

Oregon Area Business Meeting Minutes

Nov. 18-20, 2005

Seaside Convention Center

Hosted by Dist 1 – Seaside, Oregon

(Note from Area Secretary:

The information below is a written record of the business meeting. I've done my best to capture what actually happened and get it down on paper for you! The discussion notes for the motions do not contain all of the discussion that actually happened, but should convey a good sense of opinions both for and against the various motions. Paraphrasing is sometimes necessary. Thank you!)

Area Chair Dave A. opened the meeting at 8:00 a.m. with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer, the reading of the Preamble (Dave, Dist 21), the Twelve Traditions (Steve, Dist 34) and the Twelve Concepts (B.J., Dist 4). He then introduced our past delegates: Mark S., Helen M., Don J., and Darlene G. He then had the New GSRs stand and be acknowledged.

Roll

Area Secretary Suzanne B. called Roll.

Past Minutes

Minutes from the September 2005 assembly were approved as written with no amendments.

Area Officer Reports

The following Area Officers gave reports: (see attached written reports)

Bruce L.	Delegate
Eric K.	Alt. Delegate
Dave A.	Chair
Anne M.	Alt. Chair
Gus P.	Treasurer
	Motion was made to approve the treasurer's report by Ray R., seconded and ok'd by all
Suzanne B.	Secretary

Committee Reports

The following committee officers gave reports: (see attached)

Access	Tim A.
Archives	Hal E.
Grapevine/La Vina	Darlene G.
Cooperation with Treatment Facilities (CTF)	Don. O.
Corrections	Jack C.
Cooperation with the Professional Community (CPC)	James J.
Public Information (PI)	Anne C.
Hospitals	Don W.
Newsletter	Greg S. (given in absentia by Dave A.)
PRAASA 2007	Rich B.
Finance	Les S.
PNC 2006	Chase B. & Michael G.

Old Business

Tabled Motion # 5:

Motion 5:

Submitted by the "Ad hoc committee for per diem rates and funding"

Motion: To change the Lodging per diem rate that Oregon Area reimburses its Officers and Service Committee Members from \$43.00 per day to \$65.00 per day.

Intent and Purpose: To reduce out of pocket expenses for trusted servants. This will increase the opportunity for all members to participate in general service. The current amount of \$43.00 has been used since September of 1989. Since then, the average lodging costs have increased substantially. The proposed amount is a “cap” meaning that members typically make efforts to spend less than the maximum amount. Our committee has researched current lodging costs and recommends this increase.

Current Practice: The current rate is \$43 per night* This has been in effect since September 1989. Area committee members and officers performing duties and services between assemblies may use this rate. The per diem rate is not used for travel to assemblies, which is a separate allowance, and not within the scope of this motion.

*Area Guideline, Item k, under IV, C, 2

Financial Impact: In 2004, Oregon area paid \$1052.00 in lodging per diem reimbursements. With the proposed increase, that amount would have been around \$1590.00 for an increase of approximately \$538.00

Discussion:

Chris (Dist 25) Go for it – it’s 16 years overdue!
Paul H. said the rate was cheap and called for the question
Finance Committee: We have the money!

A vote was taken and it was determined that this was urgent or administrative

Motion passed unanimously.

Tabled Motion #7:

Submitted by District 22

Motion: To eliminate the Oregon Area travel funding for the September Assembly chair.

Current Practice: Currently only the September Assembly chair is funded by the Oregon Area to attend assemblies.

Intent & Purpose: To eliminate special treatment for the September Assembly chair. Historically, until 1987, all voting motions, as well as for officers and budget, was done at the September assembly and this assembly chair was funded the same as an Area Officer. The three other assemblies were known as mini assemblies and the assembly chairs were not funded. This practice has continued despite the fact that voting on motions has been conducted at all quarterly assemblies for 18 years.

District 22, being fully self-supporting, has chosen as a district to fund our September assembly chair to present the required updated status reports. However, the DCM, or any other district member may make this report, if the chair is unable to attend. There is no longer a reason to treat the September chair differently than the other three assembly chairs.

Budgetary Impact: This motion will save the Oregon Area \$400 from its budget.

Discussion: Fran asked for clarity of the voting procedures.

A member called for the question and it was seconded by Dave. A vote was taken and the **Motion Passed.**

Minority Opinion: Erik J. asked why we were eliminating funding for something so important. Russ P. reiterated this point.

The body was asked if it wished to reconsider its vote. **Motion stands as passed.**

Tabled Motion #8:

Presented by Victor A. GSR for the homegroup “Nuevo Amanecer”

Motion: We want to form a new geographic district to include Washington, Yamhill and Marion counties. We have nine groups that are supporting this motion.

