

aaHomeGroup Group Conscience Minutes

Chair Ash Megan

Time: 3:15pm EDT

Date: April 25th 2026

SC Members Present

Jeff (MAL), Jo (Secretary), Harold (Comm/Lit), Joe W (IT Chair), Jess (ALT Treasurer), Lizzy (GSR), Celina (Training Co-Chair), Ash (Chair), Manny (OIAA/IGR Chair), Dave M (MAL), Nicole (MAL), Angela (Scheduling Chair), Katy (Training Co-Chair), Ryan (MAL), Eddie (Co-Chair), Albert (Treasurer), Bob C (MAL).

Opening Prayer

Ash opened with The Serenity Prayer.

Tradition Of The Month Reading

Jeff Shared on Tradition 4

Tradition 4

Short form (pg 146 12&12)

Each group should be autonomous, except in matters affecting other groups or A.A as a whole.

Long form (pg 189 12&12)

With respect to its own affairs, each A.A group should be responsible to no other authority than its own conscience. But when its plans concern the welfare of neighbouring groups also, those groups ought to be consulted. And no group, regional committee, or individual should ever take any action that might greatly affect A.A as a whole without conferring with the trustees of the General Service Board. On such issues our common welfare is paramount.

Old Business

Trusted Servant Removal in Telegram Chats

Katy shared that regarding our operational chats our current policy is that if a Trusted Servant is inactive for 180 days then they should be removed from the operations side of the group. Efforts have been made previously by other SC members to facilitate this so now there is a process that can be followed going forward. The census was made using the Creds chat to measure activity of our TS. This was reviewed with both Training Co-Chairs, Scheduling Chair, Dave M as a MAL and Safety representative, Ash the Chair and Joe W for IT Chair so all areas had input. This process will be happening in the first day of spring and then again at the first day of fall, so the list would not be updated monthly and there could be members that are sat in chats with 11 months of inactivity, but due to the workload required to keep in mind progress and not perfection.

A member asked if the Service members that are only down to Chair have been added to the Safety chat or if it is still free choice to be in there, and Katy shared that the link and suggestion can be posted, but mentioned how sometimes the chats can be distracting when trying to chair and some members just use the direct message option in the meeting if the Chair needs to be aware of anything adding that she feels we have a pretty good system in place and the host/co-host tends to take care of most issues within a meeting.

Katy adds that there is a new TS service chat and the link is posted for members to join which has created some interesting and useful conversations and discussion items.

A member voiced their concerns with service and spoke of personalities taking over the group and spoke of how they saw members chatting about them in the service chats so they removed themselves from service. They were advised to email concerns@aahomegroup.org

A member voiced that there is a lack of compassion within the service team and feels like there should be more connection between our members and also asked if members would get a warning before getting axed from the chats.

It was shared that because we are a large group when people drift away we don't always know to reach out and other than our Birthday announcements we don't keep any records of members, also we have to be careful of breaking anonymity and sharing that members are not active. Katy added that they will drop an announcement before the purge of the chats and clarified that it is 6 months of inactivity not 6 months of being trained. It was also shared by another member that it is a We program and we do these things together as well as being accountable, so if members can be mindful of when they served that would be helpful and another member suggested making a flyer for the website and service chat.

Verification of Attendance Update

Katy shared that after the motion passed last month at Group Conscience for Verification of Attendance and the procedure is being shared for feedback. She adds that it is a courtesy that a group can choose to do to welcome them and fulfill their obligations to outside entities. Katy continues to share that our current process is to screenshot the Shield in our meeting but feedback from that was that it was not sufficient for the Courts.

The adhoc has recommended a google form which members fill in themselves. Suggesting an announcement during the intro and a chat drop with how it works. Members would then send a

direct message to the Host in the first ten minutes of the meeting, the Host then would send the link to the form ten minutes from the end to the participants still in the meeting. The member would fill in said form and get an email. The form would have information for members to fill in as much detail as needed, who was the chair for example. There wouldn't be any history of Verifications kept due to anonymity and there would be an email that members could reach out to if they have any problems. That responsibility will be with the Secretary committee.

Member feedback was that this process is self verification and Court verification requires more of a process and registration and Ash added that the member would have to stay for the meeting in order to get the link.

There was some more discussion about honesty and lack of it when people first arrive and who should be accountable for that. Us or the members.

