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Project Overview

- Aimed to study and promote cross-jurisdictional sharing (CJS) of emergency management (i.e., preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery) services between tribes and counties in California.
- Provided tribal and county representatives an opportunity to share views about CJS and make recommendations for successful government-to-government CJS arrangements.
- Recommendations guided content of a CJS toolkit.
- In the long term, project could help tribes and counties establish CJS arrangements so both jurisdictions can access adequate funding before, during, and after emergencies.
Tribe-County CJS Context

• Each American Indian tribe is unique in governance, legal processes, culture, tradition, economic and social resources, and relationships with local governments.

• Many tribes at unique risk for emergencies due to their location in remote and rural areas. Tribes also have varied capacity to address natural and non-natural emergencies.

• CJS is one collaborative mechanism for sharing resources to address emergency management and population health.
  • Important in fiscally limited areas of the country and because emergencies do not have boundaries.
Tribe-County CJS Context

- Despite benefits of sharing services for emergency management between tribes and counties, only a tribe as a sovereign governing body can choose to enter into a CJS relationship with a county.
- Due to uniqueness of each tribe, CJS arrangements between tribes and counties were expected to vary.
Research Questions

RQ1. What is the prevalence and scope of Tribe-county CJS arrangements in California?
   • How many and what types of CJS arrangements?

RQ2. Are jurisdictional measures associated with Tribe-county CJS arrangements?

RQ3. Do Tribes and counties agree about having no or any CJS arrangements?

RQ4. What are views of the Tribe-county CJS relationship?

RQ5. What are historical and cultural barriers to CJS?
Study Procedure

- Tribal and county leaders approached and asked to select representative to participate in project.
- Initial Institutional Review Board (IRB)-approved survey administered to Tribal and county representatives.
  - Adapted from Center for Sharing Public Health Services “Existing CJS Arrangement” survey (CSPHS, 2014)
  - Items about jurisdictional information and current CJS arrangements
  - Honored Tribal requests for verbal and face-to-face interviews
- Follow-up IRB-approved survey administered to subset of original sample.
  - Items about views of the CJS relationship and historical and cultural barriers to CJS
  - Completed over the telephone
Response and Participation Rates

- Tribe response rate = 87%
  - Formal participation from 83 of 111 Tribes (75%)
  - Response indicating reason for declining participation from 14 of 111 Tribes (12%)
- Corresponding county response rate = 100%
  - Formal participation from all 29 counties associated with the 83 Tribes who participated
- Follow-up response rate = 100%
  - Formal participation from all 24 Tribes and 13 corresponding counties selected for follow-up survey
Initial Survey Participating Areas
Number of Participants

Tribe (n=83):
- Elected Leader or Tribal Staff: 36
- Emergency Manager/Staff: 31
- Environmental Manager/Staff: 14
- Tribal Health Clinic Staff: 2

County (n=29):
- Office of Emergency Services Staff: 25
- Health Department Staff: 3
- Administrator: 1
Jurisdictional Information

- Population size
  - Tribes: 0 to 84,000 people ($M = 1,651$)
  - Counties: 9,500 to 3.2 million people ($M = 468,191$)

- Geographic size
  - Tribes: 0 to 547 square miles ($M = 16.77$)
  - Counties: 612 to 22,000 square miles ($M = 3,794$)

- Total Number of Tribes in County (CA Gov. Office of the Tribal Advisor, 2015)
  - 1 to 18 ($M = 7$ tribes)
Prevalence and Scope of CJS

• Coded tribe and county questionnaire responses, and supported with open-ended responses; 4 researcher agreement.
• 5 Categories for CJS from Center for Sharing Public Health Services ($1 = yes, 0 = no$)
  • Formal arrangements
  • Informal or customary arrangements (“handshake arrangement,” verbal arrangements)
  • Service-related arrangements (as-needed contracts or consultations before, during, or after emergency)
  • Shared functions with joint oversight arrangements
  • Regionalization arrangements (tribe and county become one department to serve both jurisdictions)
• 37 tribes (45%) and 5 counties (17%) reported no CJS arrangements
• Among the 46 tribes and 22 counties with any CJS arrangements (see Graph), tribes ranged between having 1-3 arrangements, and counties ranged between having 1-4 arrangements.
### Tribe CJS Arrangement Inter-Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Service-Related</th>
<th>Shared Functions</th>
<th>Regionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>-.342**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Related</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Functions</td>
<td>.470***</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionalization</td>
<td>.382***</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### County CJS Arrangements Inter-Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Service-Related</th>
<th>Shared Functions</th>
<th>Regionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>-.581**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Related</td>
<td>.690***</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Functions</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.400*</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionalization</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Associations Between Measures

- Statistical analyses tested relations between jurisdictional and CJS measures for tribes and counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional Measures</th>
<th>CJS Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Population size</td>
<td>• Sum of CJS arrangements (0-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geographic size</td>
<td>• Each type of CJS arrangement (formal, informal or customary, service-related, shared functions with joint oversight, and regionalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total number of tribes in county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportions: Total number of tribes in county to county population and geographic size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 4 significant findings for tribes:

- Negative association between number of CJS arrangements and proportion of total tribes to county population size ($t = -2.12, p = .04$).
  - Tribes with a higher number of CJS arrangements were in counties with fewer tribes to overall county population size.

