Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes
November 20, 2019


Absent: Susan Granoff, Amy Hummel, Alisa Jonas, Bobbie Knable, Christine Westphal,

Also present: Richard Benka, representative of CTO&S

AGENDA

6:00 pm Possible vote to amend the previous vote on Article 33 Amend the Town’s General By-laws to replace references to “inhabitants” and “Citizens.” (Neil Gordon, TMM Pct.1, petitioner)

Comments and Questions

Richard Benka offered a brief overview of the purpose of the articles.

The Articles are designed to rationalize the language of various bylaws in the Town that have been developed over time and use different nomenclature – resident, inhabitant, citizen, etc. They also broaden the protections of the various bylaws which are now limited to citizens or residents and that is done by inserting the public in those bylaws, e.g. smoking ban – health of “the public” vs health of “residents or inhabitants.”

To rationalize the bylaws and to broaden them and make clear that participation in Town Boards and Commissions should be open to Town residents.

Q: Youthful population, young persons affect on other laws? A: This relates specifically to the smoking bylaws and the language was in the original bylaw. Broaden reach to the public including the young population. The public is the public – it will not affect other bylaws.

Q: What is the cost of these changes? A: No cost to 33 or 34 however much time it takes for Town Clerk to update an electronic document.

Q: What happens if we do nothing? A: Language of the bylaws will still differ.

Q: Article 4.8 living wage bylaw? A: Not one we looked at and not in the scope.

- “Any covered employee” has right to file a complaint. Complaint can also be filed by concerned members of the public. “Citizens” – now “members of the public” – Why can a nonemployee citizen of some other place be filing a complaint?
- Believe the living wage bylaw also covers contractors so not Town Employees per se.
- What does citizen mean – broad meaning “United States”, narrow sense “resident of Brookline”. No agreement.
- It would be better to have a discussion about each section and then consider changing the language and likely the substance. Not the best way to go about this.
Q: Do these have to be reviewed by the AG’s office? A: Presumably.

- Appeal to exercise common sense as is outlined in the report.
- A court of law would not look at “common sense.”
- Common sense suggests that the whole wide world would not be looking at our bylaws.
- That is an assumption.
- Agree we are putting a lot in one article.
- CTOS did not look at this issue about 4.8 so perhaps proceed with recommendation less than one bylaw.
- Notification of parking ban – it is a robo call and a website posting.

Thanks to CTO&S who did the deep dive on all of these bylaws.

Don’t accept the notice that this is complicated and has lots of changes. The petitioner could have sponsored 137 separate warrant articles with 137 separate explanations. This exercise began with a contentious issue with the Transportation Board and the deciding vote was cast by a Brookline resident who had moved to Newton.

A MOTION was made and seconded to accept the amended resolution (WA 33) with the exception that we are deleting bylaw Section 4.8.6 (containing recommendations from CTO&S report)

By a VOTE of 16 in favor, none opposed, and 7 abstentions the Advisory Committee r

6:10 pm Possible vote to amend the previous vote on Article 34 Amend the Town’s General By-laws regarding eligibility for membership on boards, commissions and committees. (Neil Gordon, TMM Pct. 1, petitioner)

Comments and Questions

Harry Bohrs addressed the CTO&S report on WA 33 which tries to reconcile language to have consistent terms and also adds a requirement for residency being required for certain board and commission participation. Exception Parks and Recreation

“To the extent practicable” added to finding members for the Advisory Committee – recognizes reality of sometime difficult task of finding members.

Moderator could use this to “stack the deck” but assume it would be unlikely and if it did happen, Town would pretty much squash it.

“Registered voter resident” – deliberative group, stewards, subordinate our parochial interests in the interest of the Town as a whole. This change hopes to de-politicizes the Advisory Committee somewhat.

Exclusions include Commission on Women and Commission on Disability – no need to be a resident.

CTOS, Audit, Naming, Board of Appeals, and Preservation requires residency because these groups benefit from a certain degree of experience and knowledge of the Town.
Q: This only deals with committees named in the bylaw – what about a committee created by the School Committee? A: Constrained by the scope of the article and bylaw so it doesn’t address commissions or boards outside of what is contained here.