Katy added that the form created also saves on workflow as it would require another lane of safety and we don't have enough people in service to do that.

Another member shared that we could display a disclaimer in the chat about the responsibility being on the member to check what we offer is sufficient.

Elections

Ash passes the meeting over to the Secretary - Jo Unicorn for the elections.

Jo motions to approve the Group Conscience minutes from February and March 2026, seconded by Katy F.

Yes 26, No 0, Abstain 1 - Minutes approved.

Jo then runs through the election process

Elections

Our current bylaws state that members must be in active service for 6 months to qualify for any position. - For the purpose of this election and until the group hears the proposal from the adhoc, Active Service means to be trained in at least one of the following positions, WR, Chat/Vids, Chair & Host.

- For each position the floor will open for nominations which will be seconded and then the nominee will be asked if they accept.
- Once nominations for a position are completed, nominees shall qualify themselves for 1.5 minutes max
- Nominees will then be placed in the WR and the floor will open for discussion
- Each member may speak one time for 1 minute in favour or against nominees
- A vote will then take place, members must be on camera and a screenshot taken for records
- The nominees will be invited back into the room and Secretary announces the newly elected member.
- If only one member is nominated they automatically fill that position.
- **Safety Co-Chair Male/Non Binary**
Mandatory - 2 years sobriety & to be trained on all lanes
- **Safety Co-Chair Female/Non Binary**
Mandatory - 2 years sobriety & to be trained on all lanes
- **IT Co-Chair**
Mandatory - 2 years sobriety
- **Alt Secretary**
Suggested 1 year of sobriety

Safety Co-Chair Male or Non Binary - Backfill until October 2026

Charlie was nominated, seconded by Danielle, accepted nomination

Bob M was nominated, seconded by Lizzie, accepted nomination

Both nominees qualified themselves before being placed in the WR for the Group to discuss and Jo calls to vote.

- Charlie 13
- Bob M 24

Bob M is our new Safety Co-Chair to serve from April 26th 2026.

Safety Co-Chair Female or Non Binary - Backfill until January 2027

A member shared that if no female runs they would still like to see Charlie in this position.

Marissa was nominated, seconded by Big Bob, declined nomination to give Charlie the opportunity - Another member asked Marissa to consider changing her name and another member then nominated Marissa and she was asked to reconsider and accepted.

Andi S was nominated but was not eligible to run for the position due to current bylaws and her being removed from the SC in autumn, and was invited to run in October (See section 4 eligibility requirements below)

Andi shared that she is unsure if she is ineligible to run as her removal didn't come from the Safety Committee so feels it is void and Marissa declined from running for the position.

SECTION 4: ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR SC COMMITTEE

MEMBERS:

1. All nominees for election should have the minimum sobriety time as indicated for each position.
2. For certain officers, the requirements of sobriety and previous experience are **mandatory** and **cannot be waived**. Those requirements can only be changed by a change in the bylaws.
3. For other officers, the Group Conscience (during an election) can waive the minimum sobriety or experience requirements through a motion and a majority vote.

4. **MANDATORY:** Only members who have been in **active service** for six months on the aaHG platform are eligible to be nominated for a Steering Committee position.

aaHomeGroup

approved by GC on February 20, 2026

5. **MANDATORY:** Any Steering Committee Member who is removed from the Steering Committee may not be nominated for election to another position within 1 year.
6. A Steering Committee member may only hold 1 position at a time, with the exception of the Chair who may be serving as Assistant Treasurer.
7. The SC can remove a member of the SC, for cause, by a 2/3 majority vote of the quorum present. The Chair would be able to vote in this decision. The position would then be declared vacant.

Katy motions to vote if Andi is eligible to run and to override any previous decision, agreed by Ash and seconded by Ashley.

Jo was asked to lead this discussion and she started by stating her confusion over not following the By-laws as the group seems to be picking and choosing when the By-laws matter.

Ash interjected and asked well what do we do in this situation and there was debate about whether to continue. Katy stated that the sobriety requirements have been waived before. Ash then deferred back to Jo to take over who shared the above Bylaw requirement and shared that Andi has been welcomed back to the committee and that the Bylaws are pretty straight forward on this, adding that there was an adhoc created after the last election because people were concerned we didn't follow the guidelines and now the group wants to throw out the guidelines.