- Positive associations between: Population size and formal arrangements ($r = .24, p = .03$); population size and shared functions with joint oversight arrangements ($r = .25, p = .02$); geographic size and shared functions with joint oversight arrangements ($r = .24, p = .03$).
Associations Between Measures (Cont.)

- Statistical analyses tested relations between jurisdictional and CJS measures for tribes and counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional Measures</th>
<th>CJS Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Population size</td>
<td>• Sum of CJS arrangements (0-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geographic size</td>
<td>• Each type of CJS arrangement (formal, informal or customary, service-related, shared functions with joint oversight, and regionalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total number of tribes in county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportions: Total number of tribes in county to county population and geographic size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 significant finding for counties:

- Positive association between informal or customary CJS arrangements and total number of tribes in county ($r = .43, p = .02$).
Tribe-County CJS Agreement

- Determined whether tribes and counties agreed about having no (0) or any (1-5) CJS arrangements ($1 = $agree$, $0 = $disagree$). 

- 46 of 83 tribe-county pairs (55%) agreed about having no or any CJS arrangements.
  - 13% agreed about having no CJS arrangements
  - 42% agreed about having any CJS arrangements

- 37 of 83 of tribe-county pairs (45%) disagreed about having no or any CJS arrangements.
  - 13% tribe reported CJS but county did not
  - 32% county reported CJS but tribe did not
Tribe-County CJS Agreement (Cont.)

Agreement and Disagreement Across 83 Tribe-County Pairs

- 13% Agree: Tribe and County Reported No CJS
- 42% Agree: Tribe and County Reported Any CJS
- 13% Disagree: Tribe Reported CJS, County Did Not
- 32% Disagree: County Reported CJS, Tribe Did Not

Graph showing the distribution of agreements and disagreements across 83 tribe-county pairs.
Associations Between Measures

- Statistical analyses tested relations between tribe-county CJS agreement and CJS measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe-County CJS Agreement Measure</th>
<th>CJS Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Tribe-county pair in agreement about having no or any CJS</td>
<td>• Sum of CJS arrangements (0-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each type of CJS arrangement (formal, informal, service-related, shared functions w joint oversight, and regionalization)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Statistically significant associations between tribe-county CJS agreement and tribe-reported sum of CJS arrangements ($\beta = .79$, $t = 4.32$, $p < .001$), formal arrangements ($\chi^2(1) = 4.42$, $p = .04$), informal or customary arrangements ($\chi^2(1) = 7.64$, $p = .01$), and shared functions with joint oversight arrangements ($\chi^2(1) = 7.42$, $p = .01$).
- Post hoc analyses: Positive associations.
- No significant relations between tribe-county CJS agreement and county-reported CJS arrangements.
24 Tribal and 13 corresponding county representatives provided follow-up information about views of the Tribe-county CJS relationship and barriers to CJS.

Qualitative analyses were used to identify themes across responses.
### Views of CJS Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Non-existent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 8 Tribes, 11 counties  
  • There is an agreement for emergency services on Tribal lands [called the] Economic Development Enterprise, a.k.a. Gaming Compact, but if there is a level of conversation at the county level about emergency services, the Tribe is not at the table or made aware of the meetings. Tribal Council hasn’t made it a priority to ask the county about these meetings. [Tribe] | • 7 Tribes, 0 counties  
  • The Tribe feels the county is trying to meet a requirement. If there were a natural disaster, the Tribe would feel uncomfortable and would be skeptical about whether or not state or county services would be provided to the Tribe. [Tribe] | • 6 Tribes, 7 counties  
  • The overall relationship with the Tribe is great and open. There is a current Memorandum of Understanding in place with the Tribe and [nearby] hospitals. [County] | • 3 Tribes, 6 counties  
  • There is no ongoing relationship between the Tribe and county. [Tribe] |
Views of CJS Relationship

- Because only Tribes reported having a negative view of the CJS relationship, Tribal and county views were sometimes disparate.
  - *The relationship is non-existent. The county as a whole hasn’t really heard from the Tribe since the flood [omitted] when the Tribe lost property.* [County]
  - *The Tribe had experienced high waters and nobody from the county came to check on our well-being or alert Tribal members.* [Tribe]
Barriers to CJS

