

**Main Menu**

- [Home Page](#)
- [Trustee Guidelines](#)
- [GA Reference Material](#)
- [Keyword Search](#)
- [Download Center](#)
- [Contact Administrator](#)

**Portland - Spring '08  
Trustee Agenda**

**[Portland Conference Info](#)**

- [Agenda Information](#)
- [Unfinished Business](#)
- [Committee Related Issues](#)
- [Request for New Committees](#)
- [Steps](#)
- [Literature Changes](#)
- [New Literature](#)
- [Procedures](#)
- [2-Conference Bids](#)
- [Overseas Areas](#)

[54-Portland Rolling Agenda](#)

**[Submit an Agenda Item](#)**

**BOT Committees**

[Current Committees](#)

**Trustee Line & Other  
Features**

- [Trustee Line Home Page](#)
- [Board of Regents News Page](#)
- [Intergroup Trustee Funding](#)
- [Walk-A-Thon Ideas](#)
- [Walk-A-Thon Schedule](#)

**Future Conferences**

[Upcoming Conferences](#)

---

## Trustee Line for January 2008

Rate this issue of the Trustee Line:

Unrated      Your Rating

If you would like a PDF version of this issue to distribute to your rooms, or to print out for easier reading, click here. (this link will become active after 1/31/08 midnight)

### From The Trustees

The subjects listed below are just a listing of themes that have been submitted by other Trustees. You may respond to any of them or start an entirely new subject

Item	Subject	Last Entry
1.	39 meetings requirement	1/28/08 11:24 AM
2.	Liability insurance for groups	1/16/08 10:58 PM
3.	Do we even need a Guidance Code?	1/16/08 11:11 PM
4.	Board of Regents secrecy	1/21/08 12:59 PM
5.	Multiple topics already outlined	1/18/08 1:05 PM
6.	Trustee Guidelines - #3	1/21/08 6:51 PM

Submit a response to the [Trustee Line](#) because of something you have read in this or any other issue.

<b>39 meetings requirement</b>
--------------------------------

1/1/08 - 11:29 PM  
Happy New Year to all.

Wishing everyone a safe and healthy New Year.

Once again in my area the 39 meetings has become an issue. Perhaps someone can assist in finally addressing this issue that I have seen far too many times rear its ugly head and disrupt meetings and cause disruption and disturb a rooms/area unity harm.

Today's issue/question is, If someone goes to two meetings in the same night (our meetings are usually 2 or 2 1/2 hours) does it "count" as 2 meetings towards the 39. This person went to one meeting for about an hour, then went to other meeting.

My personal opinion is that I would like to remove the 39 meeting requirement, but that has failed previously.

I would like people's opinions, but what I am really looking for is to finally address this 39 meeting situation.

See you in Portland  
Mike A. - Area 14

---

1/3/08 - 10:48 AM  
Happy New Year

There is a reason in my mind that the 39 meeting Requirement exists. Most members will attend at least 39 meetings in their first year. In their subsequent years, they will reduce the number of meetings they attend. So as an example, let's say a member attends 2 meetings early in his 3rd year and comes back just before his next birthday and wants to celebrate. Does the member desire to celebrate???With the 39 meeting requirement, the group can say the member can not celebrate his birthday as he has not participated or worked all the aspects of program - attendance at meetings, working the 12 steps and abstinence from gambling. Members are supposed to be attending meetings to show the newcomer that the program works, be there to be a sponsor, participate in service or just be there to share their experience, strengths and hopes with those coming in and those struggling. Also by attendance at meetings, the member has contributed to helping spread the word of Gamblers Anonymous (locally, nationally and at ISO) by contributing to the 7th Tradition. Otherwise without this requirement, why do we have a program called Gamblers Anonymous. This is supposed to be a life long program - not a Come and Go tea. I would be interested to know what other 12 step groups do about the meeting requirements.

These are my thoughts  
Richard C. - Calgary Area 2A Southern Alberta

---

1/6/08 - 12:50 PM  
The 39 meeting rule is fine for people that live in areas with a lot of meetings available.

