

Pacific Mission Action Council Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2006

Present: J. Bestul, G. Edwards, C. Fenske, J. Hillmann, P. Hoffman, M. Mancini, G. Mohr, D. Reese, M. Schmid, M. Seilnacht, E. Vallejo, J. Whaley, T. Zimmerman

1. Meeting called to order by G. Edwards, Chairman at 0930.
2. The September 1, 2006 minutes were approved as written.
3. Rev. E. Vallejo opened the meeting with a devotion based on Philip 4:6-7 and the words, "*6 Do not be anxious about anything, but in everything, by prayer and petition, with thanksgiving, present your requests to God. 7 And the peace of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus..*"

Some key points of his devotion were:

- a. There are many times that we feel lost, discouraged or distracted.
 - b. We forget that God is in control.
 - c. These points also apply to what we are doing on the MAC, i.e., are we making the right decisions.
 - d. Three principals that we must remember:
 - 1) Recognize God is good and will not leave us confused.
 - 2) Seek God in our specific situations.
 - 3) Submit desires to God and trust in Him.
4. The Mission Festival report was given by several:
- a. Rev. Reese noted the positive aspects, including: "Felt it was a tremendous gathering", the interaction between mission groups, the large number of children, people of all ages, thanks to C. Fenske for her communication support. In addition, Good Shepherd was a great location with excellent facilities, with a good number of congregations being represented, although more would have been better.
 - b. Rev. Mohr noted: there were many different ethnic foods to try and that the CNH leadership was well represented.
 - c. Rev. Zimmerman noted: the booths were well done and fun to visit, a bounty of ethnic foods and the involvement of people with music.
 - d. Discussions were held on whether the festival should be held next year, with the following comments made:
 - 1) President Newton thanked Rev. Reese and the committee, which was a huge encouragement to do it again.
 - 2) Whether other regions should also have a festival needs to be discussed.
 - 3) The enthusiasm was wonderful.
 - 4) Would be nice to have congregations there that don't have ethnic missions to see what can be done.
 - 5) Festival good from an educational aspect and it shows how specific missions are not alone in what they do.
 - 6) Festival is not preaching to the choir but a good opportunity to celebrate what we're doing.
 - 7) The festival purpose needed to be clarified. Is it a celebration, an outreach or a combination?

Pacific Mission Action Council Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2006

- 8) Consensus was the festival should be an ongoing event with a planned review/study on where improvements can be made.
5. G. Edwards gave a report on the big MAC meeting:
 - a. There was a great amount of learning.
 - b. It was suggested that sometime in the spring a workshop for all MAC participants.
 - c. The participants spent time in small group prayer.
 - d. They went over all the MAC grants, with frustration being noted due to the lack of funds.
 - e. Rev. Zelt will represent the MACs at the CNH Board of Directors meeting that determines the funding.
 - f. The meeting provided a learning/discovery experience of the mission work.
6. J. Whaley also reported on the big Mac meeting, noting:
 - a. The assumption was made that all grants coming forward were worthy of consideration.
 - b. There was discussion on what we would do if we don't have the requested money.
7. The Board of Directors is scheduled to meet on November 4, 2006 to discuss the 2007 budget and mission funding. It is unknown what the MACs will receive, although it was noted that 60% would be the maximum and 28% more realistic. MAC members are prayerfully hopeful that it will be closer to the 60%. It was further noted that 100% of the Reformation offering would go to the MAC missions, although it was unknown how it would be distributed. The total dollars being requested by all five MACs is \$866k, therefore, the anticipated amount that would be budgeted could range between \$260 and 500k.
8. Some general MAC discussions were held, including:
 - a. The percentage of the district budget for overall mission and MAC missions.
 - b. How can we better educate people, get make the connection between dollars contributed and what they are doing.
 - c. It was noted that 40% of congregations don't or can't make contributions for mission work.
 - d. Some did not believe all the grant requests were as missional as they should be.
9. At this time, the focus of the meeting turned to the review of the MAC grant requests. The question of whether there was a conflict of interest with MAC members voting on programs that they were directly involved was discussed and all were agreement that we believed this would be a non-issue. Following this, Gloria led us in prayer. The remainder of the review process included:
 - a. Discussion on how we wanted to review the grants and how funding could be divided. A handout noting four scenarios was distributed and reviewed. Gloria also noted that at the big MAC it was decided that money would only be committed to a mission program for one year at a time.
 - b. Each mission request was reviewed with the following comments:

**Pacific Mission Action Council Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2006**

Mission	Comments
Hispanic First Immanuel, San Jose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds would go to Vallejo's cost, not for a new vicor • Complicated as he supports many MACs and congregations • Should more MACs support his support?
Hispanic Good Shepherd, Hayward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funding limited or none, they would reduce their mission options • Probably just have Bible studies
Hispanic Richmond/Rollingwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a one time request • Funding restrictions would not shutdown an existing program as it was for programs they want to start • Reese noted that they have done what we have asked for and should be funded
SF Nehemiah Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project would not go backwards if funds not provided.
Mosaic San Jose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several people familiar with the program spoke in favor of funding this as there is a need for this type of mission
Hispanic St. Paul Mountain View	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gloria visited them and they are making huge progress • Funding restrictions would probably not cause programs to fold
Hispanic St. John Napa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff is a major cost and without funding the cost would be borne by St. John • Their goal is to become self-supportive • They are very positive of the future
Liberian Grace Pittsburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program would be impacted without or reduced funding, but it would go on • Grant request is about 50% of what comes in for the ministry
Christ the King Morgan Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bestul visited them and they are continuing with their mission plan • The dollars would go towards community awareness • Gloria noted that they did not give a written response to questions as they may have assumed Bestul's visit was their answer • Zimmerman noted they did not respond or support the Mission Festival and believes they could wait one year for funding
Asian Our Savior Fremont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would have to look for other sources of funding. • Their extended ministry includes children and small groups

- c. The MAC had extended discussions on "what if " scenarios depending on whether the funding was closer to the 30 or 60 percent mark. A motion was approved to use Scenario 1 (give every project 60% of funding request) if the funding is 60%.

Pacific Mission Action Council Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2006

- d. The MAC then discussed what to do if the funding was near 30%. The following motion was unanimously approved:

If the budget process from the CNH BOD provides only 30% funding of grant requests, then funds will be provided to the following six ministries at the proportional amount:

- Hispanic Mission at First Immanuel, San Jose
- Hispanic Mission at Good Shepherd, Hayward
- Mosaic, San Jose
- Hispanic, St. Paul, Mountain View
- Hispanic, St. John, Napa
- Liberian, Grace, Pittsburg

10. The Reformation offering was discussed and how it would be divided. Last year it went to operating costs and this year it will be going 100% to the missions. Other comments included:

- a. There is a need to reinforce the validity of the missions even though funding may not be there.
- b. J. Whaley noted he is not sure but he believes funding will be distributed proportionally.

11. Some final funding discussions included:

- a. J. Bestul commented that missions should be asked if 30% funding would be effective; if not then it was suggested that it be put on hold until the next year.
- b. We will have a conference call with the dollars are known.
- c. We need to communicate the best case being 60% funding.

12. Under Old Business, there was a reminder on everyone's action to visit their chosen congregations and to write a short report on their impressions.

13. Under New Business:

- a. No date has been set for a retreat even, although it March would be a possible time period. There was a short discussions on potential dates.
- b. C. Fenske asked everyone to let her know if their contact information changes. A few changes were given to her.

14. Rev. Vallejo closed the meeting with prayer at 1230. The next meeting will be next spring, date and time to be provided later.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Hillmann