



WE SERVE



CANYON-STATE Lion

ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA



LETTER OF CONCERN TO THE LIONS OF ARIZONA BY PIP JOE PRESTON



AN OPEN LETTER TO THE LIONS OF ARIZONA

I have been concerned for the last several months about the proposed MD21, 21N and 21S Constitutional Changes. However, I am far from a constitution and by-laws expert, and was hoping somebody with more knowledge would address the issues. That has not happened, so I am writing this letter to you. I want our delegates to be aware of my concerns and some of the ramifications if these proposals pass.

TIMING OF THE APPROVAL

In the 48 years I have been an Arizona Lion, I cannot remember a Constitution and By-law change taking effect immediately upon a 2/3 approval of the voting delegates. Normal procedure is for changes to become effective the start of the next fiscal year, sometimes the start of the following year. We currently have

ways to change things that require immediate attention. Changing our Constitution and By-laws does not fall into this category. My question is, why the rush? If the proposals are so good for the Lions of Arizona, why wouldn't they be just as good if the changes went into effect at the start of next fiscal year? I believe that rushing this change is not only self-serving to the current council, but also a conflict of interest. There are sound reasons for delaying actions taking effect immediately after a vote. It gives our clubs and other effected entities, time to learn of the changes, and make necessary changes to their billings or other items.

21N DUES INCREASE

Are the delegates from 21N aware that the proposal includes a \$2 increase in dues, effective January 1, 2023? Information on this is included in the five pages of paperwork they received, but it has not been a center point of discussion. I cannot remember, a dues increase becoming effective in the middle of a fiscal year. If this passes, all the clubs of 21N will need to quickly adjust their billings to their members.

GIVING UP OUR CHECKS AND BALANCES

These changes diminish the vital importance of our MD21, 21N and 21S Constitution & By-laws Committee.

This takes away one of our safeguards to make sure our dues money is being properly and most efficiently spent. Under Section 7, GROWTH FUND, point (d): "After the approval of two-thirds (2/3rds) of the Council but prior to the release of any monies form this Fund, the Council must secure either written authorization from the MD Finance and Planning committee or a two-thirds (2/3rds) approval of voting delegates at the Convention or Conference of the Multiple District." As written, four people can decide to spend our money any way they want (two council members and two of the Multiple District Finance and Planning Committee). The Constitution and By-laws committee is totally taken out of the process. For our safety, I suggest that the OR needs to be replaced with an AND. If we leave the OR in this sentence, we are giving up the rights of our Lions to vote on the matter, should the council take the easier path and just get approval from the Multiple District Finance and Planning committee. I also feel the Constitution and By-laws Committee should review and approve proposed changes as an additional safeguard.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

PROPOSED REALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Under MD-21 Bylaws, EXHIBIT "B" – Article VII, General Fund Revenue: The new language reads – "The Council may reallocate monies to different Funds as approved by two-thirds (2/3rds) vote of its voting members and the advice and consent of the MD21 Finance Committee." Again, why has the Constitution and Bylaws Committee been removed from the approval process? Why don't our delegates have a say in these matters?

The biggest change in the allocation of funds is for the Canyon State Lion. It goes from \$6 to \$2. I agree that since most of the Canyon State Lion readership is done online, that we can reduce the amount we allocate for this. I would like to see a budget analysis of why the drastic change, and how they came up with this dollar amount. The Canyon State Lion is normally 16-20 pages per issue. A lot of time and effort goes into collecting articles, typing them up, organizing, and editing them. It is full of important information and is a document we can be proud of. Do we really expect the Canyon State Lion to be published at the same quality and volume, for 1/3 of the current allocated amount? If the current publishers of the Canyon State Lion walk away from their task,

who do we think can step in and produce it with the nominal proposed budget that is being presented? Is this the end of the Canyon State Lion as we know it? Don't you think we need more financial analysis and backup plans before we take such drastic action?

Currently, the Canyon State Lion mails hard copies to our members who do not use the internet. The proposal transfers that responsibility from the Canyon State Lion to the individual clubs.

SPEEDING UP TIMELINES AND DEADLINES

There are prudent business reasons why our Multiple District 21, 21N and 21S Constitutions and Bylaws require steps, notices, timelines, and checks and balances. It is to protect our clubs and members.

In the proposed changes, five timelines are suggested to be changed from 60 days to 30 days, one timeline from 90 days to 30 days, and one timeline from 120 days to 60 days. I can see how this makes it easier for our council to make changes, but at whose expense?

FINANCIAL REVIEW OF BUDGETS

Has anyone given any consideration to what impact this will have on the financial review of our MD21, 21N and 21S Budgets for 2022/2023?

The auditors will have to review these budgets up through 11/5/2022, then the adjusted budgets moving forward, which will then be a moving target as they can be changed at anytime during the balance of the year. The problem will continue next year, as next year it will be just as easy to reallocate funds at any time during the year. Personally, I like clean budgets that clearly stipulate where money comes from and where it goes. Giving control to a small group of people to move funds from one pot to another, at their discretion, not only complicates the process, but increases the possibility of misappropriation.

I was hoping that there would be an open forum to adequately discuss the pros and cons, but I see that the agenda for the MD Conference, Leadership Forum, and Special Called Election, has allocated 15 minutes for five speakers and question and answers. Plus, there are no provisions to modify any of the language, as I am told we are voting on the measure as it was presented in the last issue of the Canyon State Lion, regardless of the discussion.

I hope you make an informed decision. Thank you for your consideration.

Joe Preston, International President
2014-2015