

TABLED MOTION #2

OR Area Business Meeting – May 21, 2017

Sponsored by Joe S., Area PI Co-Chair, 2016 PNC Host Committee Chair

Motion: To Fully fund the area 58 host chair to attend PNC the following year after hosting to deliver the final report at the PNC business meeting. Funding to PNC not to exceed \$500.
Intent/Purpose: To provide reimbursement for the PNC chairs travel expenses incurred through expected service activities.
Current Practice: Oregon Area 58 funds the PNC host chair the year of the event but the PNC host chair is also responsible for delivering the final report the following year.
Budgetary Impact: \$500

Joe S.: The reason I'm bringing this forward is because I was the 2016 PNC Host Chair. I was planning on attending PNC already in 2017 to deliver my final report, I'm fully capable of funding myself, but I want this service position to be available to anybody anywhere no matter how much money that they have, to go and deliver their responsibility without having feeling obligated to come out of pocket to deliver this. It's our responsibility to fully fund our trusted servants to do their job adequately regardless of any financial state in which they reside. That's the reason for the motion.

Lisa K.: District 26: Would the only thing that the PNC Chair be doing at the assembly be just giving the report?

Joe S.: A couple of clarifications. We do not host PNC every year, it's a bid process. Areas 72 and 92 are also involved in this, so now there's a rotation of 3, so this wouldn't be a financial impact every year. The impact in host years is \$1,500 and the following year is nothing. That's the first part that I wanted to clarify. This isn't every year, it's a year following the year that we host. The second part of that is, yes, my only responsibility is to deliver that report but that's a large portion of the business meeting on Saturday of PNC, is to deliver that report, plus I'd be participating in PNC. Or the host chair would be participating in PNC.

Lisa K.: And how long is your report?

Joe S.: Maybe 10-15 minutes of the business meeting.

Lisa K.: I'm just wondering if there would be a way to pass on that report to save \$500? If we would be spending \$500 for a 10-15 minute report, and there were no other jobs that needed to be done at that assembly for PNC, I'm wondering if there would be a cheaper way to pass on that information.

Joe S.: Yes, it is possible to pass on that report. I know that the business meeting has often revolved around asking questions of that person and when that person is not available, it becomes really impossible to get any answers. We saw that this year at PRAASA and dealing with the Treasurer's report [being given by] somebody that wasn't actually involved in hosting the event. Not being there, [it] would be really really difficult for them to deliver that report with any certainty as questions arise on why we spent our money and why we were only left with this amount to pass on. I think since it is the responsibility of the host chair, I believe that the not to exceed \$500...I understand it's a decent amount of money, but I think it is our responsibility to fund that.

Robert: This is somewhat analogous to, in 2007, when the Oregon Area hosted PRAASA and I was the PRAASA Treasurer, I was then required to go to Anchorage the following year and give the Treasurer's report. I was not able to go to Anchorage, so I worked with the Alternate Treasurer to prepare the Treasurer's report so she would be prepared to take questions at the business meeting and that happened. It seems to me that the host chair for PNC could prepare a report that could be...they would have to work closely with the person who's going to deliver the report so they could take questions. But it did happen at the PRAASA, which was a very difficult report.

Ryan, GSR Disorderly Conduct, District 31: It looks like from the proposed budget for 2018, that we had a budget line item last year for the PNC host of \$1,500. The \$500 expense that is being proposed does not seem unreasonable, and it does seem reasonable to help facilitate one of our members and trusted servants to exercise their role. It seems to me as a matter of process, that should be integrated into the budgeting cycle for bidding and hosting, and then that expense just carried forward to the following budget year. So in this example, it would show \$1,500 in 2016, \$500 in 2017 for travel associated with completing that obligation. To me it seems like a budgeting and work planning issue rather than something that needs to be integrated into our regular operating expenses.

Lee, District 20: It appears to me that if we have made a decision to host PNC, which we obviously have, this \$500 bucks in the follow up year is something that is going to occur and should simply be part of our commitment. I regard \$500 as a small urgent and administrative sort of thing. Let's get this thing passed. Thank you.

Gus, Area Grapevine Chair: Gus, alcoholic, apparently wearing the black hat for the weekend. I'm opposed to this motion. We fund our Area officers to go to PNC. When we host a PNC the Chairperson and important elements in planning committee participate in a wrap-up session at the end of that PNC to help the new people come on board. Any final report from our Treasurer or our chairperson could be delivered by the floor officers that we fund to the next year's PNC. If this was deemed absolutely necessary, which I don't think it is, but if it was, why don't we use some of the \$1,500 from the year before, which we hardly ever spend, to cover the activities for pre-PNC and post-PNC. I'd also like to point out that PRAASA does not fund anybody to show up the year after to deliver any final reports. Thank you for listening.

Motion determined by a majority to be urgent and/or administrative and will be voted on immediately.