Q: What barriers are there to those not able to register to vote – i.e. not yet a citizen? Imagine a sense of frustration? A: Serves as incentive. Not a pressing issue to have someone be a registered voter in order to contribute to the committee as a whole.

Disagree with changes to the Advisory Committee – being a registered voter and “to the extent practicable” is loosey-goosey – not sure what that means – “I couldn’t find her number”? , “I didn’t have an email”? , “She isn’t collegial enough and won’t work well with the AC...”? Do these fall into the category of “practicable”?

A good idea for practices to be in agreement with the law-endorse the changes.

Q: Are there any members on Boards now who would be kicked out if this goes into effect? A: Don’t believe so.

Concern raised about potential life time appointments and the change is outside the scope of the current article.

A MOTION was made and seconded to accept the substitute language from Neil Gordon with David-Marc’s “as long as they remain residents until their terms expire” and retain “registered voters” and “to the extent practicable.”

By a VOTE of 20 in favor, none opposed, and 4 abstentions the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the main motion.

A MOTION was made and seconded to amend to remove references to the Advisory Committee “to the extent practicable”

By a VOTE of 2 in favor, 16 opposed and 7 abstentions the motion fails.

A MOTION was made and seconded to amend to retain “registered voters” in the Advisory Committee

By a VOTE of 17 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions the motion carries.

6:20 pm Possible vote to amend the previous votes on the Committee’s recommendations on other Warrant Articles for the 2019 November Annual Town Meeting

Next Meeting:

Upon a MOTION made and seconded to adjourn, and voted unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Documents Presented:
- REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TOWN ORGANIZATION & STRUCTURE ON WARRANT ARTICLE 33
- REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TOWN ORGANIZATION & STRUCTURE ON WARRANT ARTICLE 34
TOWN OF BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE

Wednesday, November 20, 2019 at 6:00 pm, Brookline High School, Room 235

AGENDA

Please note: All times are approximate and subject to change. People with an interest in being present for the discussion and vote on a particular item should arrive 15 minutes before the nominally scheduled time for that item.

6:00 pm Possible vote to amend the previous vote on Article 33 Amend the Town’s General By-laws to replace references to “inhabitants” and “Citizens.” (Neil Gordon, TMM Pct. 1, petitioner)

6:10 pm Possible vote to amend the previous vote on Article 34 Amend the Town’s General By-laws regarding eligibility for membership on boards, commissions and committees. (Neil Gordon, TMM Pct. 1, petitioner)

6:20 pm Possible vote to amend the previous votes on the Committee’s recommendations on other Warrant Articles for the 2019 November Annual Town Meeting

6:30 pm Other business and announcements

The public is invited to attend however this meeting is not a public hearing so public comments will not be taken at the meeting. The Advisory Committee welcomes written comments, which will be circulated to members of the Committee if they are sent to lportscher@brooklinema.gov no later than 12:00 noon on the day of the meeting. Subcommittees of the Advisory Committee hold public hearings on any matter on which the Advisory Committee makes a recommendation to Town Meeting. Members of the public are encouraged to attend subcommittee public hearings if they wish to comment on any item under deliberation by the subcommittee.

Any member of the public may make an audio or video recording of an open session of a public meeting. They must first notify the chair and must comply with reasonable requirements regarding audio or video equipment established by the chair so as not to interfere with the meeting.

Michael Sandman, Chair 617-513-8908 msandman1943@gmail.com
Carla Benka, Vice-Chair 617-277-6102 revben@earthlink.net
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TOWN ORGANIZATION & STRUCTURE ON
WARRANT ARTICLE 33

The Town By-Laws were drafted over many years by different individuals, departments and committees. The Petitioner for Warrant Articles 33 and 34 recognized that terminology across those By-Laws is inconsistent. For example, “inhabitant” is a defined term in the By-Laws, but an “inhabitant” is defined as a “resident” and then the terms “inhabitant” and “resident” are used interchangeably in the By-Laws. Similarly, the standards for appointment to and membership on Town boards, committees and commissions are inconsistent, with some referring to “members,” others to “citizens,” and others to “residents.”

Petitioner also believes that the category of individuals protected or given privileges by a number of Town By-Laws is excessively narrow. For example, some provisions extend protections only to “citizens” or “inhabitants” in cases where Petitioner believes the protections should extend more generally to the “public.”