GA teaches us to change our lives and give priority to families, finances and recovery. We tell people to make the finances better by get a second job. The Question is if you work a second job to pay back debt are you suppose to tell your second employer that you want to work but need off for weekly GA meetings. Another example -We have a member at the present time who is approaching 3 yrs in March. The member has been in and out of the hospital for several months fighting cancer and just was released after a 3 week stay. With chemo and hospital stays according to the rules he doesn't qualify to be honored for his success this year since He has only attended 21 meetings since his 2 yrs celebration. This is wrong. When he has been healthy this member attends over 50 meeting a year excluding group functions which he attends such as speaker meetings ect. This Member has also been a Lifeliner for the past 2 years. I am shamed of this rule and I feel this should be a group unity option. Every room knows those who participate and those who don't. Our city has one meeting per week and the closest other meeting is 40 miles away. All the meetings are evenings. 1 meeting - not several a day or several a week - just 1. We become people with feelings and care about our Brothers and Sisters it hurts when they become seriously ill but it hurts worse too not be able to celebrate with a person what is was out of their control as to the number of meetings they attended.

Thank you,  
Gary G. - Area 6C

---

1/10/08 - 1:59 PM

I signed onto the Trustee line today to post a problem I wanted to share for feedback and stumbled across the 39-meeting per year topic. I too have been confused since I came to GA just exactly how one should enforce this. I certainly don't want to be part of the 'birthday police force'. Our guidance code is a valuable tool that I use to back my position on this and many other topics when protecting the integrity of my home group and GA as a whole. Some people consider the content in the guidance code as laws. Here's how I look at that. In our judicial system, our laws are interpreted by a judge. Every case is handled individually. I believe that there will always be exceptions to any rule and/or extenuating circumstances. I feel that the groups need to look at these members individually, letting the group conscious be the judge, and do the best we can to do what's right for our members, our groups and GA as a whole.

Kathleen J - Area 2G

---

1/11/08 - 8:57 AM

Hi all,

Well it has been a while since I last submitted anything to the trustee line or even visited it. I sometimes grow weary of all the BS that goes on in and around GA. Maybe that's a character defect I need some work on. Anyway!!!! 39 meetings !!!! I think it is a shame that we need to set a minimum # for people to have to attend but I believe that without this we would see a lot more "show up two weeks before my pinning people and get a pin two weeks later, then see you in 50 more weeks people" ( which probably wouldn't be a bad thing because what do they really offer the meeting anyway). The problem with that is it cheapens the whole thing for that person who works their behind off. As far as people whining about 2 hour meetings counting as 2 meetings, COME ON!!!!!! Are they kidding!!! Ask them how much time they spent gambling. Is 2 hours a week too much? Let's see 168 hours in a week minus 2 hours tell them it still leaves 166 hours to go out into the world and be a non treated compulsive gambler. I know I gambled 60 - 80 hours a week and spent more time just thinking about it. I think it is ridiculous that someone can literally take 3 months off a year from the program and still be considered a member or even a trustee for that matter.

I know we fall back to the same thing of "well gee we only have on meeting a week and its 2 hours away". Would that same person care if the casino was 2 hours away? I went to a meeting 6 hours from my house a month and a half ago because they fall in my area. That's 6 hours each way. So do we all!!!! I believe that it then falls on the trustees or trusted servants shoulders to start more meetings and when people start whining tell em to shut up and get to 39 full meeting or get involved put an agenda item. Thank you.

Matt H. - Area 16

---

1/20/08 - 1:22 PM

Happy New Year All

We had our Area 7 business meeting yesterday and here is what my area has to say about the 39 meetings per year rule.

Are we celebrating a person staying off the bet or are we celebrating the number of meetings we attend.

A guy picked up a 8 year coin who had not been to a meeting in 1-1/2 years. He just got back from Saudi Arabia serving our Country for that time. Should he not have received his coin and had a celebration.

Members who are sentenced to serve time in jail after attending GA meetings and there are no meetings in jail. When they get out should they not be allowed to celebrate their time off the bet?

This program is much more than how many meetings I attend but how well I work my program and use the tools of the program.

Our literature says it only takes two to have a meeting. Who is to say how many meetings I have attended? This is a program of honesty.

One of the most discouraging things for a member is not to receive recognition for time

off of the bet because they were unable to attend 39 meetings.

