

Agenda Special By-Laws Meeting: Feb. 11, 2008
3114 Loma Riviera
6:30pm to 9:30pm

- I. Adoption of Agenda (Including changes to the Consent Agenda)
- II. Approval of Consent Agenda (These are the By-laws about which no one has a concern and are NOT in red). All sections of the By-Laws that are underlined were those that were approved during the Nov. special By-Laws Meeting.
- III. Regular Agenda
 - A. Review Controversial Areas of By-Laws (separate votes on each of the following outlined in red in the By-Laws).
 - 1) Article VI Section 2 (b) (iii) which begins “SUBCOMMITTEE COMPOSITION. This portion reads, **Subcommittees shall contain a majority of members who are members of the planning group.** This has been a point of controversy.
 - 2) Article VI Section 2 (c) (i) which begins, “RECUSALS”. This portion reads, **but rather as a common member of the public.** This is an addition that might cause trouble with the city.
 - 3) Article VIII Section 1 which begins, “The Peninsula Community Planning Board bylaws...” This portion reads: **Exhibits attached to the bylaws.** I am not sure what “Exhibits” refers to. Besides the map we propose to attach to the Bylaws, I don’t see any other exhibits. I think this is really making reference to the procedures found in this section. It looks like the English needs to be cleared up here.
 - 4) Article VIII Section 1 (c) paragraph 2 which begins, “Sub Committee Chairs will be elected...” This whole paragraph returns to the issue of subcommittees—this must be made consistent with the decisions in 1) above.
 - 5) Article VIII Section 1 (c) paragraph 6 which begins, “By Laws amendments can be made...”. The portions which reads, **An amendment to the By Laws will require a 2/3 rds vote** . This looks like it contradicts the previous discussion in Article II section 7 which states” [the Board] **may propose amendments to these by laws by majority vote of the elected members of the planning group.**” We need to clarify this.
 - 6) Article VIII Section 1 (c) paragraph 8 which begins, “OPTION: Discuss operation...” This looks like a paragraph which should be edited out, but the previous editor put part of it in red so we should look at it. Should we remove this whole paragraph?

- 7) Article VIII Section 1 (d) paragraph 3 which begins, “By Laws Amendments may be made...” This seems to repeat section 1 (c) paragraph 8 above. Should we delete this paragraph?
- 8) NOTE; Article VIII Section 1 (d) paragraph 4 mentions Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). It sound like much of this article (Article VIII) is a form of SOP. Cal Jones indicates that many other planning boards use “SOP”s because of their greater flexibility. Should we turn Article VIII (or at least a portion of it) into a set of SOP’s?
- 9) I have not checked the last part of the By-Laws carefully, so please spend time examining this section. In general, there are a number of typo’s and grammatical errors that need to be addressed throughout the By-Laws before they go to the City. Thus I propose that two people (preferably the secretary and the Chair) be delegated the responsibility to perform a cosmetic last edit (one that corrects the grammar, but has no impact on any issue of substance) before we send these By-Laws to the City.