

Bruce A. Measure
Chair
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

W. Bill Booth
Idaho

James A. Yost
Idaho



Dick Wallace
Vice-Chair
Washington

Tom Karier
Washington

Bill Bradbury
Oregon

Joan M. Dukes
Oregon

January 4, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: John Shurts

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding and Cooperation between the Council and the Columbia Basin Trust

The January Council meeting agenda includes, as an item under Council Business, consideration and possible approval of a renewed "Memorandum of Understanding and Cooperation" between the Council and the Columbia Basin Trust. The CBT Board is expected to consider the MOU for approval at its January 28 Board meeting. If both agencies approve, we will schedule some sort of signing ceremony.

The MOU agenda item must be considered tentative at packet time, however, in that I was informed yesterday by CBT staff that CBT Board members would like to see a few further changes in the proposed MOU, and I have not yet seen the revisions. I have been assured that the additional changes that will be proposed are purely editorial, but I will need to evaluate that when we receive the revised draft. If all looks well after I receive the revised draft, we will circulate the proposed MOU and proceed to consideration at the January meeting.

For further explanation: In 2000, the Council and the Columbia Basin Trust agreed to formalize the relationship that had developed between the two agencies through the designation of liaisons and an exchange of letters that came to be characterized as a "Memorandum of Understanding" or MOU. At the October 2010 meeting in British Columbia of members of the Council and the Trust's board, those in attendance agreed that the Council and the Trust ought to reaffirm that relationship and convert the letter into something that looks more like a formal Memorandum of Understanding. The Council and CBT staffs were charged with producing a proposed MOU for review and consideration.

In response, I took the 2000 letter as the starting text, and then made but a few editing changes to the text to reflect the new context. This included giving the document its own MOU heading; editing the opening paragraph to explain the status of the agency relationship and the document; adding a clause at the end of the second paragraph about the Council's public education/involvement/outreach mission to balance a line about the CBT's mission; revising slightly one of the items in the list of reciprocal responsibilities (paragraph 6) at the request of the members at the meeting to note simply that each agency will name a liaison and remove the specific requirement that the liaisons be the vice-

chairs; and then revising the last paragraph slightly to fit the new context. I then shared the draft MOU with the CBT staff.

Working with the CBT board members, the CBT staff has already suggested additional revisions to the text, all of them editorial in nature so far. I shared the revised draft that came back from the CBT staff with the Council members in late November, and heard back from Council members that all seemed ok so far. I understand now, as I noted above, that the CBT Board members have suggested to the CBT a few further editorial changes, and I have not seen those yet. I will circulate both a redlined and clean version of the proposed MOU as soon as I can, assuming the changes look appropriate to staff.