We don't have a problem with the 39 meeting a year rule but we do believe as you can see above that there are circumstances where it is impossible for a person to attend 39 meetings a year. We do not believe that any GA member should be denied the right to celebrate their time off of the bet.

On a personal note I am in this program for my recovery and don't have time to police how many meetings the other members in my area are attending. If I am working on me I don't have time to worry about everyone else.

Leanne W. - Area 7

---

1/28/08 - 11:24 AM

I have just read with interest the often discussed subject of the 39 meeting rule and am now going to give my humble opinion on that subject.

I am the outgoing trustee for area 5c Ottawa Canada.

This guideline came into being because of our area back in around 1988 or 89 when we had a person who worked nights and could not attend meetings regularly. We decided to have a Saturday afternoon GA get together and to invite people from other cities to attend and at that meeting we would present the one year pin to the guy who worked nights all year but had not gambled. As I had been in another 12 step program for some time at that time I never gave it a second thought about him not attending the only meeting in the area for several months and just wanted to recognize the fact that he had not gambled for over one year and there were not too many people who had that much time back then. So that is the story behind this rule.

We have never changed our thoughts on this subject and continue to give out medallions on birthdays without looking at how many meetings a person has attended. I am a firm believer in this as that is what we are celebrating a period of not gambling. It also may bring that person back to attending meetings after receiving a medallion.

I read in some literature recently that we should always try to keep the doors open to persons coming back and make them welcome as our primary purpose is to help the still suffering gambler whether they are gambling or not.

Making rules means someone has to enforce them and I don't think this is what we are all about.

In the area I come from we have several persons with long term clean time and many new ones coming through the door and staying. I am very proud of the people who are there to meet the newcomer and help them to stay.

One thing we do in our area to cut costs is that we do not give pins on birthdays we give medallions and if a person wants a pin they can purchase it through our intergroup.

John L. - Trustee Area - 5C

<b>Liability insurance for groups</b>
---------------------------------------

1/10/08 - 1:16 PM

Happy New Year!

The home group that I attend has posed a question. The church where our meeting is held has asked if we have liability insurance...and in a round-about way asking us to obtain some. They are concerned about a member of ours attending a meeting, getting injured and suing the church. My gut reaction is if they are going to require insurance, maybe it's time to find a new location, but I thought I'd share this situation with all of you to get some feedback on your thoughts and experiences.

Kathleen J. - Area 2G

---

1/11/08 - 8:06 PM

On a personal level I would say that any place that requires liability insurance may not be in tune with what our fellowship is about.

A G.A. approach would be to seek out the decision maker and imitator of this inquiry (they may not be the same person). Have a heart to heart talk about the fellowship and the goals of the group: the most important being to learn to live a normal (sane) life. With that in mind point out that with any group of this nature (i.e. 12 Step) there is bound to be some (seemingly) risky individual(s) attending meetings. I've seen homeless and mentally unstable types "pop in" to meetings from time to time (no judgments here, just observations). Pointing this out to the individual(s) may not put their concerns entirely to rest about the specific person you cited in your posting but it may help them to realize that just like a Church (especially since this is where you meet), a G.A. meeting is always at risk by opening their doors to all 'willing to receive the message'.

Lastly I would point out that a G.A. meeting is not a legal entity and therefore obtaining insurance may be an arduous task (if not impossible) beyond an individual taking out such insurance (which may not only be costly, but it may not even be obtainable for variety of reasons).

At that point it will either be resolved or, as you say, it may be time to seek a new meeting place.

Ed K. - Area 1

---

1/16/08 - 10:58 PM

Fellow Trustees,

I have not been posed with the question of liability for our group and do feel strongly about this. Most meeting places in our Area have been very generous and not asked about liability. I'm not sure we would stay in a location that was hinting at this. Although, as Ed stated, I think it would be beneficial to have a sit down with the person asking and explain the fellowship. Good luck with this and I hope it goes well for you.

All the best,

Tom S. - Trustee Area 7A  
Houston, Texas

---

<b>Do we even need a Guidance Code?</b>
---

---

1/11/08 - 12:28 PM

There are a number of issues that have caused me to respond with a new category for this month's Trustee Line. The first was Matt's opening remarks to the category of 39 meetings. He said it had been 'a while since he last submitted anything to the Trustee Line or even visited it.' Having done so, he felt compelled to post his feelings. I believe that if more people took the time to look at the Trustee Line, we might have as many as 30 to 40 categories each month with multiple submissions. You know what they say, live in hope - die in despair. But the issue for me is that when the submissions are posted, I am obviously looking at each one. There are those that say I offer my opinion on far too many items. I guess an answer to that would be a whole different category. The Trustee Line is not printed, no trees are being killed in producing it and ISO does not incur any charges for 1 entry per issue or 100.

