

**Main Menu**

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

**Louisville - Spring 2010**

**Information Page**

[Louisville Conference Info](#)

[Agenda Information](#)

[Conference Bids](#)

[Louisville Rolling Agenda](#)

[Submit an Agenda Item](#)

**BOT Committees**

- [BOR Procedural Review](#)
- [Blue Book Revision](#)
- [International Relations](#)
- [Literature](#)
- [Literature on CDs](#)
- [One Trustee Meeting Per Year](#)
- [Pressure Relief](#)
- [Prison - Canada](#)
- [Prison - US](#)
- [Public Relations](#)
- [Trustee Area Demarcation](#)
- [Trustee Meeting Rules and Procedures](#)
- [Trustee Removal Procedure](#)
- [Trustee Website](#)
- [Website Revisions](#)

**Trustee Line & Other Features**

- [Trustee Line Home Page](#)
- [Local Area Website Guidelines](#)
- [Local Area Help Flyer](#)
- [Board of Regents News Page](#)
- [Intergroup Trustee Funding](#)
- [Public Relations Area Ideas](#)
- [Trustee Memorial Honor Roll](#)

**Future Conferences**

[Upcoming Conferences](#)

**Trustee Line for January 2010**

Rate this issue of the Trustee Line:

7 votes      Your Rating

A PDF version of this issue to distribute to your rooms, or to print out for easier reading, will be available after 01/31/10.

**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	Entries
1.	2010 Wish List	1/1/10 12:01 AM	<b>1</b>
2.	A Rose by any Other Name	1/6/10 12:29 PM	<b>3</b>
3.	One Trustee Meeting Per Year Committee	1/8/10 12:29 PM	<b>1</b>
4.	Viewpoints on the 2 Conference Bids	1/19/10 2:43 PM	<b>8</b>
5.	Looking Back at 2009	1/16/10 5:53 PM	<b>1</b>
6.	Important Change to the GA Help Line	1/21/10 3:35 AM	<b>6</b>

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

**2010 Wish List**

1/1/10 - 12:01 AM

I have chosen to take the 12 Days of Christmas, and convert it to 2010 Twelve Months of Wishes - for each of you:

**ONE** Day at a Time for 365 days in everything you think, say and do

**TWO** Minutes of prayer and meditation before you begin each day; and end each day - at least

**THREE** Times the patience you had in 2009 and even MORE recovery

**FOUR** Items on your list of "things I like about me" every night before you go to bed

**FIVE** Character changes within yourself during the year

**SIX** Phone calls to someone you have never called before

**SEVEN** Birthday events you have never attended before

**EIGHT** Different meetings you have never been to before

**NINE** Good deeds that you never reveal to a soul - include becoming a Life-Liner

**TEN** Forgiveness attempts whenever necessary each month

**ELEVEN** Attempts - daily - at Honesty, Open-mindedness and Willingness

**TWELVE** Steps practiced at all times; worked on all year; and at least one set of Steps of Recover and Unity completed before the start of 2011

and if I follow these myself, I know I will be a better person, with a significantly improved way of thinking and living. I wish each of you the traditional health, happiness, safety and personal growth for 2010. God bless.

Linda S. - Area 3, San Diego

**A Rose by any Other Name**

1/1/10 - 6:31 PM

Time after time when I am told to relax and just let things happen, they don't happen and they get turned into something else. This only serves to reinforce the fact that the voice of a few is not how things can happen with our Fellowship. Group conscience is more important than policy being 'set' by a few.

Let me make my case in point with item 2C of the December '09 minutes of the Board of Regents. "Communications at Board of Regents Meetings. A motion was made to open up the phone lines to all the Trustees during the Board of Regents meetings.

Motion seconded and failed  
For...1. - Against...6. - Abstained...0

Benni F. was the sole vote in favor. However, any member of the Board of Trustees is welcome to attend any Board of Regents meeting in person."

