Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Lisa S., Alternate Chair, presenting:

The motion on the table reads:
Example Motion #1: Special Online Assembly on PAI(s) Only

"That if the Area Committee approves a motion that qualifies as a Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) for the General Service Conference to be voted on at the Assembly, the Area hold a one-day online Special Assembly in September for the sole purpose of considering Proposed Agenda Item motions, allowing sufficient time to submit the approved motion and supporting background information to the General Service Board by the submission deadline, with the Annual Assembly continuing to be held in October."

Lisa noted that, if the motion were taken from the table, she intended to offer a clarifying amendment to improve the wording without changing its intent.

The purpose of the proposal is to allow Area 72 to submit Proposed Agenda Items to the General Service Board before the current September 30 submission deadline. Since the deadline now occurs before the October Annual Assembly, any Proposed Agenda Item adopted at the Annual Assembly cannot be submitted until the following year. A September Special Assembly would allow the Area to consider and approve qualifying Proposed Agenda Items in time for submission during the current conference cycle.

Lisa also noted that many ideas previously submitted by Area 72 have influenced conference discussions, including a Proposal regarding safety literature. She further explained that recent information from Kathi F., Past Pacific Region Trustee, indicates that Proposed Agenda Items responding to newly adopted Advisory Actions are generally deferred for at least one year, reducing the urgency of some submissions while still preserving the value of having the ability to submit new proposals in the current cycle.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: provided additional background, informing the Assembly that the General Service Conference has discontinued the Equitable Distribution of Workload process beginning with the 2028 Conference. While the September 30 deadline remains in effect, there is currently no indication whether that deadline will change in future years. This new information was included as additional context for the discussion.

Area Chair called for a Motion to Take from the Table:
(simple majority)

<u>Motion to take from the table</u>: Mary W., Alternate DCM, District 45

Second by: Teri H., DCM, District 42

<u>Vote</u>: The Committee voted electronically. The motion passed by simple majority, and the Chair announced that the motion was officially back on the Committee floor.

<u>Lisa S., Area Alternate Chairperson: Moved to Amend the Motion to read</u>:

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

(Changes marked in red and underlined or lined through)

Move that, if the Area Committee ~~Quarterly body~~ approves a motion that qualifies as a Proposed Agenda Item for the Conference to be voted on at the Assembly, that the Area hold a one-day Special Assembly online in September on just the Proposed Agenda Item Motion(s) in time to submit to the General Service Board by the deadline date. The Motion and all background information are to be included in all pre-assembly materials and in the August edition of the Newsletter, with the Annual Assembly to continue to be held in October.

Seconded by: Charley P., Area Language Chair.

The Chair called for a vote on the Amendment.

Point of Order by Crystal J., Past Delegate (Panel 74): we don't vote yet on the Amendment to the Motion, we discuss just the Amendment. Then vote.

The Point of Order being well taken by the Chair, the Chair rescinded the call for a vote, apologized, and opened discussion on the Amendment to the Motion.

Discussion on the Amendment to the Motion:

Scott O., DCM, District 16: Point of Clarification: pointed out a minor grammatical discrepancy between the amendment displayed on the screen and the version included in the background materials. Specifically, he noted that the word "are" had been omitted from the projected version, leaving the sentence without an active verb.

Derek S., Area Chair: Chair confirmed that the correct wording was the version printed in the background materials: "the motion and all background information **are** to be included..." and the text of the motion as written on the screen was corrected.

Mike L., DCM, District 36: questioned whether the final sentence of the amendment was necessary, suggesting that it might not be needed. No further discussion followed on this point.

Teri H., DCM, District 42: expressed support for the amendment, stating that establishing this procedural "place marker" was a prudent step given the uncertainty surrounding possible changes to the Proposed Agenda Item submission process beginning in 2028. Having the procedure in place now would help the Area avoid having to react quickly should future deadline changes occur.

Seeing no hands online or at the microphone, **The Chair called for a vote on the Motion to Amend the Motion.**

Vote Result: The Motion to Amend the Motion passed by substantial unanimity.
The Chair announced that the motion as amended is on now on the floor for discussion.