I was particularly moved to respond with a new category because of what Kathleen wrote about the parallels of our judicial system and its laws being interpreted by a judge to our Guidance Code. It got uncomfortable for me with the references of how the groups need to make their own decisions, although not said in so many words, but that we could look the other way from the Guidance Code if the group conscience thinks it's okay to do so.

Although we are in a fellowship, we need structure. Many would argue that we tread the fine line that would violate Unity Step 9. To those who would think that way, I would ask that they open the Red Book and read the full explanation of what is said with that step, not just the headline.

The Guidance Code continues to get items on the BOT agendas because many sections and articles are either ambiguous or generally vague. When we tighten up the GC, then there are no personalities whatsoever, as long as we follow them to the letter. Doing so does not penalize anyone. If a segment of the GC negatively affects a GA member, it is their own fault. The GC is approved literature. It is heavily protected because changes to any part of it requires a two-thirds majority by the BOT on 2 successive votes. THAT is group conscience operating in its truest form. Members who don't read it, understand it, or follow it are basically saying that they are not interested in it. When a Trustee or any other member calls a segment into focus, it generally turns that Trustee or member into being accused of being the GA police - how absurd. That fact is that because a member, room or group violates the GC, it doesn't mean it's time to rely on anyone's opinion on using 'common sense' to figure out a way to 'get around' the GC. The next question would be, whose common sense are we to use?

In NJ, we had a very profound example of using common sense about what others thought was approved or appropriate literature. It just so happened that it was a clear-cut situation that a room was displaying non-approved literature. The room took a vote to consciously violate the GC because they felt that if it helped one person, then it was worth it and they also felt that it was appropriate. Our GC was not clear about displaying or distributing non-approved material or even what constituted appropriate literature. I brought this up to the room and I'm sad to say that many years after the fact, I am still considered an outcast by many in the room because I pointed out a section of the GC. As a result of this issue, the GC now has a stronger definition of what a GA room is and how it cannot use, display and distribute non-approved or non-appropriate literature. We now have a section that defines what GA-approved literature is and another for what GA appropriate material is.

This is just one example of how we need to follow what is decided by group conscience in the form of over 100 Trustees from all over the world. We are always allowed to modify what we don't like, but the group conscience of the BOT is the final determination. Groups are required to follow the GC or they will cease to be a GA group. That means the groups and individuals cannot arbitrarily override the GC because someone or some group did not pay attention to the GC segments and some concerned member or Trustee has brought it to light which might spoil the plans of others.

Do the Trustees know the program better than other members, absolutely not. Do they have a better working knowledge of the Guidance Code, hopefully, but only because they are immersed in it so much from the Trustee meetings. Are the Trustees trying to act like the GA police, no. If we don't follow the GC and make our best efforts to improve it to gain more clarity, then we will continue to see the program splintered and redirected into areas that will make the meetings very dissimilar from one area to another. We, as active compulsive gamblers, lived in a world of chaos because we wanted to do what WE individually thought was best. Coming into GA, we learned our way didn't work and it was the living will of the fellowship and its Guidance Code and group conscience that brought us to the door of recovery. Recovery Step 3 tells us that we need to give up our will and our lives in order to restore us to a normal way of thinking and living. The Guidance Code is not a compilation of suggestions. It is the GA book of how things are supposed to be done. Not following it affects GA as a whole - period, the end.

Let's stop complaining about the Guidance Code and start following it and everything it embodies. Yes, anyone can start the ball rolling for changes in any segment of it, but let's do it the right way. If we are going to use H-O-W, then change can happen and group conscience will have followed due process.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

1/16/08 - 11:11 PM  
Fellow Trustees,

I couldn't agree more with David here, the Guidance Code is the bottom line for me. It is what I was taught to follow when I first entered Gamblers Anonymous and it is what I was told to uphold as a Trustee. I don't feel like enough people even know what the GC is, much less the importance of having guidance and direction. There needs to be a framework to operate from and if a group chooses to disregard this, then they set an example to future members and groups that can be counterproductive. I wish we could educate members more about the GC, even have workshops at conventions or mini conventions on the Guidance Code. We need this to maintain what a 'group conscience' is all about.

