

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

[Discussed first at April Quarterly because it was postponed in January due to time constraints.]

Background Information Handout Provided at Quarterly:

This discussion topic is carried over from the 2025 Assembly where discussion continued regarding solutions to accommodate the change in the Conference Proposed Agenda Item Deadline Date from December 15 to September 30.

For Discussion at the April 2026 Quarterly:

- ***Does the Area Committee wish to continue or close out discussion?***
- ***Does an Area Committee Member want to present a Motion for consideration to put on the Assembly Agenda?***

Example Motion #1: Special Online Assembly on PAI(s) Only

Move that, if the Area 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. The Motion and all background information 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.

Example Motion #2: Move Assembly Up to Last Full Weekend in September

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.

NEW INFORMATION

One of the main concerns supporting this discussion is that without some way to obtain a full Area 72 conscience on a PAI before September 30, Area 72 cannot be responsive to an action taken at the Conference within the Conference cycle, i.e. if Area 72 wanted to submit a PAI in immediate response to a Conference action, that submittal would have to wait a full year before submission having missed the deadline date for the very next conference.

New information from our Past Pacific Region Trustee, Kathi F. during her visit here in January, states that the Trustee's Conference Agenda Committee typically will not forward to the next Conference agenda any PAI's that are in response to the previous conference, preferring instead to let the Advisory Action stand for a couple of years before forwarding PAI's that are in response to a Conference action.

This new information does not address:

1. If Area 72 wanted to join in another Area's PAI in support; or
2. If Area 72 wanted to submit its own PAI, it would have to wait to submit until the following year for consideration at the Conference after next.

Lisa S., Alternate Chair, Presented the Discussion Topic

Lisa provided new information from past Pacific Region Trustee, Kathi F., while she was here in January at the Quarterly and submitted the following questions to the committee:

- Does the Area Committee wish to continue or close out discussion?
- Does an Area Committee Member want to present a Motion for consideration to put on the Assembly Agenda?

Final note: From the Area Assembly discussion, a third wanted a special assembly, a third wanted to move the Assembly into September, and a third didn't see a need. Two-thirds wanted to do something.

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Discussion:

Mike L., DCM, District 36:

Expressed support for having an option for a special online-only assembly. Suggested developing a formal process for handling proposed agenda items (PAIs), noting that the recent situation with the Alternate Treasurer highlighted the absence of a defined procedure. Seems like a good idea.

Morgan S. , Alt-DCM District 40:

Noted challenges with adjusting the current calendar due to long-term scheduling commitments. Suggested penciling in a standing special assembly (potentially online) that would only be used if needed, allowing flexibility without disrupting existing plans.

Derek, Area Chair:

Discussed the options associated with Example Motion #1 and that the discussion would be on that one item.

Pete P., DCM District 22:

Asked whether a special assembly could currently be called under existing guidelines.

Derek, Area Chair:

Responded that would be open for discussion and he would poll the past delegates regarding his authority to call a special assembly. It is unclear under current guidelines and would benefit from direction from the body.

Pete P., DCM District 22:

Went on to state the he felt having a written procedure that allows for a special online assembly would be something he would prefer to see.

Amiee B., Area Corrections Chair:

Asked whether the Area Committee could submit a proposed agenda item without full Area assembly input.

Derek, Area Chair:

Replied that he did not have a specific answer for that and asked the body what they felt. He went on to say that there was a proposed agenda item submitted in 2024 on the Young Peoples video by the Area Committee with only the Area Committee conscience, not the full body. He was not sure if a committee submission carries the same weight as a full Area Body submission.

Dave, District 19 Morning Phoenix Group:

Asked about how other Areas have addressed similar challenges related to deadlines and scheduling.

Eddy, Area Alternate Treasurer

Stated he was a member of the 2023 PAI Ad Hoc Committee and reported that most Areas hold multiple assemblies annually and were able to adjust schedules more easily. Noted that the ad hoc committee information is located on the Area 72 Website in the 2023 documents, he also noted that Area 72's size and single annual assembly creates unique logistical challenges.

Kelly R., Alt DCM District 14:

Spoke to the importance of aligning Area processes with A.A. principles and Traditions, emphasizing thoughtful, informed group conscience and alignment with A.A. as a whole. Accordingly, likes the idea of having something in place immediately and then also move the assembly up in 5 years so we are in alignment with other Areas and the Conference.

Joe T., DCM District 19:

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Asked clarifying question regarding if we went forward with Example Motion #1 [Special Assembly Online on PAI(s) only] regarding timing and implementation of a potential special assembly in relation to quarterly meetings and pre-assembly processes.

Derek, Area Chair:

Clarified that any future process would include advance notice, background information, and integration into pre-assembly communications.

Patrick, Area Tech and Web Chair:

Shared that while the Area Committee could act independently, it would be preferable for proposed agenda items to reflect full Area group conscience rather than committee-only action.