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Discussion on the Motion as Amended:

Crystal J., Past Delegate (Panel 73): clarified that the discontinuation of Equitable Distribution of Workload beginning with the 2028 General Service Conference does not automatically change the September 30 deadline for submitting Proposed Agenda Items (PAIs). She explained that the September 30 deadline was established by Conference Advisory Action and would remain in effect unless changed by a future Conference action.

Mike L., DCM, District 36: reported that he had presented the proposal to his district's GSRs, who were generally supportive of bringing the motion before the Assembly. He also observed that the background material did not specifically address situations where Area 72 might wish to support a Proposed Agenda Item submitted by another Area.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: stated that he suggested that such support would likely require the same Special Assembly process contemplated by the motion.

Terry P., Past Delegate, A29 (Panel 74): An additional comment was made noting that, while Equitable Distribution of Workload had been one factor in moving the PAI submission deadline earlier, the General Service Office's extensive translation process was also an important consideration. The speaker noted that growing translation demands may continue to influence future submission deadlines.

Ray H., Eastside Intergroup: asked whether the proposed one-day online Special Assembly would require the same quorum as other Area Assemblies and whether GSRs would participate in the meeting.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: explained that Area 72 has not historically used a formal quorum process. Under the proposal, the Proposed Agenda Item would be included in the pre-Assembly materials, notice would be broadly distributed, and GSRs would be provided the information necessary to participate in the online Special Assembly.

Jan H., Alternate DCM, District 24: reported that, by and large, District 24 supported the proposal. District members felt it was important not to miss opportunities for Area 72 to submit timely Proposed Agenda Items for Conference consideration.

Derek S., Area Chairperson called for the Vote:

Lupita YM, Alternate Delegate, Point of Clarification: A voting member has requested clarification regarding the question before the body.
Derek S., Area Chairperson confirmed that the Committee was voting whether to place the motion as amended on the Assembly Agenda.

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

<u>Vote Result</u>: The Committee voted electronically. The motion passed with substantial unanimity, and no minority opinion was offered.

Derek S., Area Chairperson announced that discussion is still open on the PAI Deadline Date discussion because members of this Committee have expressed their interest in moving the Assembly up into September and a voting member at the last Quarterly let the Chair know he intended to make a motion to put Example Motion #2 onto the Assembly Agenda.

Example Motion #2:
Move that, going forward, the Area Assembly be moved to the last full weekend in September that is before September 30, as soon as feasible, so that future Assemblies are before the Proposed Agenda Item Deadline Date.

<u>Motion to put Example Motion #2 onto the Assembly Agenda</u> by Ganelle, DCM, District 41.

Second by Jo G., DCM, District.

<u>Discussion on the Motion</u>:

Lisa B., DCM, District 21: asked how Example Motion #2 (moving the Annual Assembly to late September) related to the previously approved motion to place a Special Online Assembly proposal on the Assembly agenda.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: explained that the two proposals are complementary. The first proposal would provide the Area with the ability to hold a Special Online Assembly for Proposed Agenda Items (PAIs) until such time as the Annual Assembly could be moved ahead of the September 30 submission deadline. If the Assembly were eventually moved to late September, the need for a Special Assembly would likely be eliminated.

Jo G., DCM, District 25: asked for clarification on what the body was voting on, specifically whether the motion would be decided at the Quarterly or simply forwarded to the Assembly.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: clarified that the Quarterly body was not voting on the Motion itself, but rather on whether to place Example Motion #2 on the Assembly Agenda. If approved, the motion would then be discussed by GSRs at the pre-assemblies and voted on by the Assembly.

Jana C., Alternate DCM, District 9: shared that some members in her district were concerned that moving the Assembly to September could create scheduling conflicts because September is already a busy month for many members, particularly families with

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

children returning to school. She noted that some members felt an online meeting would be easier to accommodate than changing the date of the Annual Assembly.

Louise W., GSR, District 25: asked whether her understanding was correct that the Area would use a Special Online Assembly in the near term and only move the Annual Assembly to September at some point in the future.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: confirmed that understanding.

Pete P., DCM, District 22: asked whether moving the Annual Assembly would affect the scheduling of the Area Quarterlies.

