

8

Conclusions

Study conclusions include the following.

- (1) The nature of conventionally engineered SWM is that decisions are generally made assuming an urban western-industrial community culture and society, and that full and capable authority exists over the region for which it is responsible. Because this community description contradicts circumstances on reservations, conventional SWM dictates cannot be relied on there.
- (2) Socio-cultural circumstances presenting obstacles to tribal SWM include community perceptions of waste dumping as appropriate, or relatively harmless compared with alternative SWD practices involving non-Indians. Some tribal members may discard wastes illegally due to a perception of social and federal persecution, in an attempt to "claim" the land as their own, or to avoid outside SWM services. Many non-Indians are unwilling to participate in tribal SWM, and may use reservations for illegal waste disposal, partially out of contempt for tribal values or privileges. Resident non-Indians may perceive tribal SWM actions concerning them as an infringement on their property rights and civil liberties, and may carry out unsound disposal practices as a result. For both tribal members and non-Indians, a poor ability to pay for SWM services and ineffective tribal enforcement measures provide further incentive to practice unsound waste disposal.
- (3) Tribal jurisdiction in reservations differs substantially from that of conventional communities. Limits on tribal authority over non-Indians and fee lands hamper tribal efforts to carry out SWM throughout their reservation. There are numerous SWM situations where non-Indian governments can be involved, so that tribal sovereignty issues are affected. The uncertainty in past and present fluctuations in tribal authority, and the nature of Federal Indian Policy, result in tribal wariness in carrying out effective SWM programs.
- (4) In building capable SWM programs, tribes face many obstacles either not present in conventional communities, or existing to a lesser extent. Tribal environmental programs are new, so staff tend to be less trained and experienced, and program procedures not developed fully. Both traditional and bureaucratic authority systems can be present in tribes, complicating SWM decision making, especially in situations that involve tribal sovereignty issues. SWM training and federal agency interaction are developed for specific SWM positions that, due to cultural considerations, may not coincide with the tribal organization. Institutional relationships with EPA, BIA, IHS, and HUD are problematic due to roles that are prescribed poorly, tribal perceptions and actions, agency favoritism, and differences in agency allegiances and motivation.
- (5) A conceptual framework of tribal SWM has been developed from a universal model of SWM. Culture and its context are explicitly considered by incorporating the goal and concept of tribal sovereignty and its associated issues. The circumstances affecting SWM on

reservations that differ from conventional communities are accounted for, so that tribal decision making can be predicted, and Federal Policy planned. It is suggested that the model can be generalized to a universal model of SWM.