Council Meeting Minutes April 8, 2006

10AM Bishop Schofield opened with prayer

Bishop: 61 page Report of the Special Commission on the Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion/Executive Summary. Contemplating no change and to proceed with same-sex blessings. Emphasis on "local option". Repentance called for but expressed as "regret". Page 38: Remain committed to "local option" regardless of the bishop's position, if the bishop does not forbid. Expressed regret for causing pain but not repentance over actions. Not forbidding, of course is authorizing.

Network bishops: we should not remain silent prior to convention. Therefore, presenting this resolution. Six separate primates have already stated that they will continue to recognize us, in spite of the direction of ECUSA.

Bishop presented and reviewed resolution and took questions.

Rob Eaton: to whom sent? Bishop: clergy of DSJ and those listed in the resolution. No media hype envisioned or encouraged.

Debbie Cavanagh: concerned with perception that we have left ECUSA and therefore we will be silenced at GC06. This will end our ability to have our conversation heard at GC. Fr Scott: We have not been listened to in over 30 years, why will this make any difference? Bishop: Really provides clarity not schism – calls for recognition by Anglican Communion. This is needed to maintain our relationship with the rest of the Anglican Communion. We may be partnered by other diocesan bishops.

Steve Nicholls: Our own constitutional change has presented the concerns that Debbie thinks the resolution will create. Resolution not strongly worded - I have an amended resolution. Bishop: Language intentionally general for legal protection.

Peter Cabbiness: Language problematic. Should be more aggressive and factual.

Jim Snell: Three out of four deputies to GC06 are concerned about timing.

Bishop: Who? Jim Snell: Mark Lawrence, . . . changed his mind. Would prefer to encourage you independently of this resolution.

Bishop: Hear no siginificant difference in what you are suggestions. Jim: Pokes our finger in the eye of others . . . Need to follow Windsor and Dramatine. Then follow GC06 with even stronger language.

Bp: Anglican Primates are encouraging such a statement. We do not want to find ourselves legislated out of being able respond, following GC06.

John Combs: This is the right timing – must be expressed in advance, so that people hear the other side of the story.

Steve Nicholls: What concerns do the delegates for GC06 have?

Jim: Read e-mail from Dan Martins. Endorse substance of proposal but concerned that (1) language provocative, (2) timing is ill-advised (prior to GC06) – diverts attention (3) resoltuion will be spun by Bps adversaries (4) robs GC deputations of effectiveness and credibility at GC. If GC rejects Windsor report, then it will be time to act and Dan will lead the charge.

Bishop: (1) ECUSA has given no evidence of any intention of changing its mind. (2) Needs to be presented to encourage Anglican Primates . . . [communication broken]

Steve Nicholls: How many other dioceses are engaged in such a process? Bp: We are first but four or five others are following along (core dioceses of the Network).

W. Gubuan: Resolution seems to affirm us as constituent members of Anglican Communion outside of ECUSA. We are members only through ECUSA but we are requesting recognition independent of ECUSA? So, how can we be recognized?

Bishop: With other dioceses to relate directly to Anglican Communion.

Gubuan: We are already recognized through the Network. Bishpp: Network is a subsidiary of ECUSA.

Peter Cabbiness: Why don't we just wait? If necessary to act now, why do we not take a stronger position? Bp: The statement takes a solid stand without being divisive.

Steve Nicholls: If we do not take action now, what preemptory action do you envision from GC06?

Kim Robinson: Does this afford us any legal protection? Bp: No legal protection but does give advance notice.

Debbie Cavanagh: Doesn't Network maintain our membership in the Anglican Communion? Bp: Yes we are members of ECUSA and AC but Network is subsidiary to ECUSA.

Break: 11:20 – 12:05 Re-convened. [SC met separately during break.]

Jim Snell stated that Standing Committee voted "No" during the break.

Rusty invited to speak regarding the threats by REDACTED

REDACTED

John Combs: If ECUSA breaks from the communion, this resolution and relationship with the Anglican will be strengthened.

Bishop: The primates approval will stall action by ECUSA. Move the vote.

Moved [Council] by Scott Foresman. 2nd by John Combs.

Discussion [gist]

Bp: Yes, there will be a public response by Primates.

Carlos: 1. Two objections: debilitates delegates at convention & moderates will be offended. Coheres with our constitutional change. Countered by involvement with primates and other dioceses. No vote will be embarrassing and destructive.

Bp: Asking for support based upon my personal request and trust.

