

MINUTES
of the 174th MEETING
of the SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA SYNOD COUNCIL
of the EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
Zoom Meeting
January 26, 2023
6:00 p.m.

DEVOTIONS

Vice President Tracey A. Beasley welcomed the Synod Council at 6:04 p.m. and invited Ms. Dorothy Wilson to lead the Council in devotions.

Ms. Wilson noted that she and her family have been members of Faith Lutheran in Northeast Philadelphia since its inception. She enjoys being a Lutheran. And she enjoys being at Faith. She noted surprise at where inspiration comes. She has many magazine subscriptions which she seldom reads, but during the pandemic, she picked up 6 months of magazines and started going through them, saving recipes, and reading articles. Among these articles was one in “Women’s Day” from Candace Cameron Bure. She plays Aurora Teagarden in the Hallmark series of the same name, and in the ‘80s she played DJ Tanner on the television show “Full House.” This article was “Love: it’s more than a feeling; it’s an attitude.”

In the article Bure noted that it is important to get ready for each day, and to do so on the inside as well as out. Ms. Wilson read the article, which included the words of scripture, “Therefore, as God’s chosen ones, you beloved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, and patience. Bear with one another, and if anyone has a complaint against another, forgive each other, just as the Lord has forgiven you, so you must also forgive. Above all, clothe yourselves with love, which finds everything together in perfect harmony.”

We are reminded that love is an attitude, an attitude that chooses to be patient, even when it is hard, to celebrate what is good, to help others, and not keep a record of wrongs.

Ms. Wilson concluded her devotion with prayer for the work we are called to do as the Synod Council, that it might be done in love.

CALL TO ORDER

Vice President Tracey A. Beasley called the 174th meeting of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council to order at 6:14 p.m. The Rev. Karl M. Richard, Secretary, confirmed a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the 173rd Meeting of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council were approved as presented.

SETTING THE AGENDA

The agenda for the 174th meeting of the Synod Council was approved with the addition of a discussion of a proposal regarding the property of University Lutheran Church of the Incarnation, to be led by Pr. Kim L. Lengert, esq., our Synod Attorney.

MISSION MOMENT

Pr. Violet Little and Pr. Schaunel Steinnegal were invited to share about the ministry of The Welcome Church, and particularly of The Well.

Pr. Little began with some of the history of The Well. This ministry began in the winter of 2015-2016. The reason for its development was the lack of any safe place where women without housing could go to spend the night. There are many shelters, but they are not secure. Men may be present, causing women who have suffered abuse to be on guard. In the shelters, they cannot leave their possessions unattended, and often sit up all night to ensure they are not robbed or assaulted. The name “The Well” comes from the story in John’s Gospel of the Woman at the Well, where Jesus met her where she was. It is also a play on the word “Welcome,” as this is an outgrowth of the ministry of The Welcome Church.

As with issues of concern in the Welcome Church, this decision was not entered into without input from the community. The women of the Welcome Church were gathered to share ideas and provide input. Some of the key issues discussed were the need for safety, continuity, and security. The women wanted to ensure that there would not be men present, that they would have a place to which they could return each evening, and a space where they could secure their possessions during the day when they are out.

The Well began at the historic Church of the Crucifixion. They began with some cots and a way to cook some meals. A primary goal was to create a sense of community among the women, which has become the main success of the program. Horizon House was a key ally in the determination of who would be invited to this program. Women who were labelled “shelter resistant” were the first to be brought into this housing ministry, and before long, many of them were finding permanent housing.

The Well’s model became so successful that the City of Philadelphia offered to pay the staff so the program might be available year-round. This sounds great on the surface, but it would necessitate changes in the way in which The Well could operate. This would impact the ability of the women to set the rules for themselves. An alternative plan was devised, and a new partnership developed, where the City gives money to Bethesda Project, and Bethesda pays the staff. This allows The Well to continue as it was configured, allowing the members a say in how the program operates.

As the Church of the Crucifixion has closed, the ministry has now moved to a Presbyterian Church in the City. Money was raised to make showers available at this site. This is a tremendous blessing to the women. The women continue to form community, and to work as community. They have worked to set ground rules for life together, dealing with such issues as what happens if someone does not show up for 3 days in a row? Do we hold the bed? How do we set standards of life together?

