

**Main Menu**

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

**Los Angeles - Fall 2011  
Information Section**

[Los Angeles Conference Info](#)

**Rolling Agenda**

[Agenda Information](#)  
[Conference Bids](#)

**Submit an Agenda Item**

**BOT Committees**

- [BOR Procedural Review](#)
- [Blue Book Revision](#)
- [Conference Review](#)
- [GA/Gam-Anon Joint Hotline](#)
- [International Relations](#)
- [Literature](#)
- [Member Retention](#)
- [Online GA Meeting](#)
- [Pressure Relief](#)
- [Prison - Canada](#)
- [Prison - US](#)
- [Public Relations](#)
- [Rules and Procedures](#)
- [Trustee Area Demarcation](#)
- [Trustee Removal Procedure](#)
- [Trustee Website](#)
- [Video Conferencing](#)
- [Website Revisions](#)

**Trustee Line & Other Features**

- [Trustee Line Home Page](#)
- [Login For The Trustee Poll](#)
- [Trustee Poll](#)
- [Local Area Website Guidelines](#)
- [New Area/Trustee Accommodation Fund](#)
- [Local Area Help Flyer](#)
- [Board of Regents News Page](#)
- [Trustee Memorial Honor Roll](#)

**Future Conferences**

[Upcoming Conferences](#)

---

## Trustee Line for June 2011

---

A PDF version of this issue to distribute to your rooms, or to print out for easier reading, will be available after 6/30/11.

---

### Thoughts From The Trustees - Current and Past

The subjects listed below are 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.	<a href="#">Trustee Poll - why don't we USE IT?</a>	6/24/11 12:04 AM	3

#### Trustee Poll - why don't we USE IT?

6/1/11 - 12:01 AM

Dear Trustees,

I have been wondering since the Trustee Poll has hit the Trustee website, why don't most of the Trustees take part in the polls?

It's not that hard to do, and for me I used it at the last Trustee Meeting in Cherry Hill to withdraw an item from the Agenda when I saw that those that did vote on the poll, didn't at that time, like the agenda item.

But now it seems, at least so far, that you can't get much help from the Trustee Poll. So I guess we will just keep placing items on the agenda where we will again have so many, that we most likely will run into the same problem as we have lately with the agenda, with too many items and rushing thru them, not giving the time that all items should have.

Joe B. - Area 6C, North Carolina

---

6/1/11 - 12:02 AM

Joe, thanks for bring this up. I too am at a loss for words why the participation in the Trustee Poll is so weak.

In Cherry Hil, while I was giving my report and also in the pre-Trustee meeting from 8:30 AM Thursday morning, I went through this feature in the hopes of making the Poll a relied upon part of the website.

Here is what I envision at some point in the future. I would like to see every new item for the agenda placed on the Trustee Poll for a 'temperature' reading from the Trustees. Of course not every item has to be an agenda item, because it should still be a tool for others to see if a subject has merit or not.

For the agenda, each item would be put on the agenda and we would then set up some criteria for whether or not the items actually make it to the agenda. An example would be that 80% of the active Trustees would have to vote, in order to have an item blocked from being placed on the agenda. The current Trustees would make the determination as to which items would NOT be on the agenda. Here's how it 'could' work, in one form.

Item - 'The presiding Chair will determine who gets to speak for and against agenda items once debate begins.' Obviously, such an item would fail without question. Currently, that item could be listed and presented at the next BOT meeting. Who knows, it might endure a 15 minutes discussion before it fails on a vote. I made the example extreme so I could make this point.

The Trustee Poll has 5 categories:

Yes - in favor:

Probably in favor - but need to hear more:

No opinion either way:

Probably not in favor - but need to hear more:

No - not in favor:

Only the current Trustees are eligible to vote. If this or any other item doesn't

get at least 20% of the votes in either a 'Yes – in favor', or 'Probably yes – but need to hear more' from at least 80% of eligible Trustees, then the item is blocked from being added to the agenda.

Okay, I can hear it now...what if less than 80% of the current Trustees participate? That's an easy answer. To eliminate apathy on the part of the Trustees, if an item doesn't get that 80% participation, then it wouldn't matter what the voting turns out to be, the item automatically gets listed. This would apply to items that were unanimously voted as No – not in favor. If only 75% of the current Trustees voted, then the item gets added to the agenda.

That's only 1 idea. It also would go a long way to cutting down the size of the agenda. However, it would only work if the Current Trustees got off their butts and participated. What about some of you chiming in with some alternatives?

Evidently, the more things change with the Trustee website, the more they remain the same. Participation is just something that isn't in many Trustees' vocabulary. I'm beginning to think that a phrase I heard a long time ago actually was created to describe compulsive gamblers – Seasons change, people don't.

David M. – Area 12, New Jersey

---

6/24/11 - 12:04 AM  
Joe and David -

Well, here we are...24 days later...and no responses to your "poll" suggestions. While I am frustrated by this lack of response, I am not surprised. My father taught me that 'anything worth having is worth working for.' I was also taught that I was not 'entitled' to anything; I had to work for what I thought was best for me and my fellow human beings. Apathy? I don't know and I'm not sure that is the answer.

Some Trustees DO use the poll as a gauge of Trustee sentiments, however, it appears that when it comes to voting, the same Trustees vote repeatedly - and not the majority. That bothered me - a lot. It forced me to wonder why this was happening; what was the reasoning behind this? I then re-read what trustee responsibilities are. Perhaps, if we included in those responsibilities, that trustees should participate on a regular basis on the Trustee Line with their thoughts and opinions, we might get a better representation. Would this be an answer or a solution? I don't know.

And then the cynical me took over, and I began to wonder - how many Trustees take their responsibilities seriously? How many are Lifeliners? How many have read (or at least glanced at) all of our literature? How many have brought the results of the Trustee meetings back to their groups? (Oh they don't have to - it'll appear in the Bulletin.) And yes, I am sitting in judgment, which I have no right to do. But why have a list of Trustee responsibilities if we aren't going to take them seriously? Why have a Trustee Line if we aren't going to take it seriously? Why have tools to use in the GA program if we aren't going to use them? And I question: do we know how easy it would be to lose this precious gift called the Gamblers Anonymous program if we don't continue the work for which our predecessors worked so hard?

What does Page 17 of the Combo Book advise us to do? GET INVOLVED AND BE OF SERVICE.

Linda S. - former Trustee, Area 3A, San Diego  
now - just a member from Tulsa, OK

---