All the best,

Tom S. - Trustee Area 7A  
Houston, Texas

**Board of Regents secrecy**

1/13/08 - 10:50 PM  
Enough is enough!

How can we trust the BOR when they do not give the people that send them **MONEY** and **SUPPORT** complete information on what is going on between nine members in a monthly meeting?? I have gotten excuses from Bob W and Gary G (Recording secretary) stating that getting accurate minutes is too costly and prohibitive. This is an absolute joke. A tape recorder with a few microphones cost less than \$150 here in Atlanta. Record the meetings and dictate the meetings into a proper form would help the GA membership support translations of material and even a national hotline but right now we cannot get accurate information in our minutes! Here are two examples from the December meeting:

**A letter from a member with 27 years was read proposing a method to be able to fund the National Hotline. This was discussed and found not to be really feasible. It would also be something that could violate Unity Step 3. No amount could be directed, etc. No action was taken.**

Who was the letter from?? What was their idea?? Why could it violate Unity step 3??

**B. National Hotline. Discussed David M.'s presentation from November. This was passed on to the Board of Regents Committee for clarification. The National Hotline Committee addressed the issues. A vote was taken whether or not to publish. Motion seconded and failed  
For...-1 Against...7 Abstained...-0  
For a copy contact the International Service Office.**

Can anybody give us a reason not to publish at least the issues that David brought up? A copy of what is available at ISO?? This has happened for multiple years and it is time we started to fix the problem

I tried to force their hand by putting something on the Portland agenda to make the BOR record their meetings but I was told no by Tom because the BOT cannot tell the BOR what to do due to their 503c non-profit status. This is ridiculous. The Board of Regents represents GA as a whole just as much as the Board of Trustees.

I have a radical solution to propose here. If the BOR does not want to give us tangible and complete information on their meetings; withdraw your support to them. Give your time and money to the Intergroups and local chapters that better use it. Think about it and let me know what you think.

Ian S - Area 6D

1/17/08 - 4:45 PM  
Dear Trustees

It saddens me to read a letter from a GA member (A Trustee) in The Trustee Line advocating withholding funds and support to the ISO office because of one or a few Trustees is not happy with the BOR minutes. Karen H or the ISO office has nothing to do with the BOR minutes. The minutes are taken by the BOR secretary and given to Karen to send out as written. Having been the secretary of the BOR for 2 terms I know what a tough job it is to get everything of importance on to paper while the meeting is going on. The BOR voted not to record the meeting. For myself having very little in secretarial skills I wrote as fast as I could and put down as much as I could. If I had to record the meeting and transpose it into minutes I would not take the job.

As for the letter from the 27year member his letter will appear in the next ISO bulletin. This was fine with him.

As for David's presentation the vote was 1-7 not to put it into the minutes with the one vote to put it in coming from Gary G the present secretary. The BOR put it into the minutes that anyone wanting a copy could contact the ISO office and there were only 2 requests with one coming from David. The additional cost for printing the bulletin with this lengthy report would have been several hundred dollars plus addition costs for shipping. The BOR owes it to the membership to use their best judgment when putting out the BOR minutes.

OK Trustees lets get back to positive and constructive letters in the Trustee Line and stop advocating radical solutions.

Yours in Recovery

Bob W. - Chairman BOR

---

1/18/08 - 1:17 AM

Hi All

I would like the BOR minutes to be kept brief as they are. What is important to one person, may not be as important to another person. If we have questions about what is contained in the minutes, we are free to contact Karen or any member of the BOR to explain what is happening on a particular subject. The BOR is not a secret society; their names are listed in their minutes. I couldn't do as well a job as the secretaries who have been doing the minutes since I started reading them. It is nice to know that someone else reads these minutes other than myself! But, I am sure most members of this fellowship don't care what is written in the minutes. They are more concerned about their own recovery, working the steps and staying off of gambling. I was more upset that the BOR wanted to reduce the number of pages dedicated to listing the birthday celebrations of the compulsive gambler than what their minutes have to say. I know if I was the BOR recording secretary, I would have a hard time taking any better notes. Those birthdays, show the newcomer and the struggling member that the program works!!! Keep up the good work.