I had brought this subject up with Benni F, current Chair of the BOR, and what was discussed with creating a conference call for the BOR meetings whereby any interested Trustee could dial into the call and hear exactly what was being said during the meeting. It has been no secret that I have been trying to mobilize a more comprehensive set of BOR minutes. If you want to see a solid set of minutes from an Intergroup meeting, contact Brad B. from Area 14. That's how things should be done with the BOR. We need to know who is thinking what, and who is saying what. Instead, we are force-fed superficial BOR minutes each month that do not encompass the essence of how each of the BOR members is thinking and acting. It continues from meeting to meeting, one year to the next.

One of the most difficult tasks we, as Trustees, do each Spring conference is to vote for a new roster of BOR members. If you don't live in the Los Angeles area, the chances are very high that you won't know who most of the prospective nominees are to feel confident in voting for them to be competent at their job as a BOR member. We also have to wrestle with the current BOR and those that could be elected to another term. We don't have any idea, as I just said in the previous paragraph, who is thinking what and who is saying what, let alone how they voted individually.

The BOR voted 1 to 6 in December about 'opening up the phone lines to all the Trustees.' What is so damned secretive that this was voted down? I'm insulted, as should everyone be, over the statement that "any member of the Board of Trustees is welcome to attend any Board of Regents meeting in person." Maybe I should ask all the Trustees to respond with how much a flight out to Los Angeles would be, plus accommodations and if any area Intergroup would consider funding such an event. Having attended 2 BOR meetings in person, I can say 1st hand that what is in the minutes is a distant shadow of what actually happens in the meetings. As I said, the statement about physically attending is insulting to all Trustees.

I should also add, that such a conference call would be of no increased cost to the ISO, other than a phone call to Iowa where the conference call system is housed. Any Trustee interested in hearing the call, would have to make their call to Iowa on their own dime. The system would give full control to the BOR and only allow the Trustees to enter the call in a 'listen only' mode. Certainly, matters of personal finance issues, such as payroll and bonuses, would have to be done only with the ears and participation of the BOR members. The BOR would be able to control such issues on the conference call. The calls would each be coded so that an interested Trustee would have to contact ISO for the conference call access codes. The free system I recommended to ISO can handle 150 callers. Others systems can handle much more, but at a cost. At some point, all GA members should be able to dial in, if they choose, but not at this juncture.

We hear transparency, yet the BOR remains as opaque as a block of granite to the Trustees and the rest of the members who cannot physically attend the meetings, as was so generously suggested by the BOR in the minutes.

We are forced to wait for the BOR minutes to come out 2 weeks after the fact. If anyone wants to take issue with anything in the minutes, it's too late to do anything about it at the next meeting, because the agenda is already set for that meeting and is already distributed to the BOR members, along with the minutes of the previous BOR meeting. That means we now have to wait yet another month. Statements are put to the BOR at that time, and if we don't get detailed minutes of exactly what was discussed, we are stuck with waiting even longer.

That is why seldom does anything get done that involves a challenge of what has happened previously. The current BOR members do not talk about items

from the past month BOR meetings until the minutes are out. WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE?

As a result of this veil of secrecy that shrouds the BOR meetings and its unwillingness to be completely transparent, I will be submitting an agenda item for Louisville requiring the BOR to have each meeting set up on a conference call. We will see if the conscience of 100+ Trustees can 'persuade' a group of 9 to do the right thing and squarely face the facts about this 'good ole boys club' they have created and how they conduct business.

Chime in with your thoughts. If you're for it - say so. If you don't like it - tell us why.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

1/5/10 - 5:09 PM

When I was first became a member of GA I felt there was this secret society within GA that only elite members in California could belong. After 9.5 years clean I still feel the same way. I don't believe even the salaries should be secret, after all we are paying for them.

One of the things that has been corrected was the Past Trustee Decisions that no one was allow to see except a trustee - others had to take their word for it. The thing was each trustee remembered or interpreted it differently. As the past trustee decision have now become just a record of the meets which what they always should have been that control issue has been resolved.

Minutes are difficult to prepare accurately and never complete. They are done by the perspective of the one preparing them.

