The Intersection of Agriculture and Federal Indian Law

What Farmers and Ranchers Need to Know

Roger McEowen (roger.mceowen@washburn.edu) – Washburn University School of Law
Ag Law and Taxation Blog: https://agriculturallaw.lawprofessorsblogs.com/
April 2026

Overview

For many farmers and ranchers in the Midwest and West, the "fence line" isn't just a physical boundary between pastures; it can also be a jurisdictional boundary between state and federal or tribal law. Navigating the complexities of Federal Indian Law is a necessity for those operating within or near reservation boundaries. Recent legislative shifts, including the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA) of 2025 and the ongoing debates surrounding the 2026 Farm Bill, have highlighted several points that every agricultural producer should monitor.

The Jurisdictional Maze: Who has Authority?

The foundational question for any producer on a reservation is whether the tribe, the state, or the federal government has the power to regulate their activities. Under the long-standing "Montana Doctrine"[1] tribes generally lack civil jurisdiction over non-members on "fee land" (land owned outright by the farmer, not held in trust).[2]

However, there are two major exceptions where a tribe can exercise authority:

- **Consensual Relationships:** If a non-member enters into a commercial dealing, contract, or lease with the tribe or a tribal member.[3]
- **Tribal Integrity ("Inherent Sovereignty"):** If the non-member's conduct threatens the "political integrity, economic security, or health or welfare" of the tribe.[4]

[1] Montana v. United States, 450 U.S. 544 (1981)(absent a federal treaty or statute, Indian tribes lack civil authority over the conduct of non-Indians on non-Indian land within a reservation (often referred to as "fee land" or "checkerboarded" land).
[2] Fee land is land owned outright by the producer, similar to private property outside of a reservation. Because it is held in fee, the owner generally holds the legal title, meaning tribes typically lack civil jurisdiction over the producer's activities here under the "Montana Doctrine," unless a specific exception applies. Trust land is land where the federal government holds the legal title in trust for the benefit of a tribe or individual tribal member. Because it is held in trust, the land is subject to federal oversight, often managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and is subject to tribal authority. Allotted land is a specific type of trust land that was divided into smaller parcels and assigned to individual tribal members. This can significantly complicate lease renewals, as these parcels often have multiple owners (heirs), all of whom may need to sign off on a lease renewal, creating significant administrative delays.
[3] If a non-tribal member is leasing land, they have likely met this exception which then gives the tribal agency the jurisdictional "hook" to enforce conservation standards or TEK-based management practices (discussed later) that might otherwise be challenged under the general Montana presumption. This is exactly why the administrative shift from federal to tribal oversight (discussed later) is such a significant pivot for farmers and ranchers operating on "checkerboarded" acreage.
[4] This standard is often invoked in environmental and water quality disputes.

Water Rights: "First in Time, First in Right" vs. Winters Rights

In the West, the Prior Appropriation Doctrine governs water. However, the Winters Doctrine[5] provides that when the federal government created Indian reservations, it implicitly reserved enough water to fulfill the purpose of those lands (the concept known as "federal reserved water rights"). Unlike state-issued permits that specify an exact flow rate (e.g., cubic feet per second), Winters rights are often "unquantified," creating significant uncertainty for junior state-law users until they are settled through adjudication or agreement.

The scope of a "Winters Right" can expand as the needs of the reservation evolve, which is currently a major point of tension in Western water management. Also, "Winters Rights" often carry a priority date of the reservation's creation, making them senior to most state-law water rights held by non-tribal farmers.

A modern, negotiated quantification of "Winters Rights" is shown in the current trend toward massive settlements, such as the March 2026 Idaho Water Rights Settlement,[6] where tribes agree to protect existing state-law water rights in exchange for infrastructure funding and quantified volumes. Producers should be active in these negotiations to ensure their historical usage isn't "curtailed" during drought years.

> **Observation:** This settlement is a major development in Western water law, particularly for "checkerboarded" land issues. The agreement resolves claims dating back to "time immemorial" and the 1873 Executive Order. This seniority could have theoretically displaced nearly every municipal and agricultural user in North Idaho. The settlement protects all state-law water rights (licenses, permits, and claims) with a priority date of September 6, 2023, or earlier. It is a "sister" agreement in spirit to the 2004 Nez Perce settlement, and it serves as a modern template for how states are attempting to provide "certainty" to agricultural producers in basins with significant tribal reserved rights

Leasing and the HEARTH Act[7]

Leasing tribal land for grazing or crops has historically been a bureaucratic nightmare involving the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

- **Streamlining:** The HEARTH Act allows tribes to bypass the BIA and handle their own leasing regulations. While this speeds up the process (reducing wait times from 18 months to weeks), it means producers must now be well-versed in specific Tribal Codes rather than just federal regulations.