This sense of community and self-determination has led to other opportunities. For instance, the Deaconess Community has worked with The Well, and together they have been involved in The Poor Peoples’ Campaign. Through this partnership alumna of The Well went to the Women’s March on Washington.

There are approximately 150 women who have been assisted by this ministry, about 25 each year.

Pastors Little and Steinnegal opened the floor for comments and questions.

Pr. Gwendolyn King: I am a super fan of the Well and the Welcome church, and I have known many of the women who have gone through the programs. They have brought me more hope and inspiration than words can ever say. You go, girls!

Mr. Bert Glenn: The Well ministers to women. Is the Welcome Church for women also?

Pr. Little: no, the Welcome Church is a congregation, like any other. The Welcome Church is about 75% men, which reflects the community of the unhoused. The Well was set up specifically for women because of the lack of safe places for them to go.

The latest project of the Welcome Church is for couples on the street. They do not want to be separated, but their children are usually placed in foster care. We are looking at how we can support them in the journey they are on.

The Welcome Church is very organic. Our focus is, "How can we share the love of a gracious God with all in need?"

Pr. Sellers: With the Well, were there zoning issues with housing people in churches?

Pr. Little: Not in Philadelphia. In Philly you can house people in churches. This is not so in every city, though you can work around this by claiming your congregation to be a 24-hour worship space. Our churches are as blessed by the women as the women are blessed by the congregations. It is a true partnership we have with our congregations.

Pr. Moses Suah-Dennis thanked Pr. Little and Pr. Steinnegal, and stated they are a true blessing to the Church.

REPORT OF THE BISHOP

Bishop Davenport referred the Council to her written report, and stated she would not be reading from what they already have received. She shared that lately she has been intentionally leaving the office, and she feels a tremendous sense of accomplishment and reconnection with people and ministry.

A particular issue she raised regarded the original theme of the Synod Assembly. Bishop Davenport noted that we set a controversial theme: "Transformed to Serve in a WTF* (where's the faith) World." To evoke a response, we used "WTF." While the definition was included immediately as "where's the faith," the provocative wording was offensive to several people. Bishop took responsibility for the choice of theme. She shared that to offend one is to offend all. We have since revised the theme and the messaging, removing the initials. The theme is now "Transformed to Serve in a where's the faith World."

Bishop then asked if there were questions from the Council on her written report.

Pr. Serena Sellers noted that her report included some days off for illness. Pr. Sellers wanted the Bishop to know that we are here to support her in whatever issues she may be facing.

Bishop Davenport thanked Pr. Sellers for her concern. Bishop is indeed well. The days off were just days off, not for medical reasons.

Pr. Sellers expressed her pleasure to know all is well.

Bishop Davenport then turned the remainder of her time to Ms. Carrie Schwab, Synod Assembly Coordinator, to bring and update on the 2023 Synod Assembly.

Assembly Updates

Ms. Schwab shared that the Synod Assembly planning team has received and reviewed the responses to the survey, and has been working to implement some new aspects to the Assembly based on what we have heard. Among those responses were a desire to meet again in person, to have the opportunity for fellowship, to try something new, to have an extended period of time for conversation and deliberation, and yet, to make it possible for employed lay members to attend without losing a full day of work.

We had been very excited about the possibility of going to a new site, the Valley Forge Resort Center. This would be a new venue, with a new feel, and a greater set of options for food and fellowship (one thing we heard was using the tent at Franconia for meals was not comfortable or desirable). The cost for the technology piece made it prohibitive this year, particularly since we do not know how many people will choose to attend an in-person Assembly. One-third of the respondents to the survey had requested a remote assembly, and we cannot know if they will come since it is in-person. If that many people choose not to attend, it affects the overall amount of funds we will have to cover the costs. We are still considering using Valley Forge next year, depending on how attendance and finances may pan out. Next year is the election of a Bishop, and that usually brings additional participants to the Assembly. And we will be one more year past the pandemic, which may ease some peoples' concerns.

For this year, we have decided to return to Franconia Mennonite Center. The surveys did not indicate any problem with Franconia. The consideration of Valley Forge was to meet other desires raised in the survey for fellowship and something new. We have made some changes to try to address these items:

We will begin Friday afternoon at 2:00, rather than Friday morning, in response to those concerned with losing a full day of work.

We are ending at dinner time to make it a shorter day.