Richard C. - Area 2A

Southern Alberta, Calgary, Canada

---

1/18/08 - 4:36 PM

I was interested to see the responses to Ian's piece on BOR secrecy. Yes, it was a bit edgy, but this is an open forum that doesn't always have to be all smiles and lots of hugs with appreciation for how we need to live one day at a time. Some times, things just suck. It's what we get in the normal course of recovery. It's dealing with life on life's terms and realizing that things can irritate us. More important is having the venue to air it out and get rid of it with the help of others. Thank goodness for the Trustee Line.

It was good that Bob W, BOR Chair, put in his thoughts about Ian's item. This will certainly act as a defined range of opinions from one end to the other. It's no secret that I mirror the feelings about how skimpy the minutes can be about the important issues and how we get more than we need with the less important issues. My protests about this lack of more complete information are also known, especially with the members of the BOR since I was physically present for the November '07 meeting.

The issue may just be that we in NJ are privileged to have very detailed minutes from our NJ Intergroup meetings each month. Can it be duplicated everywhere - certainly, but the issue is that we hear too many reasons, which I also would characterize as more along the lines of excuses, why the BOR minutes are the best they can be and nothing about how to give the detail that Ara H. speaks to in his submission for this month: 'If anyone has any other ideas on how to get better minutes, we should have open minds and listen to any thoughts. I think it is very important that everyone in our membership, be able to have the opportunity to read, in detail, everything that is discussed at the meeting.'

I have such a suggestion, which I would like the BOR to consider. Time and technology have changed dramatically over the years and we as a fellowship should embrace it rather than stick steadfastly to the 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it' mentality.

The average BOR meeting takes about 90 minutes. The board meeting could be held using a conference call service. Here is how it works. The phone used for the meeting in the ISO office would be used to dial into the conference call phone number using an 800 number. The 2 members outside the 200 mile range would also call the 800 number to hear the meeting. Each party would incur a charge of \$0.10 per minute. That translates into \$9 per access, or \$27 for the entire meeting once each month. I'm assuming that ISO will pay for this expense. By the way, that's \$324 per year.

In using this 800 service, when scheduling a conference, it would be possible to select a checkbox to indicate the BOR desire to record the meeting in its entirety. The recording would automatically be converted to MP3 files, which are playable on any computer or MP3 digital audio player. Within two hours of the conference's scheduled end time, Karen H. would receive an e-mail containing instructions and a link to the recording. Anytime within the 30 days following the conference call, she could simply download the MP3 files and it would be ISO's to use or share without any limitations.

Transparency is just around the corner for \$27 per month. We talk about it, now we can do something about it. The recording secretary could continue to take what I call heavily truncated minutes for publication in the Bulletin and those sent to the Trustees. The small addition is that a link to a file on the Trustee website could be added if anyone wanted to listen to the full BOR meeting. Better still, it could be placed on the BOR website, if one were to be created. Taking care of this would leave one less thing to complain about.

It would be nice to see something about this in the minutes of the BOR meeting this month.

David M. - Area 12  
New Jersey

---

1/21/08 - 12:59 PM

After reading and re-reading Ian's posting and replies to it, it seems to me there have been two types of responses.

1. He should/should not have been allowed to say what he said (regarding withdrawing support of ISO).

2. His request for more detail from the BOR has/had not been satisfied.

Regarding # 1. I personally do not agree or believe in the notion of withholding funds as a means to an end. However, I believe in Ian's right to express his opinion. As David said, this is life and everything cannot be rosy all of the time. In my opinion this is a forum of ideas for Trustees not an editorial page. Since any member, new or old, can read this website, certain guidelines should be followed and outright anarchy would not be best for the fellowship. It is my express opinion that Ian's 'radical proposal' is simply his opinion and should be treated as such. He feels this way because he feels he is being "slighted" with regard to, in his opinion, the transparency of the BOR minutes (for now, in a very specific matter).