Crystal, Past Delegate, Panel 73:

Expressed support for Option 1, noting it provides a balanced approach by allowing vetting through the Area Committee while maintaining broader participation. Highlighted that submissions from an Area carry more weight at the General Service Conference level.

Jana Alt-DCM, District 9:

Observed there are two-thirds who want to do something and expressed support for moving forward with discussion and encouraged placing the topic on the assembly agenda.

Derek, Area Chair:

Noted that it would be possible to put both motions on the assembly agenda and see what the body has to say.

Josh B., DCM District 17:

Suggested that predictable processes, such as submitting proposed agenda items, may be better suited to existing structures rather than special assemblies, emphasizing broad participation through regular scheduling.

Sansannah J., Alt-DCM District 3:

Asked whether proposals would be vetted through a committee process to ensure adequate background information and informed decision-making.

Houston, Area Registrar:

Expressed support for a temporary solution using a special assembly, while also encouraging consideration of long-term structural changes, including potential schedule adjustments and a July Assembly.

Teri DCM, District 42:

Supported including a special assembly option in the Area calendar ahead of time while noting concerns about costs and logistics associated with moving the annual assembly.

Lupita, Area Alt-Delegate:

Neat conversation. Wants to hear what the groups thoughts are as well. Encouraged members to bring feedback from their groups and districts into the discussion.

Lisa, Area Alternate Chair:

Wanted to say that most of the contracts that we have currently signed are moveable and don't have a cost difference associated with moving them, but there is no guarantee they will be movable in October. If we go to a special assembly, could we try it for a couple years and see how it goes.

Kari M., DCM District 44:

Shared district support for a one-day online special assembly if needed, noting the Area's ability to respond effectively when necessary.

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Lisa J., DCM District 24:

Highlighted cost and participation concerns related to moving assemblies to summer months, based on prior discussions and group feedback.

Melissa, Member, District 27:

Said it would be easier to skip 5 years down the road and plan those in the future to allow for those host committees to make plans for the adjusted committees, quarterlies and assembly dates. Gave example in 2023, we missed joining Area 58 on ASL Proposed Agenda Item.

Mike D., DCM District 10:

My district currently feels we should do nothing about it, but with Lisa's new information I believe it would be worthwhile bringing it back to our groups and districts for more discussion on both motions.

Dan DCM, District 3:

I don't recall bringing this up with my district, but my sense is that we would like to see these motions on the agenda so the groups can discuss, individually, likes a combination of the motions.

Debbie DCM, District 8:

Likes the idea of having a way to deal with this by the special assembly.

Louise W., GSR District 25:

Wanted to know how often this would happen that we would need to move the assembly to July.

Amanda M., Alt-DCM District 29:

Shared her home group had a strong opinion in favor of Example Motion 2 [Move Assembly into September] and that we move the assembly up, but also there should be something in writing so the Area Chairperson could call a special assembly if needed. So both options.

John C., DCM District 45:

Noted general lack of urgency from groups and suggested that moving the annual assembly to the last weekend in September may be the simplest long-term solution, while cautioning against permanent structural changes for infrequent needs.

Ricky T., Alt-DCM District 16:

Suggested delaying action until the July quarterly to allow districts and groups more time to review options and provide input. He also noted a big difference between in person and online meetings.

Courtney, Area Delegate:

Provided additional background on the proposed agenda item process, noting that:

- The form has been updated to add a line stating who is submitting the request.
- Submissions from Areas carry greater influence
- Items may take multiple years to reach the Conference agenda
- Urgent items are relatively rare
- Encouraged careful consideration before implementing significant structural changes.

John K., DCM District 35:

The groups in my district couldn't come up with anything they thought would be that urgent. Moving the assembly back causes a lot of confusion with people going back to school and a variety of other conflicting items. Thereby an online option with a set date would be our choice.

Motion Kari M., DCM District 44:

Move to place "Example Motion #1: Special Online Assembly on PAI(s) Only" on the Assembly Agenda.

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Second: District 38.

Motion: Special Online Assembly on PAI(s) Only

Move that, if [the] Area 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. The Motion and all background information 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.

Discussion on the Motion:

John DCM, District 45:

Expressed concern that advancing only Motion 1 could limit GSRs' ability to consider alternative options. Noted that some groups favor a schedule change (Motion 2) and emphasized the importance of preserving choice for the GSRs.

Theresa H., Area Treasurer:

Noted that the quarterly process already provides opportunity for DCMs to take discussion back to districts and GSRs. Emphasized that GSRs will still be informed of both options and can bring forward additional motions if desired. Expressed support for trying Example Motion #1 as a practical step forward after extended discussion.

Louise W., GSR District 25:

Raised concern about whether a September special assembly would provide sufficient time to meet submission deadlines.