Petitioner, accordingly, would modify the Town By-Laws in three general ways. First, the term “inhabitant” currently defined in the By-Laws would be changed to “resident” and then the term “resident” would be used more consistently throughout the By-Laws (this change affects both Warrant Articles 33 and 34). Second, other provisions of the By-Laws would be broadened by changing the terms “citizens” or “inhabitants” to “the public,” thus broadening protections and privileges (these changes appears in Warrant Article 33). Third, the changes would make clear that membership on certain Town bodies is limited to residents of the Town (these changes appear in Warrant Article 34).

In general, the Committee on Town Organization and Structure agreed with Petitioner’s suggested changes, although it had the questions, comments and concerns discussed below on Article 33 (Article 34 is addressed in a separate CTOS Report). Petitioner participated in the CTOS meetings regarding the two articles, agreed with the modifications proposed by CTOS, and will incorporate the modifications suggested below in an amended Warrant Article 33.

A. **By-Law Section 1.1.4**: In Section 1.1.4 of the By-Laws (“Definitions”), Article 33 changes the term “Inhabitant” to “Resident,” but then gives “Resident” a circular definition (“Resident shall mean a resident of the Town of Brookline”). Members of CTOS found the circularity troublesome and considered recommending a more specific definition based on state law (e.g., Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 62, Section 1(f) more precisely defines “resident” for state tax purposes).

CTOS decided to support the circular definition contained in Section 1.1.4 of Article 33 for two primary reasons. First, any increased specificity would involve detailed additional cross-references to State statutes and rulings, and thus could well be beyond the scope of Article 33.
Second, because term “resident” is utilized primarily to define the permissible membership of boards, commissions and committees in Article 34, it seemed reasonable to trust the appointing authority (e.g., the Select Board or the Moderator) to interpret the term “resident” sensibly without the need for detailed statutory guidance. Indeed, the term “Inhabitant” is currently defined as a “resident in the town,” and that definition has not created problems.

B. **By-Law Section 3.12.3.C.10:** Article 33 would charge the Director of Planning & Community Development with ensuring that the Town’s Comprehensive Plan was consistent with the welfare of “the public” rather than merely the Town’s “inhabitants” as is now the case in By-Law Section 3.12.3.C.10.

CTOS accepted “the public” language change proposed by Warrant Article 33 for By-Law Section 3.12.3.C.10, but noted that the language should be applied with common sense. For example, while the “welfare” of MetroWest commuters driving through Brookline might be considered, since they are members of “the public,” CTOS would not expect the Comprehensive Plan to suggest facilitating commutes between Boston and MetroWest suburbs either at the expense of Brookline residents by routing traffic onto Brookline neighborhood streets, or at the expense of Brookline businesses by removing parking on Route 9 to create an additional travel lane.

C. **By-Law Sections 3.12.3.C.21 and 3.21.1.c:** Two By-Law provisions cited in Warrant Article 33 deal with participation in the business of Town bodies. Both By-Law sections now limit such participation to “citizens.” Warrant Article 33 originally suggested changing the language to “the public.” CTOS recommends a middle ground, referring to “residents and other interested parties.”

By-Law Section 3.12.3.C.21 charges the Director of Planning & Community Development with “maximizing” input to Town boards and officials. CTOS recommends the following language:

21. to facilitate and maximize meaningful input to Town boards and officials to the extent reasonably practical from Residents and other interested parties, including civic associations and neighborhood organizations.

Similarly, By-Law Section 3.21.1.c deals with participation in the business of Town governmental bodies. CTOS recommends the following language:

(c) to the extent reasonably practical, to improve opportunities for broader and more meaningful participation by Residents and other interested parties in the business of Town governmental bodies.
The changes recommended by CTOS would broaden the language of both provisions, which as noted currently refer to participation only by those who are “citizens.” The CTOS language would also continue to recognize the important role of civic associations and neighborhood organizations, rather than deleting such phraseology as originally proposed in Warrant Article 33. At the same time, the language recommended by CTOS would not suggest that the general public, with no connection to Brookline, should have the same privileges as residents and other persons affected by Brookline governmental action. The term “and other interested parties” is intended to recognize the legitimate interests that persons such as business owners in Town, those working in Town, and property owners in Town, could have in Town decisions even if they are not residents of the Town.