Regarding # 2. It would seem that there is some room for compromise. I believe the Trustees have the right to request details from the BOR on any subject and I believe it is the responsibility of the BOR to provide those details. Technology is a wonderful thing but in my professional experience many people are apprehensive of technologies they do not understand. I would hope that both sides of this issue will take their respective 'inventories' and recognize this and find a way to proceed in a mutually beneficial manner.

Maybe some form of David's idea regarding the recording of the BOR meeting could be put on the Trustee Agenda for Portland?

With Serenity,  
Ed K. - Trustee Area 1

### Multiple topics already outlined

1/18/08 - 1:05 PM

Hi everyone, I have a submission for this months issue of the trustee line.

I just read the issue of the 39 meeting rule. That's a tough call, if one member goes to two partial meetings in one night and wants to count them at two meeting, I would think we should allow it. However, I would talk to him in private and explain why he should go to two complete meetings rather than two partial. If he could go to a noon meeting followed by an 8 pm meeting that would be better.

I tend on not getting too technical on this issue, because our primary purpose is to quit gambling and help others to do the same. This is a program of honesty.

I have served two terms on the BOR. I am aware of how difficult it is to keep detailed minutes as the meeting is going along, many times we had to stop and wait for the secretary to catch up with his notes. It is not an easy job and I respect anyone who has done it. I remember we had the same topic come up when I was on the BOR about getting more detailed minutes, even having some trustees ask the secretary to step down if he couldn't do the job.

Having a tape recorder at the meeting sounds like a great idea, but I do respect the boards decision as they voted against it. If anyone has any other ideas on how to get better minutes, we should have open minds and listen to any thoughts. I think it is very important that everyone in our membership, be able to have the opportunity to read, in detail, everything that is discussed at the meeting.

Last year, we had the most detailed minutes I had ever seen and like to thank Bob W for a great job.

I hope everyone has a great, prosperous, and healthy New Year.

Ara H. Area 1

### Trustee Guidelines - #3

1/20/08 - 2:00 AM

Hello everyone,

Trustee guideline #3 reads...

Uphold and try to implement the Guidance Code, and all decisions made by the Board of Trustees (not fulfilling this affects GA as a whole).

Just to be sure I understood this I looked up a couple of the words for clarification.

#### up·hold

to give support to

#### im·ple·ment

Carry out or accomplish especially: to give practical effect to and ensure of actual fulfillment by concrete measures

I need some advise on the best way to fulfill trustee guideline # 3 in the most tactful way possible when there are members that blatantly say 'I don't care what that says this is the way we have and will do things around here'. Is it our responsibility to do something about this or not? If we are supposed to do something about it. Then what? and How? There are no guidelines how to handle this. I know this has been going on at several meetings and have made much progress at a lot of the meetings in my area but there is still many not in compliance. I gave up on fighting the fight at those meetings for a while. I hate being looked at as the GA police, don't want to be nor do I try to be. It seems that ignoring this issue as I was is not the answer. Several members in the area have come to me with concerns about new members coming in and struggling under the non GA literature program they are attending. Now they have called upon me to act as their trustee. One member in particular cited item 3 of the trustee guidelines and told

me as his representative he hopes I find a solution. My 1st call was to ISO with the thought that if I could get a letter on GA letter head stating that not using only GA approved or appropriate can affect GA as a whole and possibly something to disband the notion that there are no guidelines in order to be a GA group. I was told by Karen that she could not do this. So where does this leave me. If there is no recourse for this situation then maybe a agenda item deleting section 1 of article 7 in the guidance code should be written. If we are to uphold and implement the guidance code then give me the tools. Do we send teachers to school with no chalk or firefighters into a blaze with no hose. I think not.

Matt H. - Area 16

Give me some feedback please!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

1/21/08 - 6:51 PM

I hope that I never have to exercise this option but I must say that the role of the Trustee includes the recommendation to the ISO that a meeting which is not in compliance with guidance code should be removed from the recognized meeting list. This would result in no one being able to find that meeting on the ISO website and further indicate that the 'meeting's' Intergroup remove that meeting from their recognized meeting list (and hotline too).

I believe that although we are not 'police', I do believe we have a responsibility to uphold the guidance code and inform meetings that serious violations could result in the removal of their meeting from the G.A. roster(s).

With Serenity,  
Ed K. - Area 1

---