I think it would be best to have the ISO located more centrally in the United States saving a lot of money in rent of office space and making it more accessible to the fellowship. I understand that it is Incorporated in California but many companies have moved the location of their headquarters and reincorporated in other states. The problem is those currently employed there may not wish to relocate and the point is not to take away anyone's job.

I believe, for me, controlling is as much a part of my illness as placing a bet and believe it or not I work on it constantly. Is this a control issue that there is so much secrecy?

Carol K. - Area 9, Michigan

---

1/6/10 - 12:29 PM

I agree with both David M, and some of what Carol K have stated. I withheld my ballot from the last BOR election. I didn't know too many that were running, and some of them that I did know, didn't really want to vote for them. I was withholding the vote in protest. I'm so glad I did, and maybe more should in the coming elections or until they open the ballot to all members and use phone lines to have future meetings. But the latest vote by the BOR not to allow the use of a listing phone line to hear the meetings, is again the "Good Old Boys Club" in action again, and then to top it off they have printed, as like a slap in the face, that "any member of the Board of Trustees is welcome to attend any BOR meeting in person" gee thanks!! I'm thinking now as I write this, if I did go to a meeting, would they be seating there at the meetings with hoods over their faces, because it nearly sounds like that club and by the way they called that a fellowship also. I'm going to end this with a statement, no I'm not , I'm going to end it by saying, again ALL BS.

Joe B. - Area 6C, North Carolina

---

<b>One Trustee Meeting Per Year Committee</b>
---

1/8/10 - 9:11 PM

Dear Fellow Trustees,

I hope all of you had a joyous holiday season and I hope the New Year brings all of you much happiness, good health and prosperity.

In Montreal, we formed a new committee to explore the possibilities of having only one conference per year. The chair of that committee has resigned and no other member of the committee desires to be the new chair. As the oversight chair of that committee, I am now looking for a BOT member to take over the chairmanship of the committee. If nobody steps up, the committee will, in all likelihood, be disbanded.

Please reply to me directly by phone or by e-mail via the information provided in the Confidential Trustee Listing.

Thanks for your work in the fellowship.

Sincerely,  
Chuck R. (1st Co-Chair BOT)  
Area 15 - New York

---

---

<b>Viewpoints on the 2 Conference Bids</b>
--

---

---

1/15/10 - 3:12 PM  
Hello to All Trustees,

Hope everyone had a happy and a healthy New Year. In reading the 2 proposals for the Trustee Meeting and National Conference in the Spring of 2011, I see 2 glaring differences.

1. Is that the International Conference would be overseen by the BOT, and a Co-Chair of the BOT. The Conference Committee would be required to follow the procedures set in place by the BOT. Such as copies of bank statements, checks, signature cards etc. And the Trustee Meeting with a Mini Conference attached would not fall under the same set of procedures. I am assuming that everything will be okay but the areas Intergroup would be the overseer of the Conference Committee.

2. In an International Conference the BOT has guidelines in place as to how the profits of the Conference are to be distributed, there are any. There are no guidelines as I know of for the latter.

I just wanted to point out the differences as I see them. I enjoy both cities and enjoyed the Unity and Fellowship of both Areas. And I know either area will do an extraordinary job!

I also hope to be able to attend either Conference, and look forward to seeing everyone in Louisville.

Richie S. - Area 6, South Florida

---

1/16/10 - 12:38 PM

Richie makes a very valid observation regarding the bids for the Spring 2011 Board of Trustee Conference. We could be setting a precedence here that we need to be aware of. Would we now be saying it is okay to submit a tag on bid to any area's mini-conference. This may be what local areas need to support their own areas. In this way the Intergroup could decide how much their area needs in order to support itself and send any "extra" to ISO as opposed to the current situation where as the local area assumes all the responsibility and loses but no profit. This could be why areas are not able to support an International Conference. In addition, hotels want their money long before most trustees send in their registration and reservations. They no longer will risk an investment of their monies in order to get a profit. What was 50 years ago no longer exist.