- Legal/jurisdictional restrictions
- Distrust
- Limited knowledge of Tribal systems
- Multiple
- Other
- No/unknown

Cultural and historical barriers
Barriers to CJS

- **Legal/jurisdictional** (4 tribes, 2 counties)
  - The relationship that California and its Tribes have in emergency management with Public Law 280 status is a barrier. Tribes wish to interact, but city and county groups do not based on Public Law 280, [and] Tribes are left out of emergency management planning. Public Law 280 affects Tribal law enforcement greatly on the California side as Tribes have no authority on Tribal land and have to work jointly with the county even while on Tribal lands. [Tribe]
Barriers to CJS

- **Distrust** (0 tribes, 5 counties)
  - The major historical barrier with the Tribe is the major distrust of white people due to the massacres [which took place from 1851 to 1856]. The massacres have never been forgotten or forgiven. [County]
Barriers to CJS

- Limited knowledge of Tribal systems (3 tribes, 2 counties)
  - During the fall fires, work was being done before the acknowledgement that cultural resources were destroyed and damaged by the fires and cleanup. There was no communication or funding for cultural monitors. The county also did not understand the importance of watershed monitoring. [Tribe]
Multiple (8 tribes, 1 county)

There is a deep-rooted ongoing distrust on behalf of the Tribe. The county is trying to establish a Mutual Aid Arrangement (MAA) with the Tribe. The Tribe is concerned with how the MAA will impact other arrangements in place and the Tribe’s sovereignty. The Tribe won’t discuss changing the language or other options for the MAA. Instead of working with the county, the Tribe tends to shut down. I have observed an overly strong knee-jerk guarding reaction from the Tribe, but I believe the reaction is warranted due to past historical treatment. [County, distrust and limited knowledge of Tribal systems]
Barriers to CJS

- **Other** (3 tribes, 3 counties)
  - The concerns come down to funding. Bigger Tribes like [omitted] have a Memorandum of Understanding with the county as well as the Tribal infrastructure, including Tribal fire departments, but the Tribes still pay the county for services. Since the smaller Tribes either don’t have casinos or don’t have successful ones, the county seems to be less interested because the Memorandum of Understanding will not provide funding for the county. The county has a mentality that Tribes should pay a fair share [...] [Tribe]
Summary and Discussion

- This study provided a preliminary understanding about Tribe-county CJS for emergency management.
  - Nearly 20% of federally recognized Tribes are located in California.
- It is important to involve Tribal leaders or designated Tribal emergency or environmental staff in developing and sustaining Tribe-county CJS arrangements.
  - Designated Tribal representatives in this study were often elected officials or emergency staff, not health clinic staff.
Summary and Discussion (Cont.)

- Less integrated, informal or customary CJS arrangements may work better for some Tribes than formal arrangements.
  - Formal arrangements were most frequently reported by larger Tribes. Smaller Tribes and Tribes with differing capacity for emergency management may benefit from informal or customary arrangements.
- It is important to engage in cross-jurisdictional communication and collaboration.
  - Tribe-county CJS agreement was only significantly associated with Tribes’ report of CJS arrangements.
  - Tribes and counties had different views of CJS relationship.
  - Barriers include distrust and limited county knowledge of Tribal systems.
Project Lessons Learned

• Consider emergencies within a societal, public health context.
• Reach out to governmental and health-oriented representatives.
  • National Policy Matrix found limited knowledge about Tribe-county CJS from health-only officials.
• Use Tribally responsive protocols to study Tribe-county CJS.
  • Project Advisory Group
  • Culturally and methodologically adapted instrument from Center for Sharing Public Health Services
    • Theoretically guided, responsive research
  • Tribal Epidemiology Center staff gather data and stories
  • Mixed methodology for data analysis
  • Findings shared with participants at end of the project
Future Directions

- Research: Expand exploration of Tribe-county CJS to the national level.
- Intervention: Fund positions and programs that build Tribal capacity in emergency management and promote ongoing relationship-building between Tribes and counties as a precursor to formal arrangements.
  - Technical assistance experts staffed within Tribes or Tribal organizations.
Additional Meetings and Products

- Advisory Group
- National conference presentations
- Regional roundtables in Northern, Central, and Southern California
- Reports and manuscript
Advisory Group

Core Members: Dore Bietz, Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians; Brenda Bowie, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria; Don Butz, Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians; Tim Campbell, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria; Dr. Theresa Gregor, Inter Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation; Marc Peren, San Bernardino County Office of Emergency Services; Cruz Ponce, Inter Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation
CJS Toolkit

- Developed with content requested by Tribal and county representatives and input from Advisory Group.