*Vote taken on the motion, 2/3 majority not achieved. **Motion FAILS.***

Minority Opinion

Lisa K.: At first, I totally misunderstood the motion, it sounds like it is their job...I thought it was going to the assembly to make a report, because I read it really fast. I voted for it because it's their job to do it so we should fund them to do their job, I think.

Brandon, District 26: I kind of feel like a broken record lately, but I feel like an important part of the 7th tradition is, if we are asking people to do things that cost money, that we should be fully funding those people so that nobody has to go out of pocket to do AA business. Seemed like a no-brainer to me.

Chase, District 21: This is my first assembly. For me to hear these motions presented at the mic, without having something written, is difficult. This is confusing to me, the way the motion was made. I would like to see all the motions in writing before the meeting, thank you.

Jim F.: I can just tell you that we'll try to do a little better next time with the acoustics and what you're able to hear and what you're not able to hear, but it's something beyond our control at this time. That was a point of order, you weren't speaking to the motion.

Scott, GSR Happy Destiny, District 36: I'm for this motion. I think it's important that we support those that want to be of service. It's very difficult to find people that will be of service in the first place and to support those that want to be of service should be an obligation on our part.

Cindy, GSR No Name Group, District 26: I just want to remind us that we are talking about inclusion, that we want to include everybody, as much as we can in all activities of AA, and I think this would economically exclude somebody if they saw they had to have that expense. So in the sense of inclusion, I'm in favor of this motion.

Sue, District 2: Seconding that, there's been the out-of-pocket expense for someone, but perhaps more importantly is that someone may not even consider the position because they don't have the funding. Also, I just wanted to clarify that some of the discussion has been about should a report be sent instead of a person. It seems to me that is decided by the PNC organization, we're not deciding if the person should go or not. It's expected, I don't know if we can say required, but certainly expected, and I think it's our obligation to fund that person.

Jim F. started the process of deciding whether to reopen debate:

Sue, District 1: Can I ask a question about this? I have a question about the funding that's in place. I understood Gus to say we have the \$1,500 and it isn't always used. Are you saying that the money is already there and they can go back and use it?

Randy, Finance Co-Chair: The \$1,500 that everyone is talking about is the amount that was funded the year of the PNC. This year, which is the following year, it is not funded. There is zero money in that account. Currently though, we do have, in the checking account \$16,414.75.

Motion to re-vote made by Johnny, District 1, seconded by Stan, District 7.

*Vote taken on whether to reopen debate, simple majority achieved. **Debate on motion is reopened.***

Marc, GSR Center Group, District 9: I have a point of order, I was reviewing this thing, and it looks like there is an expenditure of Area funds and I don't think we've heard from the Finance committee. I mean we briefly heard from him, but we haven't heard from him whether we have that money to spend, is that correct? Are we supposed to hear from the Finance committee if it's about Area funds?

Jim F.: After the motion is voted upon we will.

Ryan, District 31: Definitely, again, agree that we should be helping our people go to fill their obligations. Still opposed to locking in a number, here forward, of \$500. It should be up to the people budgeting for the conference. It may cost more than \$500 to send somebody to Alaska. It may cost less. Leave it to the people creating the budget, we know where the conference is going to be held the next year, it can be forecast and integrated into work planning. But let's not lock ourselves down to still not being able to send somebody because it's too far away for \$500 to get us there. Thanks.

Jeannie, DCM District 1: I was just wondering if there was maybe, I don't know what part of the process we're in, if we could maybe table this and find out how much we don't use when we pay for them to go, and see if that amount can roll over into what they want. I think they should be paid to go but not have extra money that they're not even using.

SJ, Area Secretary: Last year I was the Treasurer for PNC. I can say, just from personal experience, that it is incredibly useful to have someone who was involved at the last PNC to be there at the next PNC. This comes up at PRAASA too, as Gus mentioned, they don't have the carry-through at PRAASA, and what ends up happening at PRAASA, and what happened at PNC as well, is that people who are there kind of scratch their heads, and they can't answer questions because they weren't there and they don't have the details. So it is really useful to actually have someone who was involved in the prior PNC to be at the current PNC.

Tim, District 13: Maybe we could just combine the two expenses into the current year for both current and post.

*Vote taken on whether to reopen debate, simple majority achieved. **Debate on motion is reopened.***

*Motion determined by a majority to not be urgent and/or administrative. **Motion TABLED.***

Joe S.: Point of Order: I believe that you can not go back and table something after discussion has ended. So we either vote on it today...we vote on it today no matter what. It either dies or lives, but we have to do that today, we can't go back and do that. Am I incorrect in saying that? Jim: According to the guidelines Joe, that is not correct. I'll read it from the guidelines. It says the motion is reconsidered, which we did. Full debate pro and con resumed, which we did. The Question may be called again and seconded, and it wasn't. A sense of the meeting may be taken by simple majority, vote or table. This is in Area guidelines.

Motion stands as TABLED.