Carol K. - Area 9, Michigan

---

1/16/10 - 4:31 PM

Hats off to both Andy R and Chicago GA for preparing the information on which we are to vote. Having worked on a conference committee, I know the amount of time, energy and dedication that is required. Whichever way the vote goes, it was meant to be. But for one, I am so thankful that you cared enough to do what was asked for. Great jobs.

With love, faith, hope and trust in the Fellowship

Linda S. - Area 3A, San Diego

---

1/16/10 - 5:47 PM

I have to mirror Linda's sentiment and be thankful that the 2 areas found it important enough to submit bids, be it for a full conference or just a Trustee meeting, but there are bigger issues in play here.

The Spring '11 conference has been up for bid since Kansas City in the Spring of '09. No bids were received. That made it an open conference for the Fall of '09 in Montreal. Again, no bids were received. I've been a Trustee since 2000 and have never seen this before. Now what? Well, thanks to our Chairman, Denis M, we are now in the middle of a quick response meeting. My hat is off to the Rules and Procedures committee to have had the foresight to define the

area of procedures for such a meeting. Without those procedures, I shudder to think what kind of chaos we would have undergone trying to figure out which part of the football is the front.

What really is at the heart of this issue is that areas just don't want to go through the craziness of putting a bid together, just for the so-called 'honor' of putting one together. For all those conferences, I remember speaking with some of the people involved in each of them. Although everyone was more or less happy with the outcome, it was much more than apparent by the expressions on their faces that the production involved in pulling a conference together can morally and spiritually bankrupt an area's members.

We in New Jersey had considered submitting a bid for the Spring '11 conference for Montreal, but the details just didn't come together in time. One of the scarier themes was that we, just like any other area, had to face the reality that NJ Intergroup would NOT be getting 1 penny from the proceeds of the conference, that includes any of the money collected at the doors when each session is finished. That money would be split 55/45 between ISO and Gam-Anon. The really unbalanced part of the equation is that if the conference were to suffer a loss, it would be NJ Intergroup's loss, 100%. What's wrong with this picture?

It may be more than just a coincidence, but as the cost of conferences go up each year, the number of areas willing to bid for them is going down. It's time for a change. In the next few weeks, I will be putting two agenda items in for Louisville.

1) - The hosting area of any International Conference of Gamblers Anonymous, in which there is also a Trustee meeting, will be entitled to 15% of the gross profit of the conference, up to a maximum of \$1,000.

It is time that we do more for our hosting areas other than just getting in front of the microphone and thanking the respective committees for their efforts. We must change this 'one-way' money proposition of everything for ISO and Gam-Anon and nothing for the hosting areas.

My second item is this:

2) - The balance remaining from the net proceeds of any International Conference will be split between ISO and Gam-Anon in a percentage equal to the number of registered attendees from each respective Fellowship.

We must stop coddling Gam-Anon by just handing over 45% of the proceeds of each conference. We preach fairness, equity and balance with our GA members and how they conduct themselves with their spouses, relatives and friends, especially when they are members of Gam-Anon. In keeping with those themes, the ratio should be split accordingly. We have had conferences in which the net proceeds available for distribution have been almost insignificant. Does anyone ever hear that Gam-Anon is at risk of running out of money as a result? Please, the line forms on the left for those who would say that.

The real question is that should a conference actually lose money, would Gam-Anon step up for their 45% share of the loss? I think the answer is quite clearly, NO. I know when this item comes up on the floor in Louisville, there will be those who are outraged by my motion, because these members have appointed themselves as the messengers and saviors of the Gam-Anon Fellowship; saving them from those crazy people, like me, who are looking for a level playing field. Hopefully, I will have a lot of support for each motion.

As always, I'm asking for some feedback here - both for and against. Let's work out the kinks in these items before we get to Louisville by voicing our opinions. That's why the open rolling agenda and the Trustee Line are so well matched for each other.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

1/18/10 - 10:15 AM

Dear Trustees,

I hope that the holidays were good for everyone and everyone is feeling well. As I have been quiet for quite some time on the trustee line I felt this was a topic I wanted to speak on. First of all, I ditto the appreciation to NJ and Chicago.