Derek, Area Chairperson: replied that only the Annual Assembly would move. The Quarterly meetings would not.

Crystal J., Past Delegate (Panel 73): reminded the body that a Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) may be submitted by anyone to the General Service Board before the September 30 deadline. She explained that while many PAIs are submitted each year, only a small number ultimately become Conference Agenda Items. Crystal encouraged DCMs to become familiar with the process so they would be prepared to explain it to their districts.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: reminded members that the Area website contains extensive background information, including Area 72's history of submitting Proposed Agenda Items dating back to 1996, previous discussions on the topic, and examples of items that may be more appropriately addressed directly with General Service Office staff rather than through the Proposed Agenda Item process. He also noted that responding immediately to Advisory Actions from the most recent Conference is generally not considered by the Conference until a later cycle.

Scott O., DCM, District 16: observed that, if both motions were eventually adopted, there could be a conflict because one proposal would continue holding the Annual Assembly in October while the other would move it to September.

Mary W., Alternate DCM, District 45: observed that Example Motion #2 proposes a specific September date for the Annual Assembly, while the Special Assembly proposal allows greater flexibility. She also suggested that the current process appears to be functioning adequately and questioned whether such a significant scheduling change is necessary.

Paul O., Alternate DCM, District 7: asked whether, if approved by the Quarterly body, Example Motion #2 would become a discussion topic or an actual motion at the Assembly.

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Derek S., Area Chairperson: confirmed that it would become a Motion at the Assembly.

Lisa S., Area Alternate Chairperson: shared that, based on her experience securing Assembly facility contracts, moving the Assembly to late September appears feasible. However, she questioned whether the Area should first gain experience with the proposed Special Online Assembly before making a permanent scheduling change. She suggested that gathering experience and data over several years would better inform any future decision to move the Annual Assembly.

Houston L., Area Registrar: expressed support for eventually moving the Annual Assembly to September. He reflected that Area 72 has historically been very engaged in General Service Conference matters and believes adjusting the Assembly schedule would allow the Area to participate more effectively by responding to Conference issues and submitting Proposed Agenda Items in a timelier manner. She also supported using the Special Assembly as an interim solution until the Annual Assembly could be moved.

Lupita YM., Area Alternate Delegate: encouraged the Area to consider an incremental approach rather than making a major scheduling change immediately. Drawing a parallel to recent Conference actions, she suggested that trying the Special Assembly first would allow the Area to evaluate its effectiveness before deciding whether moving the Annual Assembly is necessary.

Sansannah J., Alternate DCM, District 3: asked whether the relatively small number of Proposed Agenda Items submitted by Area 72 justifies moving the Annual Assembly or whether the Area should first evaluate how frequently the process is actually used.

Derek S., Area Chairperson: replied that historical information on Area 72's Proposed Agenda Item submissions is available in the background materials posted on the Area website for members to review when considering these motions.

David J., DCM, District 14: observed that moving an entire three-day Annual Assembly in order to consider what may be only a single Proposed Agenda Item seemed disproportionate. Based on his experience participating remotely, he felt the proposed Special Online Assembly offered a practical solution while preserving the current Annual Assembly schedule. He expressed support for allowing the Assembly to consider the Special Assembly proposal first before deciding whether moving the Annual Assembly is necessary.

Dave H., GSR, District 19: supported moving the Annual Assembly because doing so would ultimately allow GSRs to be the body voting on Proposed Agenda Items rather than relying on a Special Assembly of the Area Committee. He believed this better reflects the AA service structure and the principle of the "upside-down triangle," ensuring the groups remain the primary voice of the Fellowship.

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Darrel S., GSR, District 45: expressed support for allowing the Assembly to consider both proposals. He viewed the Special Assembly as a temporary solution until the Annual Assembly can eventually be moved one week earlier. He emphasized that waiting an additional year to submit an important Proposed Agenda Item could unnecessarily delay valuable contributions from Area 72.

Maryland N., Area Archivist: reflected on Area 72's long history of influencing the Fellowship through successful Proposed Agenda Items and other initiatives, including literature, group inventory materials, and historical resources. While acknowledging the Area's tradition of meaningful contributions, she also expressed support for taking incremental steps and evaluating the effectiveness of the Special Assembly before making a permanent scheduling change.

