
- “The sole remedy shall be for one or more of the parties to exercise its right to terminate this Agreement. . . . No suit to enforce the terms of this Agreement shall be brought against any party to this Agreement.”
- Resolution states Mille Lacs County’s desire to have a new Cooperative Agreement with the Mille Lacs Band.
- Publicly sets forth the reasons for the revocation in detail.
- Mille Lacs County formally requests an audit of the Mille Lacs Band Police Department evidence rooms to facilitate the transfer of state law enforcement authority.
- Revocation is to be effective July 21, 2016 at midnight.

June 21,  
2016-  
July 21, 2016

- Mille Lacs County Attorney formally requests an Opinion from the Attorney General pursuant to Minn. Stat. sec. 8.07 regarding the application of Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90 and requests an audit of Mille Lacs Band evidence rooms from the Minnesota Auditor.
- Mille Lacs Band refuses to comply with any audit and states that their state law enforcement authority in Mille Lacs County will continue despite the lack of a cooperative agreement.
- Attorney General refuses to provide an Opinion and directs the County Attorney to provide legal advice to Mille Lacs County.
- State Auditor states that they have no authority to audit any tribal police department.
- Mille Lacs County Attorney repeatedly reaches out for in-person negotiations regarding a new cooperative agreement.
- Mille Lacs Band refuses to meet in person and demands a new written proposal for a cooperative agreement.

July 18, 2016

- After attempts to negotiate a new cooperative agreement and/or receive an Opinion from the Attorney General pursuant to Minn. Stat. sec. 8.07 are unsuccessful, the County Attorney provides an opinion and protocol for law enforcement to the County Sheriff pursuant to Minn. Stat. sec. 388.051(1)(b).
- Primary purpose is to avoid encounters between law enforcement in the field.
- Conclusion: On the application of State law and current agreements, Mille Lacs Band Police Department remains a state law enforcement agency in Pine County, but is not a state law enforcement agency in Mille Lacs County.
- MLBPD may conduct warrant arrests, citizen's arrests, provide statements/reports, carry a firearm.
- MLBPD may not issue citations, apply for search warrants, use firearms to effect a citizen's arrest, conduct investigations, impersonate a peace officer within Mille Lacs County
- If the Mille Lacs Band claims inherent tribal criminal jurisdiction, joint investigations are encouraged.

July 21,  
2016-  
August,  
2016

- Revocation takes effect.
- With the support of the Mille Lacs County Board, the Sheriff starts a hiring process to identify and hire new Mille Lacs County Deputies to provide appropriate law enforcement services to all citizens of Mille Lacs County.
- Mille Lacs Band seeks a cooperative agreement with municipalities in Mille Lacs County including Onamia and Isle. This is inconsistent with Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90.
- US Department of Justice employee Ken Bergeron meets with Mille Lacs County Administrator and County Sheriff and offers to mediate.
- Mille Lacs County seeks a method of engaging in confidential negotiations with the Mille Lacs Band to avoid the “posturing” that will come with public negotiations and allow for full and frank conversations about difficult issues.
- Mille Lacs County and Mille Lacs Band jointly apply for a temporary confidential data classification to the Commissioner of Administration.

# September, 2016

- Sept. 16—Application for Temporary Data Classification is denied by Commissioner Massman
- Sept. 23—Mille Lacs County sends a termination of the Confidentiality Agreement to the Mille Lacs Band after determining that it cannot be enforced pursuant to the provisions of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act
- Sept. 27—The termination of Confidentiality Agreement is fully executed and the proposed 2016 Cooperative Agreement is shared with the Mille Lacs Band. This is a public document.

# Important new terms in the 2016 Cooperative Agreement

- MLBPD must comply with the same audits as any other state law enforcement agency
- Reaffirmation of the Compromise in 626.90 and 2008 Agreement
- Agreement that inherent tribal criminal authority will only be exercised on trust lands
- Providing notice of search warrants to the Sheriff
- Placing a tribal dispatcher in the Sheriff's Office at no cost
- Providing cultural training to Mille Lacs County Deputies
- Providing notice to the County Attorney of all felonies, gross misdemeanors, and DWIs that are investigated by the Band
- Developing a comprehensive procedure for conflict investigations
- Providing notice to the Sheriff and the County Attorney of all meetings with government partners discussing law enforcement in Mille Lacs County

## October, 2016

- Oct. 17—Mille Lacs Band responds, stating that the proposal is “unacceptable and does not provide a basis for productive negotiations.” The Band’s counterproposal does not incorporate any of the previously listed changes made by Mille Lacs County.
- Oct. 25—Mille Lacs County requests a detailed response identifying the language that is unacceptable, why it is unacceptable, and proposed replacement language.
- Oct. 28—Mille Lacs Band responds that it has already responded in good faith and that it “does not have anything to add at this time.”
- Mille Lacs Band meets with the Governor about entering into a JPA with the State of Minnesota.

# November 2016- present

- Stalemate. No discussions planned.
- Mille Lacs County Attorney again reaches out to the Mille Lacs Band to have discussions. No response from Mille Lacs Band.
- To date, Mille Lacs County has hired seven new Deputies. The hiring process continues.
- Mille Lacs County believes that the Mille Lacs Band will once again seek to change Minn. Stat. sec. 626.90. The exact parameters of this proposed statutory change are unknown.
- As a matter of sound public policy, it is Mille Lacs County's position that any tribal police department must have accountability from some state organization. In 1991, the legislature determined that that agency should be Mille Lacs County.

# What is Coming Next?

- Mille Lacs Band Police Officers will receive Special Law Enforcement Commissions to enforce federal law under TLOA
- MLBPD will actively look for a “TLOA-jurisdiction” case to self-refer to the US Attorney’s Office that is within the 61,000 acre 1855 treaty boundary, but not within trust lands.
- Neither Mille Lacs County, nor the State of Minnesota will be a party to this criminal case.
- A criminal defendant with limited resources, will challenge the federal government’s jurisdiction under TLOA, alleging (like Mille Lacs County and the State of Minnesota) that the reservation has been diminished or disestablished.
- United States District Court will issue a ruling regarding the boundary of the Mille Lacs Reservation without Mille Lacs County or the State of Minnesota even being heard.

## Why Does this Matter?

- It is likely that the Mille Lacs Band will assert increasing civil-regulatory jurisdiction over non-Indian residents living within the 1855 boundary.
- While it is true that the Mille Lacs Band could not currently prosecute non-Indians because it has not applied to do so under the Violence Against Women Act, the Self-Governance Communication and Education Office has already identified additional criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians as part of its VAWA 2018 platform.
- There are two state parks, three incorporated municipalities, three townships, parts of two state forests, several state highways, and many homes and businesses owned by non-Indians within the 1855 boundary.
- Real estate agents have called the Mille Lacs County Attorney, asking for guidance about whether or not the home they are selling is “in a reservation.”

# What does Mille Lacs County want from the Governor's Office?

- **Do nothing.** Allow Mille Lacs County's twenty-five years experience managing the relationship with the Mille Lacs Band Police Department to inform the next cooperative agreement. This is why 626.90 required an agreement to "define and regulate the provision of law enforcement services."
- **Continue to support the statutes as written.** Mille Lacs County cannot effectively negotiate with Mille Lacs Band as long as it believes that some other state agency will step in to take Mille Lacs County's place.
- **Allow good government to do its job.** Mille Lacs County had a compromise with the Mille Lacs Band that worked for 25 years. It can work again.

Tribal Law  
Enforcement  
in Mille Lacs  
County

- Thank you for your time!