Josh C., DCM District 11:

Expressed concern that a special online assembly could create participation challenges by requiring trusted servants to attend two assemblies in close succession. Suggested that moving the annual assembly may result in greater participation.

Teri H., DCM District 42:

Spoke in favor of having a planned special assembly option available without requiring major schedule changes. Noted that maintaining flexibility in the calendar may better accommodate members' schedules.

Derek, Area Chair:

Clarified that the PAI deadline is September 30, and that both Motion 1 and Motion 2 would fall within that timeframe.

Janna Alt DCM, District 9:

Asked whether both motions could be placed on the Assembly agenda and discussed through the regular process, allowing GSRs time to consider both options.

Derek, Area Chair:

Confirmed that both motions could be placed on the Assembly agenda if separately moved and explained how future implementation could render one motion unnecessary depending on outcomes.

Eddy, Area Treasurer and former PAI Ad Hoc Committee Member:

Shared that the committee had previously recommended adjusting the assembly schedule rather than implementing a special assembly, citing concerns about accessibility (online participation barriers) and increased demands on trusted servants. Also expressed openness to a hybrid or interim solution while long-term changes are considered.

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

Crystal J., Past Delegate:

Spoke in favor of Motion 1 as a limited, less resource-intensive approach. Compared it to a trial or pilot, suggesting it allows the Area to test a solution without committing to significant structural change. Encouraged focusing discussion on whether the motion is ready for the Assembly agenda.

Joe T., DCM District 19:

Noted that discussion within his district has been limited and expressed concern about voting without clear district group conscience. Suggested that additional time could improve the quality of the decision.

Derek, Area Chair:

Explained the tabling process stating that once a motion is on the floor, we need to either vote on it today or table it until a future date at which time we would vote to take it off the table and continue discussion.

Theresa H., Area Treasurer:

Just wanted to make clear, we are not voting on the motion itself, we are simply voting on whether to put it on the Assembly Agenda.

Mary W. Alt-DCM District 45:

Asked clarifying questions regarding the PAI deadline language and timing.

Derek, Area Chair:

Confirmed that the deadline is no earlier than September 30 and has remained unchanged.

Morgan S., Alt-DCM District 40:

Expressed preference for having both Motion 1 and Motion 2 presented to the Assembly to allow GSRs to consider all options. Indicated reluctance to support Motion 1 independently if the alternative option is not also considered.

Pete P., DCM District 22:

Shared that his district supports moving forward with Motion 1 and expressed readiness to proceed, suggesting that additional motions could be brought forward if needed.

Dan DCM, District 3:

Observed that the body appeared divided and that additional district input may be beneficial.

Dan DCM, District 3: Moved to table Motion 1 until the July Quarterly

to allow further discussion at the district and group level.

Second: District 45

Derek, Area Chair: Called for a vote on the motion to table.

Result: Motion to table passed. Motion 1 discussion was deferred to the July Quarterly.

Derek, Area Chair:

Confirmed that no motion was made regarding Example Motion 2 and indicated the discussion on the topic would be closed, with Motion 1 having been tabled to the July Quarterly.

Lisa S., Alternate Chair:

Asked for clarification on the implications of tabling the motion, specifically whether the same motion would return in July. Expressed concern that the current wording of Motion 1 may lack clarity and suggested that without revisions, the body may encounter similar challenges when the motion is reconsidered. Asked whether there is an opportunity to refine the language prior to July.

Derek, Area Chair:

Responded that the intent of the motion is clear and that minor edits could be addressed when the

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

Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly on Discussion

motion is brought back from the table in July. Indicated that the body would have the opportunity at that time to review the motion and consider amendments.

Crystal, Past Delegate:

Noted that the motion as written in the background materials appears clear and suggested that any confusion may have resulted from transcription or formatting errors when the motion was displayed.

Derek, Area Chair:

Explained that the version of the motion shown on screen may have contained transcription or formatting discrepancies from the original Word document and confirmed that the version in the background packet should be considered the accurate reference.

Lisa DCM, District 24:

Clarified that, even in the printed background materials, there were still elements of the wording she found unclear and reiterated the importance of addressing those concerns prior to reconsideration.

Derek, Area Chair:

Confirmed that any concerns regarding wording and clarity can be addressed through discussion and amendment when the motion is taken from the table in July.

Houston, Area Registrar:

Asked for clarification regarding whether input on the motion could be provided prior to July, and whether an ad hoc committee exists to support that process.

Derek, Area Chair:

Clarified that the prior ad hoc committee concluded its work in a previous rotation and is no longer active. Noted that while work on the topic has continued, it has not been through a formal committee structure. Further explained that background information has been developed and provided over the course of the current rotation to support informed discussion, and that input may be shared directly with the Chair. Indicated that a new committee is not considered necessary at this time.