Ash wanted to hear further discussion from the group.

Some members shared that they felt Andis removal was done quickly and came from emotions suggesting that an exception should be made for this instance only, adding that we should clean up the wreckage from our past and be putting principles before personalities. Some were requesting review of the By-laws.

There were attempts made to keep time with the discussion and Ryan wanted to get to the vote, along with another member who suggested we vote on Andi, Marissa and Charlie.

The group were reminded that even though members can agree that the situation with Andi should have been resolved by now, there is not anything in the Bylaws that allows the group to change anything without $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of the SC and then majority at the Group Conscience. It has not been addressed within the Steering Committee so we cannot vote for it today.

Katy stated that they are not looking to change the bylaws, just make a one time exception.

Jo stated that the adhoc was created regarding the election due to taking things from the floor being a concern from our members and also that the group appears to be slightly misinformed, while she can agree that the situation can be revisited, Andi had ample opportunity to share her side, adding that there were 3 closed SC meetings with Andi's appeal.

Andi shared the following timeline of events,

September 25th removed no notice by the Steering Committee, September 30th appeal request, October 1st the election announcement was posted with the Secretary position already filled and finally October 18th the Steering Committee heard the appeal and then the October elections were heard after.

Ash added that the motion that Andi has submitted regarding the removal process should have been heard at this Group Conscience but due to the election there wasn't time.

Big Bob then shared the votes from the 3 Steering Committee meetings regarding the event, which were almost unanimous and added that another appeal can be done with all the details presented to the group and concluded by sharing that the election process clearly needs to be looked at for these events to be happening, and other members shared that the discussion needs to be concluded and the topic be discussed with the Steering Committee.

Jo shared that she felt really conflicted as in January when she followed the voice of the Group, members wrote in concerns and there are Bylaws in place for a reason which are already the voice of the group. Jo then screenshared the election notice which has been on the website for a while where members have had time to review and submit any queries which they have failed to do and wanted to move forward with the guidelines written on the notice, suggesting members write in to concerns if they have an issue with that. Jeff interjected and said that that wasn't doable as there is already a motion and a second on the floor.

Jo calls to vote on whether Andi should be eligible to run for any position at this election.

Yes 20, No 16, Abstain 8.

Big Bob spoke for the minority sharing that if the group is going to throw out the bylaws which are explicit, carefully written and approved by Group Conscience and by having this vote now it means that the bylaws are not in force and we are throwing out the voice of our previous GC's. Without the Bylaws we have nothing to stand on. If members want to amend sections then there is a process with time giving the group a chance to review. He also spoke about sensitive topics being broadcast to the whole group and echoed caution about disregarding the Bylaws.

Some members were willing to change their vote and a revote was called as well as re-iterated that the whole motion should be squashed as it goes against the by-laws which doesn't give room to amend on the floor.

Jo called to re-vote because the motion was already on the floor.

Yes 8, No 17, Abstain 14 - Motion declined, Andi was not eligible to run for a position at this time.

Charlie was nominated, seconded by Danielle, accepted nomination

There were no other nominations and Charlie shall be Safety Co Chair from April 26th 2026

- Group Conscience approved that the Co-Chairs should, when possible, be filled by one man, one woman, or one non-binary member. If only men, women, or non-binary members are nominated they may be elected to fill the seats.

IT Co-Chair - Backfill until October

James Cowboy was nominated, seconded by Lizzie, accepted nomination

There were no other nominations and James shall be IT Co-Chair from April 26th 2026

ALT Secretary - Backfill until October

Christine M was nominated, seconded by Danielle, declined nomination

Bob M was nominated, not seconded - Bob was elected in a different position

Ashley CA was nominated, seconded by Jo, declined nomination

Jennifer was nominated, seconded by Jo, accepted nomination

Julie C was nominated, seconded by James, accepted nomination

Sarah K was nominated, seconded by Christine, declined nomination

Ryan was nominated, seconded by Danielle, declined nomination

Patricia B was nominated, seconded by B, declined nomination

Danielle was nominated, seconded by Jo, declined nomination

Both nominees qualified themselves before being placed in the WR for the group to discuss which included the question of two members of the same household being part of the Steering Committee and Jo fed back that there was a motion on this which failed to pass on the 21st of May 2025. Jo called to vote

- Jennifer 23
- Julie C 13

Jennifer is the new ALT Secretary to start serving on April 26, 2026

Jo gratefully hands proceedings back to Ash.