I have been quite interested in the situation that we have going on here. I have had many discussions with people and have even been reflecting on my ongoing experiences of putting together one of these International conferences. I have always been concerned about the cost it has on my area to fund me for an International conference. I believe Carol was heading in the

same direction that I am. The conference itself is about recovery. We want as many people to be able to attend the conferences. I believe this is why many areas have begun to have mini- conferences. I know that in my area I was a big initiator of the mini-conference because I wanted the local people to experience the recovery that I know I got from attending the International conferences. However, I also realized that the local people just couldn't afford to make these conferences so I pushed for the mini conference.

I believe that the idea having a BOT meeting in conjunction with a local areas mini-conference could be beneficial to ALL local areas.

1) The area hosting the mini in conjunction with a BOT meeting does not put any extra amount of risk or pressure on their intergroup. The local area does not have to assume anymore responsibility than what they initially plan to for their mini-conference.

2) The cost for all areas would be less. I know that not every area funds the trustee completely, but in the current situation the trustee is required to register with the conference. If the BOT meeting was held in conjunction to a mini-conference it would cut the cost down for the areas that are funding the trustees. The area would only be funding for the nights of the BOT meeting and the transportation to the BOT meeting if that is what they choose to fund. The conference part itself should be left up to the individual trustee. If the trustee has the funds on their own to stay for the conference part then they can choose to, if not, then there is no obligation or pressure for that trustee to stay.

3) The conference part is about recovery! I know that I am dealing with this in my area right now. I want my local members to attend the conference in the Fall 2010. My wanting to share the experience of an International conference with the members here in Tampa was my drive for putting on a bid. However, what I am facing now is the local members feeling like they can't attend because of the cost. I understand this feeling because I too am still a person sometimes that wants ALL or nothing. So, the problem with the International conference for areas is that it even becomes stressful for the local members that want to attend that can't afford to pay the \$50 registration and the extra \$150 or whatever the cost might be for the dinners. We want these local people to reap the rewards of the recovery of a conference and I believe that areas are finding that possible with hosting a mini-conference.

4) My last point and Richie S. alluded to the profit situation...these International conferences are not suppose to be about making a profit. We are having the conferences for RECOVERY! We just happen to be trying to take care of business along with that. So, if we stay focused on the conferences being about recovery and not that a conference might be profiting to contribute to ISO, maybe we will be able to keep the cost lower and reach out to more members in each area. Even members outside of an area that is hosting a mini-conference might be able to budget attending the mini conference if the cost was not as drastic as our International conferences are. I know that the costs are higher because of the promises made to the hotel and the level of food and entertainment we have. Let's remember what the principle behind these conferences is really about...RECOVERY. A conference should only be concerned with the cost of the conference not the amount of money it is going to profit.

I look forward to seeing everyone in KY.  
Dina P. - Area 6B, Tampa Florida

---

1/16/10 - 10:53 AM

I'd like to address Dina's point #4 about profits versus recovery.

International conferences are about recovery and unity - there is no getting around that. But if you ask any of the conference committee chairs over the last 10 years what concerns were paramount in their minds as far as success of the conferences, and profitability will be very high up on their list. I also understand that the conference chairs are supposed to show their 'game faces' at the conference and not burden the attendees with any of the business situations of their conferences, but to themselves, and most likely their committee members, turning their conferences into profitable ones is critical.

The reason is simple. No profit and the area takes the financial hit, straight and to the point. Until a revamping of the money structuring of these conferences can be done, we will not eliminate this concern. During the conferences, everyone is focused on the fluidity of the conference and the unity of the events. After the conference, we don't send out forms to see to what degree those conditions were executed. We look for the financial report and a check from the conference committee. We can avoid the discussion of

profitability in lieu of what recovery we derived from the conference, but the reality is that no area is looking to run a conference and put their Intergroup or area at financial risk. I can hear it now - someone is out there saying that money is not our problem. Well, let's have a conference that loses money and then see what kind of machinery is put into place to overcome that problem.