Dinner on Friday will be on one's own, allowing people the option to go to various local eateries for fellowship and conversation. This will also save on the cost of providing a meal that many people "skipped out" on when we ended the day with worship following dinner.

We will be sharing information about local places where people might gather.

Lunch on Saturday will be inside the building, where we used to have the Mission Center, rather than in the tent. This will mean having two seatings for lunch, but we will not be subject to the weather. This is not significantly different in timing. When we used the tent we did not all eat at one time. While people are not at lunch, they can take advantage of the Mission Displays.

We will keep electronic voting. We will use a different system that will not be dependent on Wi-Fi, so voting members will not be pushed off for lack of bandwidth.

Ms. Schwab entertained comments and questions.

Pr. Serena Sellers: If the lunch will be in the space for the Mission Center, will there still be a Mission Center?

Ms. Schwab: Yes. It will either be downstairs in the Sunday School space, or we may make use of the large hallways to have the mission displays arranged in them. But we are definitely planning for agencies and ministries to have display booths.

Treasurer Janet Neff: Will there be a pre-session on finance so we can share the details of the report and the budget there? This seemed to help streamline the process at the Assembly.

Ms. Schwab: Yes, we plan to do this again.

Pr. Gwendolyn King: How will the meal work? If there are two seatings, how will they be determined.

Ms. Schwab: We will assign a time, early or late, to people as part of the registration. We will keep congregations together.

REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vice President Tracey A. Beasley noted the Synod Council had received the Executive Committee report in their packet of materials. She asked if there were any questions or comments before we go into particulars of one part of it. With no questions raised, the Vice President introduced Pr. Kim Lengert, our Synod Attorney, to bring information about a proposal concerning the University Lutheran Church of the Incarnation (UniLu).

University Lutheran Church of the Incarnation

Pr. Lengert thanked the Synod Council for allowing her to serve as our attorney. It has been an exciting time already. By means of introduction, she shared that she has recently celebrated the 33rd anniversary of her ordination. Approximately 15 years ago she took a sabbatical and went to law school. She has transformed her brick-and-mortar law practice to be entirely virtual. She is still licensed in Pennsylvania, and still practices in Pennsylvania, but she lives on an island in Maine.

Regarding the issue before the Synod Council, she has been working on this proposal from The Mark, LLC. The conversations have included the developer, the ELCA, National Lutheran Campus Ministry, and University Lutheran Church of the Incarnation (UniLu). Information has been shared with the Synod Council, but as further information, concerns regarding possible damage to the structure have been addressed. A title search has been done on the property so issues of any easements that may have existed can be addressed. We are now at the point of memorializing the agreement so that construction can start, and the work be completed.

Vice President Beasley asked if Pr. Lengert could give an overview of what it is that is being proposed to the property of UniLu.

A brief summary: The Mark has purchased the property next to University Lutheran. Because of the height of the building they are constructing, they want to add two anchors under the church building and use them as tie-ins for the construction to make the new building more secure. These anchors will give more support and safety to the new structure. The anchors will take some time to put in and will be completed in stages. The process will take several weeks to

complete. During this process, monitors will be added at the UniLu property so that the contractor can be aware of any changes in the structure prior to any damage occurring. The reports of this monitoring will be shared with all parties during the construction, so all are aware if concerns arise. They have offered \$75,000 as compensation for the inconvenience of this work.

Mr. Bert Glenn: Is this anchor system for construction, or is it a permanent structure?

Pr. Lengert: The anchors are permanent; they will not be removed at the end of the construction.

Mr. Glenn: Will UniLu get an annual rent for this?

Pr. Lengert: This is a one-time payment.

Mr. Glenn: is this the \$75,000 that is noted in the documents?

Pr. Lengert: Yes, and this is stated as being for any access to the property of UniLu, and any inconvenience caused to the congregation during construction.

Mr. Glenn: Is there a reason we are not asking instead for an annual rent?

Pr. Lengert: the congregation has not brought a request for annual rent. The thought is that this sum is more significant than an annual rent would be.

Pr. John Heidgerd asked how the amount of \$75,000 was achieved.

Pr. Lengert: This number, and the one-time payment, is what has been offered by the developer.

Pr. Heidgerd: Was any kind of benchmark analysis done to determine an appropriate value?