Motions

Motion on the Motion process. - Seconded by Mike

Motion regarding our Motion Process

Motion:
Revise and Organize the motion process
Ryan M.

Thanks to everyone for their service. I believe as we have seen from the past few meetings, the group is growing and changing. Which is a great thing. However I believe the old processes of motions, fits more of the way the meeting used to work then how it does now. The process is confusing and members don't feel heard.

The old process was that motions go to the steering committee first and are voted on to then go to the GC. This was because of time at GC meetings and wasn't wrong but the group felt like the SC had all the power to block motions from going to the GC. But at this time the group wants to put all motions in front of the GC.

So I think we can model the motion process now to better fit what the group wants to do now than before.

My suggestion would be to model the motion process closer to an Area Conference meeting because of the groups size and amount of meetings. I have attached an area meeting's motion process for an example.

We do most of these things already but my changes to our process would be as follows:

1. Instead of motions going to the SC, they should go directly to the GC. Because now we are having conversation about the motions twice or even 3 times, which is actually wasting more time than just having a longer GC.
2. During the GC the same process would happen that happens at the SC. However for time

Motion:
Revise and Organize the motion process
Ryan M.

constraints I would utilize what the area does and put a time limit on both the presentation and shares. Also for time purposes, I would really try to make sure we encourage members don't speak twice on the same motion like area does.

3. The time limit can be 2.3 or 5 min per motion for the presenter to present. I would let the group decide on this time limit.
4. Helping the motion writer to write their motion from the start by keeping a format, a google doc system could be used (like we talked about working well for court verification's). It can have 4 cells: Motion name: Description of the motion- What tradition is affected and what the motion will provide for the group. (the main things that make a strong motion).
5. The motion can be denied, amended on the floor (amendments are not suggested unless needed because we should try to let the motions be, but once amended the floor owns the motion and that is what would pass), or sent to a committee from the chair at the GC- this committee could be the MAL or an Ad Hoc created from the GC when everyone is present. But like an area conference if the meeting is edited and sent back to the GC with edits the recommendations would be the new motion.
6. The Committee's reviewing should have the motion completed by the next GC for organization purposes.

This motion will send most motions to a vote at the GC, a few to an Ad Hoc, and some will be amended. But it will make the process more efficient and fair for presenters that make motions. Also this motion will lighten the amount of Ad Hoc groups we have because right now were sending all motions to an Ad

for the presenter to present. I would let the group decide on this time limit, helping the motion writer to write their motion from the start by keeping a format, a google doc system could be used (like we talked about working well for court verification's). It can have 4 cells: Motion name: Description of the motion- What tradition is affected and what the motion will provide for the group. (the main things that make a strong motion).

5. The motion can be denied, amended on the floor (amendments are not suggested unless needed because we should try to let the motions be, but once amended the floor owns the motion and that is what would pass), or sent to a committee from the chair at the GC- this committee could be the MAL or an Ad Hoc created from the GC when everyone is present. But like an area conference if the meeting is edited and sent back to the GC with edits the recommendations would be the new motion.
6. The Committee's reviewing should have the motion completed by the next GC for organization purposes.

This motion will send most motions to a vote at the GC, a few to an Ad Hoc, and some will be amended. But it will make the process more efficient and fair for presenters that make motions. Also this motion will lighten the amount of Ad Hoc groups we have because right now were sending all motions to an Ad

Motion:
Revise and Organize the motion process
Ryan M.

Hoc and the SC First before just voting on them the way they are. This will make the process simpler and let more motions get voted on- as they are.

Ryan presented the above motion, sharing that the bylaws do not state that the SC should be voting on the motion. He has observed that some motions are coming into the Secretary email and then there are 3 or 4 meetings on them before the GC sees them. Ryan feels that motion should be heard at GC and if anything needs to be amended that can be done on the floor. Ryan shares that his information has come from how other groups handle motions. He continues to share that he feels the group has grown from when the bylaws were written and we can progress forward saving the amount of time taken and allows members to be heard as they intended to be.

The floor opened for discussion and other members shared that the SC making decisions on behalf of the group is governing and also that motions should be seen prior to the meeting so that members can have working knowledge and can come prepared. One member was unaware that the motions get posted into the communications chat and suggested that they be uploaded onto the website a week prior to the GC.