Sample Memorandum of Understanding Template

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is a formal arrangement between two or more parties. MOUs are often used to establish partnerships and define the roles and responsibilities of each party in the partnership. MOUs can be legally binding or non-binding, which must be stated in the document.

Below is a MOU template that tribes and counties could use as the basis of their arrangement. Additional sections may be added to the MOU if applicable.

Memorandum of Understanding between [Tribe] and [County]

1. Background
   [State the purpose of the tribe and county relationship.]

2. Purpose
   [Describe the specific purpose of the MOU. Examples include: cooperation, coordination, and communication in emergency management.

3. Goals and Objectives
   [State the goals and objectives that the tribe and county want to achieve through the MOU.]

3-Day Emergency Supplies Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essentials</th>
<th>Cooking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water (1 gallon per person per day)</td>
<td>Plastic knives, forks, spoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water purification kit</td>
<td>Paper plates and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid kit, first-aid supplies</td>
<td>Paper towels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid book</td>
<td>Heavy-duty aluminum foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Camping stove for outdoor cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilet paper, toilet seat covers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trauma kit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools and Supplies

- Axe, shovel, broom
- Adjustable searchlight and flashlight
- Tool kit including: screwdriver, pliers, and hammer.
- Cell of 1/2” SAW
- Possum tape, staple gun, and shears for window replacement
- Bicycle
- City map
Regional Roundtable Meetings
Thank you!

Maureen A. Wimsatt, PhD, MSW, Principal Investigator
Director, California Tribal Epidemiology Center
California Rural Indian Health Board
mwimsatt@crihb.org
Project Updates

Go to: http://www.publichealthsystems.org/cross-jurisdictional-sharing-arrangements-between-tribes-and-counties-emergency-preparedness

Cross Jurisdictional Sharing Arrangements Between Tribes and Counties for Emergency Preparedness Readiness

Overview
This study will examine cross-jurisdictional sharing (CJS) between tribal and county governments in emergency preparedness capacity building and response. Investigators from the California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc., and partners from California Conference of Local Health Officers, Inter-Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation, California Department of Health Care Services, and Indian Health Program of the California Department of Public Health, seek to gain a better understanding of: 1) the current prevalence and scope of CJS between tribal and county governments focused on strengthening emergency preparedness capacity; 2) the perceived spectrum of “value” in CJS arrangements between tribes and their potential county governmental partners; 3) how CJS value is associated with factors such as perception of the nature of tribal to non-tribal government relationships and formality of CJS agreements, as well as by organizational structure and capacity, quality of collaboration, politico-legal, and historical factors; and 4) the tribal and county government CJS characteristics most associated with achieving benchmark public health emergency preparedness measures. This study aims to identify effective practices for CJS implementation that will protect health and shed light on the nature of tribal and county government relationships from historical, cultural, and legal perspectives. Dissemination tools include a CJS toolkit for tribal and non-tribal governments.

Publication
- Barriers to Collaboration Between Tribal and County Governments: Planning for Major Disasters and Other Emergencies (California Rural Indian Health Board Policy Brief, January 2017)

Presentations
- Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Between Tribes and Counties for Emergency Management Services (California Rural Indian Health Board Summit, July 2016)
- Cross-jurisdictional sharing between tribes and counties for emergency management (PHSSR Research in Progress Webinar, April 2016 recording)
- Resilience and Scope of California Tribe-County Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing of Emergency Management Services
Commentary

Michael Mudgett, MPH
Epidemiologist, California Tribal Epidemiology Center
California Rural Indian Health Board
mmudgett@CRIHB.ORG

Ana-Marie Jones
Chief Resiliency Officer, Interpro
National Advisory Committee member,
National Health Security Preparedness Index
ana-marie.jones@interpro-mail.com

Questions and Discussion
## Upcoming Webinars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Organizer/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 21</td>
<td>12-1pm ET/ 9-10am PT</td>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTABLE COMMUNITY OF HEALTH STRUCTURES AND CROSS-SECTOR COORDINATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Eli Kern, MPH, Public Health - Seattle and King County</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, July 19</td>
<td>12-1pm ET/ 9-10am PT</td>
<td><strong>IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF NEWBORN SCREENING FROM COLLECTION TO TEST RESULTS</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Beth Tarini, MD, MS, University of Iowa College of Medicine</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, July 27</td>
<td>1-2pm ET/ 10-11am PT</td>
<td><strong>CLINICAL-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS &amp; 2-1-1 TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Bergen Nelson, MD, MSHS, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for participating in today’s webinar!

www.systemsforaction.org

Twitter: @Systems4Action

#Sys4Act

For more information about the webinars, contact:
Ann Kelly, Project Manager  Ann.Kelly@uky.edu  859.218.2317
111 Washington Avenue #201, Lexington, KY 40536
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