While participation in Town affairs should not be narrowly limited to “citizens” as is now the case, CTOS believes that suggesting unlimited participation by any member of the “public” could discourage residents from participating in Town affairs and reduce willingness to serve on Town boards, committees and commissions. CTOS believed that chairs should exercise reasonable judgment in determining participation by “interested parties.” To take an extreme example, members of a hate group from outside the Town need not be accorded the same privileges to participate in Town decisions as those with direct interests in those decisions. It should be noted that the Attorney General, though encouraging “as much public participation as time permits” in meetings, makes clear that “public participation is entirely within the chair’s discretion.” Open Meeting Law Guide, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Office of Attorney General Maura Healey (October 6, 2017), at 15.

D. By-Law Section 3.21.3.b and By-Law Article 7.9: The proposed change in Warrant Article 33 with respect to By-Law Section 3.21.3.b would require public meeting notices, agendas and information regarding the contact person for the meeting to be disseminated to “members of the public” who join lists for “electronic notifications (such as by email).” The current By-Law language theoretically limits membership on such meeting notice lists to “citizens.” Similarly, the proposed change in Article 7.9 of the By-Laws would provide for action to be taken to warn the “public” of snow emergency parking bans rather than merely “inhabitants of the town” as is now the case.

CTOS has consulted with the Town Clerk and Information Technology Department and determined that nothing prevents non-residents from adding their email addresses to the notification lists regarding public meetings under By-Law Article 3.21.3.b. (This is despite the facts that another current By-Law provision, Section 3.21.2, provides for such public notification lists to include “only Town Meeting Members and other Town residents,” that Warrant Article 33 does not propose a change in that language, and that any such change at this point could well be beyond the scope of the warrant.)
CTOS also was informed by the Department of Public Works and the Information Technology Department that nothing precludes non-residents from adding their phone numbers to receive automated notification of snow emergency parking bans under By-Law Article 7.9.

CTOS thus determined that the changes proposed in Warrant Article 33 to broaden the scope of notifications under By-Law Section 3.21.3.b and By-Law Article 7.9 are feasible.

E. **By-Law Section 8.23.1**: With regard to Section 8.23.1 of the By-Laws (“Tobacco Control”), CTOS agrees that the purpose of tobacco control should be stated as the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the public, rather than merely inhabitants of the Town, but also believes that it is important to emphasize the importance of protecting the health of youth who may lack judgment with respect to tobacco and e-cigarette consumption. Therefore, CTOS would not eliminate the reference to the “younger population” as originally proposed by Warrant Article 33. CTOS recommends the following language incorporating the reference to “public” health but also retaining the current reference to the “younger population”:

   In order to protect the health, safety and welfare of the **public, including but not limited to its younger population**, by restricting the sale of and public exposure to tobacco and e-cigarette products known to be related to various and serious health conditions such as cancer, this by-law shall limit and restrict the sale of and public exposure to tobacco and e-cigarette products within the Town of Brookline.

As noted above, where CTOS has recommended changes in certain provisions of Warrant Article 33, petitioner agreed with those changes and will incorporate those changes in a revised Article.
Warrant Article 34 attempts to reconcile inconsistent terminology in our by-laws regarding appointments to Town boards, committees, and commissions. Its intent is to ensure everyone serving is a current resident and that common, standardized terms are used. The article would also impose residency requirements where none currently exist. The Committee on Town Organization & Structure (CTOS) considered Article 34 at multiple meetings and had extended discussions with the petitioner. CTOS recommends FAVORABLE ACTION on a revised motion to be offered by the petitioner. We expect that the petitioner will include the full text of that revised motion in the supplement to the Combined Reports.

DISCUSSION

Various articles in Brookline’s current by-laws were established over time and not always consistently, leaving us with a hodgepodge of terms. Throughout our by-laws, resident members of boards, committees, and commissions are variously referred to as “member”, “citizen”, “resident”, and “volunteer member”. Warrant Article 34 seeks to impart better clarifying and consistent language in these by-law articles. Viewed as a whole, our current by-laws can appear a bit dog-eared and in need of neatening up.