Purpose: In order to better service our groups, we want to be an active district within the structure of the Oregon Area. According to the service manual, when a district reaches 20 or more groups it is time to consider opening a new district. District 34 has twice the suggested number of groups and is not a geographic group (which would include the entire state of Oregon). We have taken a group conscience that by forming this new district we give better service.

Monetary Impact: \$50 per assembly to enable the DCM to attend, or \$200 annually.

Enclosed you will find a map of the area in which we would like to operate as a district.

Discussion:

Teffany got up and said her group supports this motion.

Julio said that not ALL of Dist. 34 supports this motion. A letter was sent out to the GSRs and DCMs that told of the results of the District 34 meeting on this topic. This motion is brought forth by a group that wants a convention within the Oregon Area and cannot get funding through District 34 and that this represents an ulterior motive to host a convention. Special agenda is clouding the issue. He said that lots of late info came to the front.

Samantha said the people are in place and the politicking is irrelevant. They are already a district in action and we just need to give them a number.

Tony said we are a new district and do not need endorsement by you. However, we want to gather information and work together in unison and to be of service. We have to expand because we have gotten too big. He asked that we do not push them back as they wish to grow. At the Oct. 29th Business meeting the GSRs voted to support this. A group conscience was taken and they need to move forth. They cannot stop at this point.

A member shared that her home group was formed upon a resentment and that this happens a lot. She is glad to see such enthusiasm in District 34 and that they have always been looked up to. Since District 35 wants to be and is supported by District 34...since they're here they are in total support.

Nancy stated that she is against this motion. The motion as presented changes things geographically and that it is wrong. We need to do principles before personalities and right now personalities have taken over. No interpretation is going on right now since the interpreter is in line for the mike. She reiterated the motion as read represents a geographical change and that there is supposed to be an amended motion presented and they would like to hear the amendment.

Chris stated that he was opposed to the motion. There is a process in place for redistricting and research is going on. District 34 is not prepared to go forth. There is no unity here.

A member who was a GSR for a Spanish speaking meeting wonders where the amended motion is that they agreed to. They wish to make a geographical change. All they can say is that as a group they are in place. They are not against anybody else (ie: Dist 34) They just wish to service the still suffering alcoholic. Everyone at the business meeting voted to support the new district. The Oregon Area nor GSO can stop this...its already taking place.

Dale stated they will not support this motion as written. There are steps in the service manual on how to go about this. The manual needs to be the guide.

A point of clarification: Dave pointed out we can only vote on this motion as it is written since it has not yet been amended. An amendment must be made by the presenter of said motion in order to change the motion.

Jesus called for the question but the body did not support the move to vote.

Ray pointed out that the procedure for redistricting is in the service manual. There is a time issue at stake. They need to be brief and to the point. Good communication is imperative. Districts can become unwieldy. Groups can come forth and announce they are a district.

Victor says there is too much confusion. We need to pull and amend the motion.

At this time the following amended motion was presented and the previous motion was withdrawn.

Amended Motion #8:

Presented by Victor A. GSR, Grupo Nuevo Amanecer

We would like to form a new Hispanic District. We have eight groups registered who are in support if this motion.

Proposition:

We want to have a new active district inside the Oregon Area in order to further our service to our communities. According to the Service Manual, when a district has twenty groups or more it is time to consider the addition of new districts.

We realize that by expanding the Oregon Area and adding a new district, we are creating an opportunity to further the service within the Hispanic community.

Monetary Impact:

\$50 per meeting for the DCM to travel for \$200 annually.

Note:

On the business meeting from District 34, October 29, 2005, the point was brought up if they should support the opening of a new district. After listening to all of the opinions, the General Service Representatives voted and

approved the support of the opening of a new district. Present at this meeting was Richard B. from the PRAASA Committee and Anne M., the Chairperson from Oregon Area #58.

Discussion:

Nikki asked what does this mean? There seems to be a lack of communication. While she is happy to see the enthusiasm of the Hispanic Community and such passion and cohesion it now seems to be splitting apart. Anger, resentment and bitter feelings run throughout

Samantha got up to say that the interpreter does not have an alternate and has to get up to translate those at the mike. They are doing the best that they can with what they have to work with.

A member stated that we are fulfilling the requirements of the service manual. Only 5 groups are necessary and they have 8. They want to clarify that they are just adding trusted servants. All they want is a number so they can do the service legitimately with GSO.