Pr. Lengert: Those discussions have been between the congregation and the construction company. The congregation is represented by a civil attorney, and I trust they have done this assessment well. This attorney is a person whom the Synod uses in representing congregations, and he also happens to be a member of University Lutheran.

Mr. Richard Daniels: What are the names of the two engineering firms involved?

Pr. Lengert: One is SPAK, and they are working with the congregation. I can find the name of the other for you later.

Pr. King: For clarification, which property “next to” UniLu has been purchased? Is it the property that used to be the International House?

Pr. Bryan Penman brought up a Google Map view of the property to help gain some perspective.

Pr. King: What I am concerned with is the ashes that are buried along the fence. Has this been taken into consideration?

Pr. Lengert: I was not aware that there was a crematorium there. Is this on the UniLu side of the fence?

Pr. King: Yes

Pr. Lengert: Then this arrangement should not interfere with these ashes.

Mr. Richard Daniels: What concerns of trespass will there be? Will all the construction to be done on the developer’s property?

Pr. Lengert: The only need to go onto the property of UniLu will be for monitoring, not for construction. These anchors will be going in at a “pitch,” and the intent is to do so from the developer’s property while going under the property where UniLu is.

Mr. Glenn: If the congregation is doing the negotiating, why are we as the Synod Council involved in this consideration?

Pr. Lengert: The Synod has a 73.4% interest in the property. The ELCA Lutheran Campus Ministry has a 26.6% interest in the property. University Lutheran has no equity in the physical site.

Treasurer Janet Neff indicated that this is listed on our balance sheet as “Equity and Chapel and Student Center.”

Pr. Lengert: As a result of this equity stake the Synod Council will need to sign off on this proposal. We do not need to do so tonight, but soon.

In searching the paperwork before her, the engineering firm for the developer is listed as “engineer of record.” She will need to get back to the Council with which firm this is if this is a concern.

Mr. Daniels: I was just curious, as I am a civil structural engineer. I didn’t know if perhaps I knew the firms.

Pr. Heidgerd: I am glad we are not acting on this tonight, as I would still like a further understanding of the process used for the valuation of \$75,000. I would like to know the valuation of whatever rights UniLu may be giving up.

Pr. Lengert: The underground rights are not part of the deal. The use of the anchors does not compromise these rights.

Pr. Heidgerd: I just want to ensure that UniLu is being fairly compensated for whatever they might be giving up. And since the Synod is a 75% holder in the property, it seems as though the Synod ought to know how this value was determined.

Mr. Glenn: If these are concrete anchors, and are permanent structures, is there need for an easement for this structure? How is this happening.

Pr. Lengert: There is not a need for an easement. The easement is actually with the electric company, and the electric company has signed off on this.

Mr. Glenn: Doesn’t UniLu have property rights since it is underneath their building? Do they not have the right to exclude?

Pr. Lengert: The Synod and Lutheran Campus Ministry technically have the property rights, UniLu does not.

Mr. Glenn: So, is the \$75,000 then coming to the Synod? Or at least 75% of that?

Secretary Richard: This is one of my questions, also. As this is the Synod’s property, it seems as though the Synod has an interest in knowing how the number has been determined. It also seems to me that since the property is owned by the Synod and the ELCA, the process would be that the money comes to the Synod, and then the Synod should determine what goes to UniLu.

Vice President Beasley: Who pays the insurance and everything that is related to the new construction in case something goes wrong? We are not paying for that, are we?

Ms. Neff: That should be on the developer. She added, I don’t want to speak for everybody, but I personally am confused. Could we have a diagram or something to show us more of a description that may not be a legal document, but which can show us what is happening and to

who, and what the repercussions are? There are a lot of good questions here about the 75,000 and who gets it, how it is calculated, and what the implications for the congregation are.

Mr. Daniels: The developer is going to put a structure on our property. The structure is going to be there forever. I don't know if we ever will have a desire to redevelop the property and maybe put up our own 34 story building. But the developer is going to be "first in" with a permanent structure, which means we'll never be able to put some structure in that place. I don't know if we're concerned about that or not. But before they start work is the time to hash that out. I would like to see a copy of the foundation drawings.

Pr. Lengert: The full plans should be drawn up and ready by the end of the week. It is also important to realize that the purpose of this building is for student housing, and so there will be 34 floors worth of students next door to University Lutheran, regularly going past the church.