The fact is that neither I, nor any other GA member, wants a conference to lose money. If we do see such an event, then I fear that even fewer areas will submit bids in the future. Give the area an incentive to reap some of the expected profits and many more areas will be motivated to submit bids. Look at it as a form of deregulation. The more the incentive, the more competition, and most probably, the better our conference rates will become.

My illustrations in my previous posting talked about the inequality of how Gam-Anon would no doubt not take any responsibility for losses at the 45% level by which they currently get the net proceeds of a conference. The reality is that ISO doesn't take the responsibility for its 55% either, although it has the resources to do just that, if it should ever come to that.

So maybe since ISO and Gam-Anon get their proportionate share of the net proceeds, they should also be officially obligated to make up any shortages, providing that there was no theft or misappropriation of funds by a member from the area.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

1/18/10 - 2:41 PM

Hello Fellow Trustees,

I generally do not submit many items to the Trustee Line, but I frequently read what is happening and I think it's a great place to hear different opinions, especially prior to the BOT meetings.

I remember when no one presented a bid for the Spring 2011 conference and I was thinking how could this be, because I had never seen or heard of that. There was always an area to step up. When we formed a committee to find possible locations to hold our BOT meetings, I thought that might be a viable solution.

Now we are presented with two areas that stepped up to have this conference and/or a place to hold our BOT meeting, which I think is great. It's amazing they were able to be ready. I have spoken to many people in our area, as well as my fellow trustees, and I really don't know which way to vote. My initial thought process was about the profits we might not have to go to ISO, but then, I was thinking about our local Intergroup, and which way would be more affordable to them, as we are fully funded, and it is always a financial concern whether there is enough money to fund our trustees. I feel like I have an obligation to the members who elected me and the Intergroup/Area that I represent. However, with all that said, I still am torn, because of the value of having an International conference, and what my personal experiences are with them. I attended my first conference in 2003 in Irvine, CA and met people from all around the world. It opened my eyes to know that so many of us share this problem. Most importantly, were the workshops and the fellowship, that have continued to follow me during my path of recovery. I am forever grateful for that. I even mentioned at our past Intergroup meeting that although some of us cannot afford to come to a mini conference, we really cannot afford not to come, because of the valuable information available through all of the workshops.

I also understand the feeling of organizing a conference, whether it be a mini or an international, and the concerns about meeting the required numbers, so as not to lose money. I know that it's not about the money or profits, but it certainly is not about losing money either. Those were my concerns a year ago when I thought about presenting a bid, and still are concerns today. I'm only human. It's great to be optimistic, but the reality is if people can't afford to attend, the numbers won't be met. That's a lot of extra weight to carry. Having experienced both International and mini conferences, I understand the importance of making it available for everyone, not just for those who can afford the costs.

The value of that is priceless and that is the gift of recovery.

Steve F. - Area 1, Los Angeles

---

1/19/10 - 2:43 PM

Greetings, Brothers and Sisters,

I like David's ideas about the distribution of any profits derived from hosting an International Conference. That said, first, I personally think that 15% for the hosting area is not enough. They should be entitled to at least 1/3 of the gross profits. (No maximum)

An area that hosts a conference at this level must sign contracts and make commitments to the hotel. If those commitments aren't met, isn't the area signing the contracts financially liable? And, considering that it's the GA area hosting the conference, I doubt if anyone from Gam-Anon signs anything, thereby avoiding financial problems. As it stands now, the host area assumes all financial risk, but doesn't share in any profits.

As for dividing up the remainder of the profits in proportion with the number of Trustees vs the number of Gam-Anon Delegates, I agree with his suggestion, however, that could be logistically very difficult. For example, we know that a Trustee registered for the conference is a GA member, and a Delegate (at the Spring Conference) is Gam-Anon, but what about the folks who register, but do not give any particular affiliation? What about guests who belong to neither fellowship? I think it would just be simpler to come up with a percentage based on the total number of members of both fellowships. For example: if there are 10,000 members of GA, and 3,500 members of Gam-Anon, GA ISO would receive 65% of the profits, and Gam-Anon ISO 35%. Does that sound fair? What possible argument could Gam-Anon have against such a proposal? If they were to put on a conference and assume all of the financial risk, I think we'd be quite content to take only about 1/3 of the profits.