Consistency of terms has value. The term “citizen” can have a very broad interpretation and has probably come to be understood a bit differently than originally intended – potentially a citizen of the United States who is not even a resident of Brookline. Alternatively, and perhaps of more concern, it can be interpreted to exclude long-term or even permanent residents of Brookline who do not happen to be citizens of the United States.

While it is intended that some “members” of Town organizations be residents of our town, it is not true, or at least not explicitly expressed in our current by-laws in all cases.

In addition to providing common terms, many of the changes posited in Warrant Article 34 yield substantive structural changes of intent or changes in practice in our by-laws. Some of these changes may have implications that should be considered carefully.

For example, the term “citizens” is changed to “residents” in the COUNCIL ON AGING SECTION 3.10.1. Assuming we now use “citizen” to mean “resident”, then the change is not substantive. Likewise, under ARTICLE 3.2 SCHOOL COMMITTEE a change from “residents” to “members” is consistent in that School Committee members are required to be elected – and are therefore residents.

In other cases, however, “members” becomes “residents” in the by-law’s list of requirements for who is eligible to serve on a board, commission, or committee, and that can be a change of substance and can narrow eligibility. Article 34, as it initially appeared in the Warrant, would institute a requirement that members of the following boards, commissions, and committees be
residents: Commission for Women; Commission on Disability; CTOS; Audit Committee; Board of Appeals; Preservation Commission; and Naming Committee.

CTOS paid particular attention to the impact of Article 34’s proposed changes on the Commission for Women and the Commission on Disability.

Currently, the Commission for Women only requires the appointment of “members”, not that they necessarily be residents. This is true for the Commission on Disability as well. By adopting the changes initially proposed in this warrant article, we would require members to be residents. Warrant Article 34 implies a certain value judgment that it deems advisable, and worth changing, in all cases. That notion may not be embraced by everyone and can be potentially counterproductive in some cases.

In the opinion of CTOS, no changes should be made to the current by-law structure with regards to the Commission for Women or Commission on Disability. The CTOS heard voices from and for the Commission for Women with a strong conviction that there may well be instances where a non-resident of Brookline, with a certain contributory understanding of women’s issues, could well serve on the Commission. Likewise, CTOS feels that there are members of our community, though non-residents, who may contribute significantly to the Commission on Disability. As an example, The Massachusetts Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired (MABVI) is located in Brookline. As a member of the Brookline community, MABVI (originally founded by Helen Keller) has contributed significantly with programming geared toward Brookline residents and has had a close working relationship with our Senior Center. There is undoubtedly a pool of talent and understanding in the MABVI staff. While not residents, they are community members. In addition, the current by-law indicates that one member of the Commission on Disability should be a member of the Select Board or a Department Head. Many Departments Heads are not residents of Brookline, and this is another reason not to impose a residency requirement.

Of the other Town organizations that would require member residency under this article, we believe it is a reasonable constraint. The other organizations (2.3 CTOS, 3.5 AUDIT COMMITTEE, 3.6 BOARD OF APPEALS, 5.6.4 PRESERVATION COMMISSION, 6.8 NAMING COMMITTEE) all have a more intimate relationship to the town and having members of these organizations be Brookline residents probably best serves our community. CTOS recognized that, in general, Brookline residents should have the responsibility of serving on Brookline’s boards, commissions, and committees that make important decisions that affect the town. In discussions of the Audit Committee, CTOS noted that Brookline has many residents who can bring valuable experience and expertise to this committee, and that the auditor retained by the Town brings an external perspective to the committee.

In several instances, the change from “citizens” to “residents” is accompanied with the phrase “so long as they remain residents”. This is to ensure that after the time of appointment, should a member move and no longer be a resident of Brookline, their term ends. It is a term not needed in every instance, but it is in some. Note that some of the current by-laws specify that members of a board, commission, or committee must be residents in order to serve on the relevant body, whereas others only stipulate such a requirement for members at the time of their appointment. By adding the phrase, “so long as they remain residents” in some places, Article 34 makes the by-law more consistent.
Under ARTICLE 3.16 PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION, the following codifying language is added: “There shall be a Park and Recreation Commission to consist of seven residents, appointed by the Select Board for three year staggered terms.” This is because, even though it has been occurring in practice, it has not been codified.