Dan H., DCM, District 3: shared that although he had initially favored moving the Annual Assembly, discussions within his district changed his perspective. His district preferred not to move the Assembly at this time, and he anticipated voting against placing the proposal on the Assembly agenda while recognizing that further discussion would occur at the Assembly if the motion advanced.

Jim M., DCM, District 28: noted that Area 72 has historically submitted relatively few Proposed Agenda Items. Since the Area had already agreed to consider the Special Assembly proposal, he believed it would be prudent to gather experience with that process before considering a permanent change to the Annual Assembly schedule.

Josh B., DCM, District 17: reported that many GSRs in his district preferred having one Assembly rather than two. He also expressed concern that an online Special Assembly might result in lower participation, potentially affecting the Area's collective group conscience. For that reason, he favored allowing the Assembly to consider moving the Annual Assembly.

Angel M., DCM, District 34: supported placing both proposals before the Assembly. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that all GSRs have the opportunity to participate in decisions affecting the Area's voice at the General Service Conference, noting that some members still prefer in-person participation over Zoom.

Patrick M., Area Tech & Web Chairperson: observed that the Quarterly's responsibility is to prepare clear motions for the Assembly to consider. He believed both proposals were sufficiently developed to allow informed discussion by GSRs at the Assembly. Rather than removing one option, he felt the Quarterly should forward both proposals so the Assembly could evaluate them and determine the best course of action through an informed group conscience.

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Kelly R., Alternate DCM, District 14: expressed support for placing both proposals before the GSRs. She felt that the relatively small number of Proposed Agenda Items submitted by Area 72 should not discourage participation at the General Service level. She also observed that many trusted servants already struggle to attend additional meetings, and adding a Special Assembly could create another barrier to participation. In her view, allowing the GSRs to consider moving the Annual Assembly would provide an opportunity for the groups to determine which approach best meets the Area's needs.

Louise W., GSR, District 25: asked for clarification regarding the composition of the proposed Special Assembly, specifically whether it would function as a General Assembly with GSR participation. She indicated that, if so, she could support using a Special Assembly when an urgent Proposed Agenda Item arises while also considering moving the Annual Assembly to September in the future.

Donna MH., Archives Steering Committee Member: expressed concern that moving the Annual Assembly forward should receive additional study before advancing to the Assembly. She noted that changing the Assembly weekend could create conflicts with significant religious observances, such as Yom Kippur, and emphasized the importance of maintaining inclusivity when selecting meeting dates.

Robin M., GSR, District 54: observed that moving the Annual Assembly would require careful consideration of facility availability, attendance, and scheduling. She acknowledged that finding suitable venues at the end of September may present additional challenges and emphasized that implementing such a change would require significant planning and cooperation throughout the Area.

Teri H., DCM, District 42: suggested another possible approach for future consideration. Since the Delegate generally knows well in advance whether a Proposed Agenda Item may require Area action, she wondered whether the Area Committee itself could hold a Special Assembly after DCMs had distributed the necessary background information to their districts, rather than involving a broader Assembly.

<u>Derek S., Area Chairperson called for the Vote</u>:

<u>Vote Result</u>: The motion to put Example Motion #2 on the Assembly Agenda Failed.
(by a vote of 32 in favor; 24 opposed; needs substantial unanimity).

<u>Minority Opinion on the Failed Motion</u>:

Following the vote in which the Motion to advance Example Motion #2 failed to advance to the Assembly Agenda, the Chair opened the floor for **minority opinion**, reminding the body that the minority consisted of those who had voted **in favor** of placing the motion on the Assembly agenda.

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Erin E., Area Newsletter Editor: stated that, given the closeness of the vote, the proposal should be forwarded to the Assembly so the GSRs could determine its outcome. She also commented that she missed the clarity provided by the electronic voting system.

Paul A., Third Legacy Chair, District 36: commented that although they personally favored keeping the Assembly schedule unchanged, they believed the decision ultimately belonged to the GSRs and that the Assembly should have the opportunity to weigh in.