After voicing my opinion, let me now say this. Any time we start to discuss Gam-Anon, it gets emotional. They have always supported us, and we have supported them, even to the degree of knowingly violating our own Guidance Code to keep the link to their web site on ours'. I certainly don't want any one to think I'm bashing Gam-Anon - I'm not. Personally, I consider myself a strong supporter of Gam-Anon. But, if we are going to consider ourselves and them truly separate entities, let's act like it.

You're going to take a lot of flack for your motions, David, and I know I'm going to take quite a bit for agreeing with you - but I do.

I'll see you all in Louisville.  
Your friend in recovery,  
John B. - Area 13, Philadelphia

#### Looking Back at 2009

1/16/10 - 5:53 PM

Those trustees that think we can get something done other than a physical meeting may want to take note that for the year 2009 there were 170 entries into the Trusteeline. This doesn't even average out to two per trustee. As I know there are a few trustee that write monthly and sometimes enter on more than one subject a month it brings that average down to an embarrassing level.

Personally, I enjoy trying to meet a couple trustees I haven't had a chance to chat with at each conference. I enjoy hearing your travels down the path of a better way of thinking and living. I learn more insight into myself and value the time you have spent with me.

Journaling has not been my thing, however, I see the rewards of it in many people. For some that may be the reason for the lack of submissions. Of course, there are many trustees I have never heard speak at meeting either.

I know I need GA to be here for the rest of my life be it a day or 50 years, therefore, I try to do the things that will keep the fellowship alive. I believe improvements can be made. For those of you that say it worked for me 50 years ago why change it now. I would like you to reflect on those that came and went during your time in GA. Think of the obituaries you read and the funerals you attended for those you knew who came and went and those who relapsed and found prison or death before returning. Count yourself blessed. Please send in to the blue committee what did and didn't work for. Not just I did what my sponsor said but what did he say. Not just I worked the steps but how did you work them.

Carol K. - Area 9, Michigan

#### Important Change to the GA Help Line

1/19/10 - 8:17 AM  
Dear Trustees,

This past Friday the Board of Regents voted to turn control and oversight of the GA HELP LINE back over to the Board of Trustees.

As you may recall, the concept of the hotline was developed by a committee of the Board of Trustees. Once the concept was approved, it was turned over to the BOR for implementation and the BOR has been in charge of the hotline system since then.

Over the past two weeks I have had conversations with Benni F., chair of the BOR who was of the opinion that the BOR should no longer be involved. He advised me that his hope was that the BOR would vote to turn it back over to us.

I explained to Benni that I thought this should first be discussed by the BOT at our next meeting and I requested that his vote be held off until then. I felt that the BOT should have the opportunity to express it's wishes on this before any action was taken.

On Friday the BOR voted to turn complete oversight to the BOT no later than May 1, 2010. So, as Chairman of the BOT, I am forced with a decision. I suppose I could refuse to accept this action and wait for our meeting in May when you would have the chance to be heard.

My concern in doing so is that the hotline would then have no oversight or direction for that period of time. This is unacceptable to me.

Therefore, I feel compelled to accept the action of the BOR until such time of your collective voice can be heard.

In addition to this email, I have asked David M. to post this letter on the Trustee Line so that you have the opportunity to chime in on this if you wish.

Brother Denis  
Chairman of the Board of Trustees

---

Note from the Trustee Website Admin:  
This topic will be carried over to the February Trustee Line to allow sufficient time for all interested Trustees, both past and present, to offer their thoughts and opinions.

---

1/19/10 - 1:07 PM  
I am fully in favor of this change.

The BOR is no longer billed for any Hotline services by Erlang Communications. It is my understanding that there are no future plans, or need, for the BOR to be billed for any aspect of the operation of the Hotline (national or otherwise).