Ryan clarified that the motions would come in and be posted and then be discussed at Group Conscience ensuring that everyone knows when and where decisions and discussions will be had and Ash expressed the transfer between IT was a bit rocky so it took a while for TS to get the access that they needed.

Other members shared about our primary purpose and that we need to change with the times,

sharing that they are happy to see the “machine” get fixed.

Manny shared that it would require a bylaws change and shared the link of where members can add input on this.

[aaHG proposed Bylaw Change \(DRAFT TO BE REVEIWED\) - Google Docs](#)

Other members shared that the bylaws can be confusing at times and they don't feel that they are necessarily interpreted correctly, in favour of more simplified bylaws, and another member rhetorically asked how many “rules” does aaHomeGroup need, reminding the group of Rule 62.

There was more feedback on how a process for the motions is needed and they are happy to see these changes ensuring that the Group Conscience gets their voice back and there was also mention of not bringing a fully written motion to the Group but rather an idea and the group discuss and work on the solution.

Katy read an excerpt from the AA Group Pamphlet

“What is an informed Group Conscience? - The Group Conscience is the collective conscience of the group membership and thus represents substantial unanimity on an issue before definitive action is taken. This is achieved by group members through the sharing of full information and individual points of view and the practice of A.A principles. To be fully informed requires the willingness to listen to the minority opinions with an open mind. On sensitive issues, the group works slowly, discouraging formal motions until clears steps of its collective view emerges. Placing principles before personalities, the membership is weary of dominant opinions, its voice is heard when a well informed group arrives at a decision. The result rests on more than a Yes or No count, precisely because it is the spiritual expression of the Group Conscience. The term informed Group Conscience implies that prudent information has been studied and all views have been heard before the group votes.”

Another member shared that districts, areas and intergroups have bylaws but it is not normal for an A.A group to have bylaws.

Bob M called the question and Ash said to wait until the other two hands spoke and then more voices were heard.

Ryan shared that he is happy to take floor amendments, his intention was to get the motion process changed and however the group wants to proceed, he is happy with that result providing it is the group decision.

Another member asked what the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of the Steering Committee vote was for and it was clarified that it was for the bylaw changes.

Ash suggested that we hold off until next month to vote and Jo shared that we called to question after two hands, adding that the group has already heard more than that and the

motion is on the table with a second so we need to proceed.

More hands were called on with members sharing they appreciate the strive to go forward and gave thanks to the adhoc who put the motion together. They also shared about the meeting taking time and members being tired and not having time to process everything that occurs in the Business Meetings at times, as well as sharing that they feel rushed to make decisions.

Ash asked what the group would like to see to ensure that the group is fully informed and where they would like to see motions posted and acknowledged the question was called before taking more hands.

A member queried why there is not any discussion when only one nominee is nominated and Ash clarified that we follow Roberts Rules of Order and also spoke that if we were to discuss when only one member is elected it would be more of personalities not principles.

Jeff shared that when someone calls the question the chair can choose to ignore it and also that we do not hear minority reports correctly, suggesting having a discussion at the next Steering Committee and concluded saying that the conversation should stay on topic of the motion and that we should be following procedures which would make this process a lot simpler.

Ryan made the amendment that motions should be discussed at one Group Conscience and then voted on at the following Group Conscience, seconded by Mike.

In short - Motions sent to the secretary, heard at GC, then voted on at the next GC.

Ash called to question and the group voted on the Motion.

Yes 30, No 1, Abstain 1

Minority opinion was heard and no one wished to change their vote.

Motion Passed.

Jeff motioned to adjourn, seconded by Angela

Ash called in favour to stay

Yes 24, No 4, Abstain 1 - The meeting continues.

Stewardship and Finance Recommendations

Motion 1:

For the treasurer to take on the big book program, ensuring that the process from member request to distribution of the big book is logged for transparency and has a fair rotation with the term of the acting treasurer.

With this motion, we suggest a change of bylaws in the description of the treasurer's duties.

Motion 2:

The committee recommends: Due to the safety of group funds in personal accounts being at risk for loss and possibly taxable, aaHomeGroup should restructure the current banking system into a business or group banking system with the treasurer acting as the representative and the group itself owning the bank account.