Jo G., DCM, District 25: Stated she voted incorrectly and wanted to put it on the Assembly Agenda.

Ganelle H., DCM, District 41, supported forwarding the proposal to the Assembly, noting that the close vote suggested broader discussion was warranted. She also expressed concern that limiting the discussion to the Quarterly body could reduce participation by GSRs in matters affecting the General Service Conference.

Dave H., GSR, District 19: observed that he would now have to report back to his group that the GSRs would not have an opportunity to discuss or vote on the proposal because it had not advanced by the Committee.

Kari M., DCM, District 44: stated that it is the responsibility of DCMs to carry the voice of their districts and that GSRs should have the opportunity to express their group's conscience on the proposal. She also noted that the Area has discussed this topic for several years and believed it was time to allow the Assembly to consider it.

Scott O., DCM, District 16: remarked that the Area had spent considerable time discussing the possibility of moving the Annual Assembly and suggested it was time to let the GSRs decide the question at the Assembly.

Charley P., Area Language Chair: shared that he had heard DCMs describe strong interest from their GSRs and did not want to deny the Area body the opportunity to vote on the proposal.

<u>Motion to Reconsider</u>: Lupita YM., Alternate Delegate (Voted in the Majority and wished to change her vote)

Second by: Theresa H., Area Treasurer:

<u>The Chair called for the Vote on the Motion to Reconsider</u>:

<u>Vote Result</u>: The Motion to Reconsider passed by simple majority.

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

The Chair then explained what happened after an informal point of inquiry as follows: We heard minority opinion, once finished, the chair would normally then ask if anyone who had voted in the majority (in this case, voted against putting Example Motion #2 on the Assembly Agenda) wished to change their vote. Lupita, who had voted in the majority, simply jumped that process and went right to making a motion to reconsider because she wanted to change her vote after hearing minority opinion.

The Chair then called for a vote on whether to put Example Motion #2 onto the Assembly Agenda:

Vote Result: 44 in favor; 10 opposed. The motion passed with substantial unanimity, and Example Motion #2 was placed on the Assembly Agenda.

Minority Opinion:
Following the successful revote to place Example Motion #2 on the Assembly agenda, the Chair opened the floor for minority opinion from those who had voted against the motion. The Chair requested clarification from Crystal regarding the appropriate minority before recognizing speakers.

Rose B., DCM, District 7: expressed concern that forwarding additional motions to the Assembly could result in an overly full agenda for the GSRs, making it difficult to complete all of the Assembly's business within the available time.

Dan H., DCM, District 3: stated that he agreed the GSRs should have an opportunity to discuss the issue but preferred that they begin with the already-approved discussion regarding a Special Assembly rather than with a second motion. He believed the discussion would naturally lead the Assembly to develop its own motion if a permanent change to the Annual Assembly schedule proved necessary.

Jim M., DCM, District 28: reiterated his support for trying the Special Assembly concept first before making a permanent scheduling change. He felt an experimental approach would provide valuable experience while avoiding confusion created by having two similar proposals before the Assembly at the same time.

Point of Order by Terry P., Past Delegate, Area 29: noted that, under Robert's Rules of Order as modified by A.A., minority opinion is generally not taken following a second vote.

Derek S., Area Chair: The Chair acknowledged the point, indicated he was unaware of that, briefly sought input from past delegates, and elected to continue hearing the remaining minority opinions.

Motion Nos. 3 & 4 - Proposed Agenda Item (PAI) Deadline Date

Minutes from the July 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Pete P., DCM, District 22: expressed concern that the Assembly would now have two closely related motions before it. He also noted that he had not discussed Example Motion #2 with his district's GSRs because he had anticipated that the broader discussion generated by the first proposal would allow the Assembly to develop any additional motion if needed.

<u>2nd Motion to Reconsider</u>: After minority opinion concluded, the Chair asked whether anyone who had voted **in favor** of placing the motion on the Assembly agenda wished to change their vote. **Three** members indicated that they did, **which the Chair accepted as a motion and a second.**

The Chair called for a Vote on the Motion to Reconsider:

Vote Result: the motion to reconsider failed. Example Motion #2 was moved to the Assembly Agenda.