Each Intergroup, signed up for the Hotline, is under separate agreement with Erlang communications for the month to month cost and operation of their Hotline. Since the BOR is responsible for the financial operations of the ISO, and not individual or collective Intergroup finances, I see no reason for BOR to be responsible for the financial obligations of the Intergroups signed up for and using the Hotline.

In my opinion, this makes perfect sense.

Ed K. - Area 1 Trustee, Los Angeles

---

1/19/10 - 1:44 PM  
I feel that the BOT should be in charge of the help line. We are the guardians of the program, and this should be part of our responsibility.

Kevin O. - Area 13, Maryland

---

1/19/10 - 3:27 PM  
Hot Line, now its getting real Hot!

I was just thinking, maybe that's bad, but I was, I know the last Chair of the Hot line was conducting a survey on the cost of each Area. We never did get the results of that survey and reading between the lines, of minutes from the BOR, there will be not cost reduction, from Erlang Comm. Inc., from what they, the areas, are paying now and also all Areas paying the same rate per minute. Being that as it is, would the BOT after accepting the Hot Line back

for the BOR, have the right to form a Committee to over see the Hot Line, and maybe try another company to get a lower rate, or would we have to give it back to the BOR?

Joe B. - Area 6C, North Carolina

---

1/19/10 - 5:24 PM

To my fellow Trustees:

A telephone "hot line" is an absolute, necessary, and critical function of our Program and Fellowship. I remind myself that our primary purpose is to help those who are still suffering from this horrible disease. In today's world, there are only a few basic tools of communication for those in desperate need: the telephone and the computer. We need to be available to those who need us - at any hour of any day. I feel like I am preaching to the choir, sorry.

It is unfortunate that the BOR feels as they do; but I can certainly understand their position. It IS our responsibility. The BOR is solely responsible for the operation of the ISO Office - not the groups within our Fellowship - this has been stated before. Therefore, we, as Trustees of this Fellowship have to decide if we care enough about our Program, our Fellowship, our Recovery and Step 12 to reach out to those in need and provide whatever experience, strength and hope we can provide - and if that is through a national/international hot line - so be it.

The ONLY concern I have today is the administration of such a system. We - in San Diego - have not been as fortunate as many of you have with our current system. We have made repeated telephone calls, written letters and notes and have been avoided and ignored time after time. In my opinion, this is unacceptable.....with any system. There MUST BE accountability and responsibility. We have been told by others - "tough - live with it." Well, to me, this is not an acceptable attitude from any service provider....be it for G.A. or not. Even less so with G.A. since lives depend on our quick, loving, and understanding responses.

I like the idea of our BOT becoming more actively involved in our "hot line system." However, a thorough review, audit, research and plan MUST BE in place this time to make sure we are all treated equally and no favoritism is shown to any one person, or any one group. Principles before personalities. The administrator of such a system must be available, dependable, reliable, forthright and forthcoming with information, suggestions and ideas to make things work, or make things better. Who would be willing to take on such a dynamic challenge? Should it be one person, or a committee of dedicated individuals on whom we can depend and rely on? I do not have the answer. But these are definitely some of the questions I began asking myself today upon Denis M's announcement. Are there other questions I have not thought about yet? Is there another side of the coin that I have not looked at?

This, to me, is a very heavy decision - and one that we must give very serious consideration to - not taking on the "hot line system," I think that's a must - but rather the nuts and bolts and the administration of ANY program to be considered.

I appreciate your reading my thoughts and opinions.  
With love, trust, faith and respect for our Fellowship  
Linda S, Area 3A Trustee, San Diego

---

1/21/10 - 3:35 AM

The hotline needs a very active committee. Our area has had no response for repeated tries over the last couple of years to get a hold of Erlang. When I called and talked to Bennie a couple months ago he said I could go through him or Gary but it is all being taken care of and we don't need a contract no area has one. Well, I guess the decision tells how it is. Yes we need to take it back. Can a committee be formed prior to Louisville?

Carol K. - Area 9, Michigan

---