A proposed change of substance appears under ARTICLE 2.2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE by adding the phrase “to the extent practicable” after noting that at least one elected Town Meeting Member (TMM) shall be appointed from each precinct. Our current by-law requires at least one TMM from each precinct and no more than four. However, in practice, this is not always achievable, and from time to time there are unfilled openings in a precinct. This phrase recognizes that reality. We cannot require that a TMM, when asked, must serve on the Advisory Committee. Concern was raised that, in theory, this might allow for potential “stacking” within the Advisory Committee ranks. Some felt that should such sinister inclinations actually manifest themselves, Town Meeting, if not the electorate, would quickly rectify the situation. Moreover, in the absence of a TMM from a precinct, the Moderator has sought to appoint a precinct resident to the Advisory Committee to give voice to that precinct. We know that there are times when the TMM provision of the by-law cannot be fulfilled. By ignoring that reality, however, we tacitly accede to a violation of our by-law and thus CTOS believes that adding the “practicable” phrase proposed by Article 34 is warranted.

The other change of substance would allow the appointment of a “resident” who may not be a registered voter (though clearly this would not be the case for elected Town Meeting Members). The CTOS believes this is a change that may productively serve the Advisory Committee. While the majority of Committee members are registered voters and likely quite politically active, the intent of the Committee is to be deliberative and, to the extent possible, keep politics at bay. We are all advocates of sorts, but within the Advisory Committee one must serve as a steward. The propose change here is in keeping with that recognition, allowing for a slightly different voice from the community.

**Summary**

Below is a summary of the changes originally proposed in Warrant Article 34.

**Member vs Resident**

The substantive change here is that where membership in an organization does not necessarily require one to be a resident, the changes in WA 34 will now require it.

This is true for the following:

2.3 CTOS, 3.5 AUDIT COMMITTEE, 3.6 BOARD OF APPEALS, 3.9 COMMISSION FOR WOMEN, 3.23 BROOKLINE COMMISSION ON DISABILITY, 5.6.4 PRESERVATION COMMISSION, 6.8 NAMING COMMITTEE.
“So long as they remain residents”

This phrase is used in four places: 3.7 BUILDING COMMISSION, 3.11 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (ITAC), 3.12 PLANNING BOARD, 6.8 NAMING COMMITTEE.

There is consistency of the use of this phrase in these four cases, as members are appointed (as opposed to “shall consist of”) and they may be residents at the time of appointment, but nothing indicates that they must continue to be residents. The new phrase would now require it.

One-offs

2.2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE: membership is by appointment. Committee members would no longer have to be registered voters, only “residents”. The requirement that there be at least one (but no more than four) Town Meeting Member (at the time of appointment) from each precinct can be set aside at the discretion of the Moderator with the introduction of the phrase “to the extent practicable”.

4.9 ELECTION CAMPAIGNS: membership is by appointment. The appointing authorities are the Town Clerk, the Select Board, and the Moderator. Only the Moderator is required to appoint “residents”. Members appointed by the Town Clerk or Select Board need not be residents. This is currently the case in our by-laws, and WA 34 does not seek to change that.

CTOS Changes

The CTOS suggested not making changes to the current structure of the Commission for Women or Commission on Disability, Also, the CTOS suggest that no changes be made to the Committee on Campaigns as Town Meeting may well remove that provision this fall. The petitioner accepted our changes and incorporated them into his revised main motion under Article 34.

Conclusion

The broader question in all of this, aside from the use of common terms, is to what extent we want to require residency as a requirement for membership in various Town organizations. The CTOS believes the petitioner’s revised motion strikes a solid balance. Other than the above mentioned, no objections were voiced to the CTOS regarding the residency requirements, nor were any objections conveyed to us through the Select Board. The CTOS believes that the housekeeping proposed under Article 34 will be benign, though specific bodies may yet (even as late as the debate at Town Meeting) provide reasons why the limitation to resident members should not apply to them. As stated above, however, we feel there is a reasoned argument to require it in many if not most instances.
RECOMMENDATION

The changes offered in Warrant Article 34 help streamline and clarify our by-laws as such, by a unanimous vote taken on November 5th, the CTOS recommends FAVORABLE ACTION on the petitioner’s revised motion.