---

[5] Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564 (1908).

[6] Coeur d'Alene Tribe Water Rights Settlement Agreement (Feb. 26, 2026). Idaho House Bill 789 (2026), codified at Idaho Code § 42-1430 approved and ratified the settlement, and Idaho Code § 42-1765B established the Coeur d'Alene Tribal Water Supply Bank that allows the Tribe to lease its consumptive-use federal reserved water rights to off-reservation users. This creates a market-based mechanism for ranchers and cities to "rent" senior water security.

[7] The Helping Expedite and Advance Responsible Tribal Home Ownership Act of 2012. Pub. L. No. 112-151, 126 Stat. 1150 (2012), *amending* the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act of 1955, 25 U.S.C. § 415.

- **Technical Misalignment:** A common issue is the "misalignment" between BIA lease dates and USDA program deadlines. If your lease isn't renewed in time for FSA certification, you may lose eligibility for crop insurance or disaster payments.

If the tribe has implemented the HEARTH Act, they have taken over the leasing process from the BIA. This means that if a producer has some older BIA leases and some newer HEARTH Act leases, a producer's administrative burden doubles.[8] This makes it vital to maintain separate records for each. The BIA still requires Environmental Assessments (EAs) for certain actions, whereas a HEARTH Act lease might follow an expedited tribal environmental review process. Mixing these up during an audit can lead to lease termination. Given these overlapping jurisdictional and administrative hurdles, producers must shift from reactive management to a proactive strategy.

Strategy for the "Checkerboard" Producer

Issue	Strategy
Lease Timing	Start the renewal process 12 months before expiration. Do not rely on "automatic" BIA extensions.
Jurisdiction	Keep a "Jurisdictional Map" of the farming operation. Know exactly where fee land ends and trust land begins to manage chemical applications and grazing rotation.
Mediation	Check if the state has an Agricultural Mediation Service (like KAMS in Kansas). They can often help navigate disputes involving BIA or tribal agencies before they escalate to litigation.

As noted, managing a combination of fee land (private ownership) and tribal/BIA leases creates a "checkerboard" of jurisdiction that requires a very specific legal and administrative strategy. When a farming operation straddles these boundaries, a single mistake in one area can jeopardize the eligibility or legality of the entire enterprise. Managing both types of land simultaneously presents several legal and regulatory issues.

The "dual-enrollment" headache for USDA programs. When a farm operates on both fee land and tribal leases, there are essentially two different "landlords" with two different sets of rules.

- **FSA and NRCS Compliance:** For fee land, the farm must deal with the local county FSA office. For tribal leases, the farm may have to deal with the BIA or a tribal agency under the HEARTH Act.

- **The Deadline Gap:** One of the most common issues is when a BIA lease renewal is delayed beyond the Spring Acreage Reporting deadline. If the lease isn't active in the BIA's system, the FSA may not recognize the landowner's "control of the land," making the farm ineligible for crop insurance or disaster programs like the LFP (Livestock Forage Program) on those specific acres.

This "dual enrollment" problem can present a classic administrative "Catch-22" that creates a massive amount of risk for producers operating on Indian land. To participate in almost any USDA program (including Crop Insurance, the Livestock Forage Program (LFP), or ARC/PLC), a producer must prove they have "legal control" of the land. On private land, a signed written lease or even a verbal agreement is often enough for the FSA. On Tribal or Allotted

[8] While the HEARTH Act streamlines things for the *tribe*, it creates a "dual-compliance" environment for the *producer*.

land, the FSA generally requires a BIA-approved lease. Without that stamp of approval, as far as the FSA is concerned, the farmer is a "trespasser" on those acres, not a producer.

In addition, the “timeline collision” can be quite real. Agricultural cycles operate on hard deadlines that do not wait for federal paperwork. The Spring Acreage Reporting Deadline is typically July 15 for most spring-seeded crops and forage. By this date, a farmer must certify every acre that is farmed or grazed. Lease renewals often require appraisals, environmental reviews, and multiple signatures from heirs (allotted land). If the BIA hasn't finalized the renewal by the July 15 deadline, the lease is not "active" in the system. If the lease is stuck in "pending" status at the BIA on the reporting deadline, the FSA cannot tie the farmer’s name to those specific Farm and Tract numbers. Thus, if the farmer can’t prove control, the acreage can’t be reported. For example, if LFP payments are triggered by drought conditions on *eligible* grazing land but the acres weren't reported on time because of a lease delay, a loss cannot be claimed on those acres. For a rancher in a drought year, this can mean losing tens of thousands of dollars in feed assistance. Similarly, a crop insurance policy cannot attach to a crop if the "insurable interest" (the lease) isn't legally established. If there’s a total crop failure but the BIA paperwork isn’t finished, the insurance company may deny the claim, arguing that the producer had no legal right to the crop.