Darlene stated that she was against the amended motion and thinks we need to table this to take back to the groups so everyone can understand exactly what's going on. Especially the new Hispanic groups that think they are a district even though they haven't been recognized as such by the Oregon Area.

Francisco stated that he is not in support - the people behind it are in it for prestige and to run a conference. He said they are breaking the first tradition.

Lizz stated that no matter what happens it will be God's will. Most groups get formed this way.

A member asked where is the unity? This is not unity. NW, SW, E, W, N, S, SE and NE all need to be represented.

Miguel said that as the new DCM for District 34 he is confused and concerned over who belongs where. He had someone tell him they give District 34 a month before it dissolves. Sounds like fighting against each other and not for alcoholics.

Debbie of Dist 19 is very nervous and emotional. Heard the question was called and thinks we need to discuss this more. God should be in all our affairs.

Jose, a rep from Gresham, said it was his personal opinion that a district can be divided into smaller districts.

Thinks many problems may arise. Why is this such a big deal? If they don't care what the Area thinks why are they even here? God will decide.

Tatiano said that on May 16, 1993 they made a request to become District 34. It has been working at this level for 10 years. They would like our support.

Eric asked the question: Area 2 districts fighting over groups? Wonderful! He told the story of the GSR that was confused where he belonged and was told to go to the 3 nearby districts and decide where they belonged. The people behind this want to do this by the book and do it the right way. There is nothing written that says they can't become a district. However if they want financial support they have to come to us for approval. He turned to the new district and said, "You are in existence and you cannot be denied."

Robin said there are other ways of redistricting. A large district can subdistrict. Another alternative is that they can create zones within the district with each zone having its own representation, but all would have but one District overseeing it, one DCM.

Ray called for the question. It was seconded by Jay. Discussion was closed. We voted whether or not to vote and we decided to vote.

A vote was taken and the **Motion Passed**.

Minority Opinion:

Dale stated that a letter passed around states that they formed the district in order to host a convention and that is a bad motive.

John stated that redistricting should be done because it is not meeting the needs of service. A geographic District makes more sense.

Tim said he felt there was a great deal of emotion going on. They haven't been funded traditionally. They want us to settle their dispute. This motion should be tabled so the groups can participate. No need to rush, only a second discussion is needed. The website name discussion got more time.

Julio said he is not in agreement as he has been with District 34 for years. These groups never even worked with District 34. The Hispanic district is having difficulties. District 34 already lacks service workers and a new district won't fix that. As a district they are in conflict and they are not in a position to make a new district.

Wendy said we should table. It was confusing before and its more confusing now! How is the Oregon Area functioning to serve the Spanish District? This is no urgent issue.

Chris said a number of assemblies back gas monies, travel and etc...should have been investigated. An ad hoc committee should have been formed as all the Oregon Area could learn from this process.

Darlene stated she was against this motion. 8 groups already think they have a new district called District 35. They need education about the process.

Another member said ditto in the ad hoc committee idea.

A member stated that this motion was formed against the outgoing DCM. Thinks this should be done differently. More ideas like subdistricting and zones should have been discussed. This process has been too hasty. Fran said we should table this and take it back to our groups. There is racism going on. AA is a reflection of the world at large and we should not turn a blind eye. Katherine said if it wasn't confusing enough before it sure is now and it will only get worse. The Hispanic community needs to come forth as a united front to present this.

At this time the Minority opinion subsided and we asked if anyone wished to change their vote and hands went up. We again asked the body if they wished to revote but there was no majority to do so.

Motion stands as Passed.

Motion 9:

Submitted by the Oregon Area Access Committee

Motion: That the Oregon Area provide a letter of support for the formation of an Access Committee at the national level, for the GSO agenda.

Intent & Purpose: To give continuity to Access Committees throughout the United States and Canada. This would provide a GSO committee the time and energy to focus on gathering the experiences of those working with alcoholics with special needs. The information then would be shared with access committees, groups and individual members to help better serve alcoholics with accessibility/special needs issues.

Budgetary Impact: None

There was no discussion and the question was called. Stu seconded and a vote was taken
Motion Passed.

Minority Opinion:

Bruce pointed out that this has been done before and a letter of support goes nowhere. We need to put forth a motion to form the committee. Letters of support just get read to select groups and have little impact. If we keep doing the same thing over and over nothing will change.

Fran moved that we revote, Dave seconded but there was not enough support to vote.

Discussion reopened and

Bruce reaffirmed that if we want action to take place we need to amend the motion to put forth a motion.