To end discussion: "Yes" 8, "No" 1

Members of Council:

Sierra:	
Fr. Scott Foresman (via phone/e-mail)	"Yes"
A. K. Rogers - unable to attend today	"Yes"
Kern:	
Fr. Steve Nicholls	"Yes"
Paul Wagner	"Yes"
Sierra:	
Fr. Craig Heenan	"Yes"
Kathy Bernardi	"Yes"
Fresno:	
Deacon Jane Williams	"Yes"
Peter Cabbiness – entered late: 10:27	"No"
Yosemite:	
Fr. John Combs	"Yes"

Bob Lawton "Yes"

Delta:

Fr. Woodrow Gubuan "No"

Shelley Lindgren - unable to attend today [via e-mail] "No"

Movement by SC – Jim Snell: SC has already voted "No".

Bp: Inappropriate to vote privately.
Jim: Votes as a unit, as we have always done in the past.
Bp: Inappropriate to vote privately.
Jim: Private.
Bp: Insult.

SC left the meeting to discuss.

Council universally voiced being insulted by SC's action to discuss and vote privately.

Jim: SC met and have other resolutions to consider – we love honor and respect you but today we will be encouraged to chat with you at our meeting in two weeks.

Bp: If you need more time, I will honor that. Appreciate your time and interest.

Rusty: Attorney-Client privilege and therefore cannot discuss and must have permission by bishop prior to speaking.

Rob Eaton+ Concluded in prayer and blessing at 1:20PM. SC left.

Diocesan Council re-convened without Kathy Bernardi (or Lindgren & Rogers) at 1:22PM

Rusty passed out a copy o

REDACTED

REDACTED

Fr John Combs [MSC]: to form a sub-committee of DC to be established and released to use up to $100,000 of unrestricted reserve funds of Corp Sole for legal and consultation fees. Seconded by Fr. Scott Foresman.

Unanimous "Aye".

Nominated by bishop: Dc. Jane Williams, Bob Lawton and Fr. Steve Nicholls

Bp: Strategizing committee vs. Watchdog committee over funds. Already have advisors but need someone to watch over use of funds. [audio tapes ran out]

Rusty: It would be appropriate for the chancellors to address DC as needed. Bp: Yes but still want the sub-committee to defend Bp against accusations regarding reckless use of funds. Rusty can review funds prior to authorization.

Three agreed (Williams, Lawton & Nicholls). Scott called the question. "Aye" unanimous.

Council meeting adjourned at 2:04PM.

Notes and minutes taken by Fr Van McCalister

Standing Committee: (all present)
Fr. Rob Eaton
Fr. Carlos Raines
Fr. Jim Snell
Fr. Michael McClenaghan

Marion Montgomery
Debbie Cavanagh
Kim Robinson
Tom Wright

Others attending:
Rusty Van Rozeboom
Fr. Van McCalister
John Hammel
Debbie Matley
ECW chair – Clara Disinger?

E-Mail votes & Comments

In a message dated 4/7/2006 6:30:21 PM Pacific Daylight Time, akrogers1@verizon.net writes:

Second, how will this be communicated to our parishioners? We need a communications plan other than word of mouth.
Third, is there going to be a press release? I strongly suggest there be one, so that we get our position out in public first, since I am convinced the (secular) press will distort whatever we say.

This IS crucial. A statement to be read in our churches MUST be published and ready for tomorrow morning.
S Foresman +

June,

I thought I would be able to attend this meeting but I won't be able to. I have read the resolution and my response is a strong no. The council will be in my prayers this morning as they make this serious decision.

Shelley Lindgren

Ladies and Gentlemen all,

As I already informed June, unfortunately I cannot be with you tomorrow. I just returned from a business trip, and I have a long-standing commitment to lead an archaeological field trip tomorrow, but my thoughts and prayers will be with you.

I am favor of the resolution as it is presented, which I see as a petition for support and a statement of dissociation (to use a term from physics) with the acts of ECUSA, but not yet an act of secession. I hope I am correct in this view. The time for overt secession has not yet arrived.

Next let me ask a few practical questions, and I hope you will think through the succeeding steps in the meeting tomorrow.
First, to whom is this resolution to be mailed? ECUSA? Archbishop Rowan of Canterbury? Archbishop Peter of Nigeria? The Fresno Bee? I hope this will be clarified, and a specific mailing list presented.
Second, how will this be communicated to our parishioners? We need a communications plan other than word of mouth.
Third, is there going to be a press release? I strongly suggest there be one, so that we get our position out in public first, since I am convinced the (secular) press will distort whatever we say.
God be with you all tomorrow.
Sandy Rogers
St Michael's/Ridgecrest

Also responding positively were, Fr. Ron Parry, Fr. Mark Lawrence, and Fr. J. P. Wadlin. Bishop wanted that to be announced.

If you get this could you please respond so I won't call you.

Thanks
June