> **Note:** “638" contracting, discussed below**,** is directly aimed at this bottleneck. 638 contracting effectively allows tribes to "step into the shoes" of federal agencies like the NRCS or forest service.

Differing conservation and land-use standards. Operating on both means that the farm is likely subject to two different sets of environmental standards. On the fee land, state-level pesticide and water use regulations apply. However, under the Clean Water Act, many tribes have "Treatment as a State" (TAS) status. This allows them to set water quality standards that are *more* stringent than the state’s.[9] Also, if runoff from your fee land enters a stream that flows into tribal land, you could be subject to tribal environmental enforcement, even if you were in compliance with state law on your own property.

Fencing and trespass. In the West and Midwest, livestock "drift" is a constant reality. However, the legal consequences differ based on where the cow stands. If on fee owned land, state fence laws apply. If on tribal land, many tribes have specific Tribal Trespass Ordinances. Unlike state court, tribal courts may have jurisdiction over non-members for livestock trespass on tribal trust land. The fines can be significantly higher than state-level "estray" fees, and the process for recovering impounded livestock involves tribal, rather than county, officials.

The 2026 Farm Bill, "638" Contracting and TEK

The 2026 Farm Bill (currently in markup and commonly referred to as the “skinny farm bill”) includes provisions that expand "638" Self-Determination contracting. Named after the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975,[10] "638" contracting allows Tribes to take the federal funding usually managed by agencies (like the Forest Service or NRCS) and run the programs themselves. For ranchers, this may mean dealing with a tribal agency rather than a federal one for forest management or conservation grants.

> **Observation:** For farmers and ranchers, while this can mean more localized decision-making, it also means navigating a different set of administrative rules. If a Tribe takes over forest

[9] In other words, TAS status can lead to tribal water quality standards that override less stringent state standards for producers on or near reservations.

[10] 25 U.S.C. §§ 5301 *et seq*.

management, they might prioritize different thinning or fire-prevention methods than the Forest Service did, which directly impacts forage availability for livestock.

If a Tribe takes over the administration of these programs via 638 contracting, they could theoretically streamline the lease-to-FSA pipeline, moving at the "speed of business" rather than the "speed of the BIA." But, until the systems are fully integrated, producers remain in a "limbo" period where they could be paying for the right to the land but are denied the federal safety net because of a clerical delay. In short, the producer is doing the work and taking the weather risk, but because the BIA hasn't finished the paperwork, the FSA treats the land as if it doesn't exist for the purpose of FSA-administered programs.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service NRCS is increasingly directed to incorporate TEK into conservation standards.[11] Non-tribal producers on leased land may find that "best management practices" are shifting to include more traditional indigenous land-use strategies. While NRCS standards dictate what counts as a "good" conservation project, if TEK is integrated, a "best management practice" for soil health might shift from modern mechanical no-till to traditional intercropping or prescribed cultural burning. Also, to get paid for the EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentives Program) or other conservation grants, farmers must meet NRCS standards. If those standards change to favor TEK methods, producers, both tribal and non-tribal, may need to adapt their land-use strategies to stay eligible for federal cost-sharing.

Another possible impact of TEK is that many non-tribal farmers and ranchers lease Tribal or "checkerboarded" land. As TEK becomes the baseline for "best practices," these lessees may be required to adopt indigenous land-use strategies (like specific timing for grazing to allow native plants to seed) as part of their lease agreements.

Observation: The OBBBA gave farmers more money and better tax breaks starting for the 2025 tax year, but the 2026 Farm Bill is changing *how* the land is managed. For the producer, this represents a shift from a centralized federal "one-size-fits-all" approach to a model that empowers local Tribal authorities and integrates ancient land-use wisdom into modern agricultural policy.

Conclusion

Agricultural operations in "Indian Country" are subject to a unique legal "checkerboard." As federal policy shifts toward greater tribal sovereignty, farmers and ranchers (and their legal counsel) must prioritize clear, written contracts and stay engaged with state legislative developments and tribal council updates.

Copyright 2026: AgManager.info and K-State Department of Agricultural Economics

[11] TEK is the historical body of knowledge of indigenous people regarding the relationship of people and animals with their environment. The 2026 Farm Bill directs the NRCS to incorporate this into its official "Conservation Practice Standards."