Ryan shared that the ad hoc met and discussed issues regarding the Big book and transparency, lack of tracking and receipts. Ryan added that the position was never voted on or decided by the group, so they recommend that the Big Book goes to the treasurer responsibilities including a bylaw change adding the responsibility into the document. Ryan also added that they also recommend a second motion of having a bank account for aaHomeGroup and the floor was open for discussion.

Members expressed their excitement as they had previously asked for information which wasn't available and also shared that the GSO is tapping into prudent reserves and with the amount of resources offering a free book, the lack of accountability with funds was concerning as it could have been sent elsewhere. Thanks were given to both Jess and Albert for being willing to take on this service role and the importance of having all financial information in one space.

Another member questioned why the medallion program wasn't included in this motion and Jo shared that Eric is transparent with his funds (see below) and Ash added that there is a substantial difference between \$100 a year and \$1000's.

As of today, I have ordered more coins to distribute, the last group having been all sent out. The funds that were sent to reimburse me have been expended as of the beginning of the month. Those coins have also gone up in price and are now \$1.65 each. The cost of postage has also gone up as now the USPS is requiring a surcharge for hand cancelling. All in all, the cost has gone from \$2.50 a send to \$4.00 a send. I am requesting additional funds to continue the program. The last \$150.00 lasted two years. I am sure \$100.00 will last at least a year, if that is what the Committee wishes to send. My venmo is 

Thanks Eric C (Chicago)

Jess shared that she is happy to share monthly statements for the big book and Jo called to vote, seconded by James

Yes 24, No 0, abstain 0 - Motion 1 for Treasurer to be responsible for the Big Book, passes

Ash shares Motion 2, for aaHomeGroup to open up a Bank account, seconded by Ashley.

The floor opened for discussion and members felt that there needs to be more of a breakdown of how the logistics will be worked out and Ash shared that the motion can be voted on with an adhoc finalising logistics, like with the VOA process.

Ryan shared that other groups have paved the way and there are two options, one requiring an EIN and one that doesn't, making sure that it's a group account and not using personal accounts.

Other members shared that the motion is pretty cut and dry again sharing that we don't need to reinvent the wheel here, and could vote on it with the adhoc to finalise the details, being surprised that personal accounts were being used.

Ash called to vote, seconded by Harold

Yes 27, No 1, Abstain 0 - Motion passes.

The no vote was to clarify if the treasurer still needs to motion to send funds to the program and Jo shared that she doesn't believe that it is required as it would be part of the monthly account reports going forward and Ash clarified.

Andi was happy to table her motion

Todd motioned to adjourn - no vote required unanimous nods from the floor.

Closing Prayer

Todd - Lords Prayer

Responsibility Statement

All

Meeting Adjourned.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
Income				Jan 2026		Feb 2026		Mar 2026		Apr 2026				
Account No.		Category	Sub-Category											
A10.00		Contributions												
A10.05			Venmo	\$654.86		\$824.00		\$825.00		\$1,022.00				
A10.90			Paypal	\$210.00		\$336.40		\$171.27		\$255.43				
			Zelle	\$0.08		\$0.08		\$61.86		\$0.08				
		Total Contributions		\$864.94		\$1,160.48		\$1,058.13		\$1,277.51				
Total Income								\$0.06		\$1,058.19				
\$10.00		Technical Services												
S10.05			Domain Names											
S10.10			Zoom Monthly	-\$53.76				\$53.64		-\$63.76				
S10.15			Zoom License					\$342.99						
S10.20			Email Services					\$11.86						
S10.90			Other Technical	-\$53.76		\$0.00		-\$408.49		-\$63.76				
		Total Technical Services												
\$30.00		Administration												
S30.05			Coin Program											
S30.10			Big Book Program			-\$1,296.91								
			The Trudge											
			Reimbursements											
			7th Tradition to GSO			-\$1,000.00				-\$1,000.00				
		Total Administration		\$0.00		-\$2,296.91				-\$1,063.76				
End of Month Bank Balance (per bank)				\$9,337.28		\$8,200.85		\$8,850.55		\$9,064.30				
Minus Minimum Account Balance (\$5,000)				\$4,337.28		\$3,200.85		\$3,850.55		\$4,064.30				
Minus Prudent Reserve (\$2,000)				\$2,337.28		\$1,200.85		\$1,850.55		\$2,064.30				