At this time the following amendment was made:

Submitted by Tim A, Access Chair

Motion: For the Oregon Area to send a motion to GSO to add to the Conference Agenda items to consider the formation of an Access Committee.

Seconded by Dave.

Vote was unanimous. The **motion was Passed.**

At this time we had our

Service Rotations for the Oregon Area:

We would like to extend thanks to these trusted servants as they move out of their positions and we welcome those coming in.

Darlene G. rotated out as Grapevine Chair and is now a Past Delegate.

Bruce L. rotated out as Delegate and rotated in as Grapevine Chair.

Eric K. rotated out as Alternate Delegate and rotated in as Delegate.

Dave A. rotated out as Area Chair and rotated in as Alternate Delegate.

Anne M. rotated out as Alternate Area Chair and rotated in as Area Chairperson.

Chase B. rotated in as Alternate Area Chair.

James J. rotated out as Cooperation with the Professional Community Committee North Chair and

Alan U. rotated in as Cooperation with the Professional Community Committee Chair South.

Jerry C. rotated in as Cooperation with the Professional Community Committee Co-Chair North.

Rebecca W. rotated out as Public Information Chair and Anne C. rotated in as Public Information Chair North.

Jay S. rotated in as Public Information Co-Chair South.

Don O. rotated out as Cooperation with Treatment Facilities Chair and Bill I. rotated in as Cooperation with Treatment Facilities Chair.

Les S. rotated out as Finance Committee Chair and Ron W. rotated in as Finance Committee Chair.

Patrick B. rotated in as Finance Committee Co-Chair.

Murray M. rotated in as Finance Committee Assistant Chair.

Greg S. rotated out as Newsletter Chair and Kelly G. rotated in as Newsletter Chair.

New Business

Motion 1:

Submitted by the Oregon Area Finance Committee.

Motion: To increase the 2005 Treasurer Budget by \$150.00

Intent and Purpose: To reimburse the Treasurer for printing and supply expenses incurred during this fiscal year. Some of these expense items will be used during fiscal year 2006.

Current Practice: The current budget for the Treasurer is \$430.00

Financial Impact: With the passage of the proposed motion, the 2005 treasurer line item will increase by \$150.00 to a new budget total of \$580.00.

Motion was seconded by Wendy W.

Finance Committee: We have the money.

There was no discussion and the question was called.

We voted that the matter was urgent or administrative.

Motion Passed.

Minority Opinion:

A member asked how we handled it before.

Treasurer responded that the prices went up on printing.

No one wished to change their vote

Motion stands as Passed.

Motion 2:

Submitted by the Oregon Area Finance Committee.

Motion: to fund PRAASA (Pacific Regional AA Service Assembly) and PNC (Pacific Northwest Conference) Committee Chairs to assemblies and fully fund attendance at appropriate conferences.

Intent and Purpose: To fund our trusted servants and keep these positions from only being available for people who are able to pay their own expenses.

Current Practice: The PRAASA and PNC committee chairs are asked to pay their own expenses.

Financial Impact: PRAASA chair \$2,000.00 every 14 years
PNC Chair \$1,500 every other year.

Seconded by Robin

Finance Committee: We have the money

Discussion:

Helen M. got up to ask if we forgot Forum, as they might come here in the future?

A member asked for clarification...would there be two chairs on the committee and would they both be funded?

The response was that there is only one sum of money how they use it is up to them.

Fran asked what qualifies as an appropriate conference?

The response was given that PRAASA chairs would go to the previous PRAASA to the one we host and PNC would go to the previous PNC to the one we host.

Wendy pointed out there were ambiguous terms used in this motion, it could be misconstrued.

Tim got up to say that the ambiguity is there on purpose so that special circumstances can factor in.

The question was raised why the dramatic difference in financial impacts? Answer was that PRAASA hasn't been hosted by the Oregon Area in 14 years while we host PNC more often.

Tammy called for the question.

We voted to end discussion

We voted that this was urgent or administrative and the motion was passed.

Minority Opinion:

David said that we should take this back to the groups since they have nothing else to discuss.

Hal thought the groups should have a say in this.

A member thought the wording was too vague and the motion should be rewritten. The lump sums are too vague and a breakdown of expenses should be given.

Mike thought we should take it back to the groups.

Ray moved to revote, Teffany seconded and we revoted.

The Motion stands as Passed.

Treasurer's Report

Opening balance:	\$36,743.35
Checks written at assembly	<u>\$8,839.96</u>
Outgoing Balance	*\$27,903.39

*Adjust this balance to less \$300 to fund PNC and PRAASA Chairs.