Pr. Heidgerd: As we are thinking about the \$75,000, I had a similar experience at the seminary when I was the CFO regarding selling the air rights on top of one of our buildings to a cell phone company. We were getting over \$20,000 per year, and were able to translate that into a sell-off of future cash-flow of about \$800,000. This is why I am concerned about how we determine the value of a one-time payment of \$75,000.

Mr. Glenn: It seems as though this project cannot go forward without our approval, and that is why there is a monetary transaction as part of this. Also, as Richard has pointed out, not only are we allowing them to use our property for their purposes, but we also may be limiting our future potential to do something with this property should we want to.

Pr. Lengert: To clarify, the original plans for construction of the building have been approved whether these anchors are approved or not. These tie-ins are being proposed as an added safety feature.

Pr. Heidgerd: So, in what way are we helping them more than they are helping us? Are we getting fairly compensated for giving up our property so they could do this construction in a way that would satisfy the codes of the of the city building people?

Pr. Nathan Krause: I note we show \$100,000 on our balance sheet as University Lutheran air rights. I do not know how this may play into this conversation.

Ms. Neff: Several years ago, we sold those air rights. The interest we earn each year on that money we give to UniLu.

VP Beasley: At this point, and for the sake of time, I think we will have another meeting. It probably would need to be a special meeting. I will also say that the lawyer for UniLu needs to be in this meeting also. He will have answers to some of these questions. Are there any other concerns to raise before the meeting we will call for this issue?

Mr. Everett Wick: How soon do we need to make this decision? I have a son who has a development consulting business that deals with high-rises, and I would like him to look at this contract before we sign. I would like him, with permission, to look at this proposal and offer his opinion.

Vice President Beasley: We also have Brother Richard Daniels who is in this field if I am correct.

Mr. Daniels had lost connection for a brief time, so Mr. Wick repeated that his son has a consulting business that handles high-rise construction, and he would like his son to take a look at this proposal and offer any thoughts.

Mr. Daniels: I think this is a great idea. I would be glad to be a part of this.

Mr. Wick: My son is in Minneapolis.

Mr. Daniels: With Zoom, anything can work.

VP Beasley thanked Pr. Lengert was thanked for her time and her explanations. Pr. Lengert will follow up on the questions raised at this meeting. A decision will be made at a future meeting for just this issue.

Appointment of a Treasurer

Vice President Beasley asked for Treasurer Janet Neff to be placed in the “waiting room” while the Council considers the appointment of a treasurer.

After Ms. Neff was out of the meeting it was noted that the treasurer serves for a term of four years. Ms. Neff was appointed to this position in February of 2019, and thereby her term is coming to an end. According to the bylaws of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod, the Synod Council appoints the treasurer.

The Executive Committee made the following motion:

S.C.23.01.01. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council appoints Ms. Janet Neff to the office of Treasurer of the SEPA Synod for a 4-year term, expiring 2027.

Mr. Glenn spoke in favor of this resolution, stating that he finds Ms. Neff to be very good to work with, and he is glad she is willing to serve again.

The Synod Council unanimously adopted the resolution.

Ms. Neff was readmitted to the meeting and was congratulated on her re-appointment.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Actions on the Roster

Secretary Richard brought forward the following actions on the roster:

Request to Move from the Active Roster to the Retired Roster

S.C.23.01.02. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council approve moving the Rev. Janelle Kraiss to the retired roster effective May 1, 2023. The Synod Council unanimously adopted the resolution.

Information not requiring action

Death

Mrs. Elizabeth Tiemeyer, (honorable mention, not to be included in the official Report of the Secretary in the Bulletin of Reports), death occurred January 1, 2023.

Amendment to Continuing Resolution

At the request of the Committee on Reference and Counsel, and with the concurrence of the Vice President, Secretary Richard proposed an amendment of the continuing resolution regarding timing of submissions to the Committee on Reference and Counsel to make the practice consistent regardless of type of Assembly, and to provide adequate time for the Committee to do its due diligence in making recommendations regarding proposed action to the Assembly.

S.C.23.01.03. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council approves amending continuing resolution **S7.32.A01**. by deletion:
S7.32.A01.

2. Rule Regarding Resolutions Not Meeting the Deadline for Reference and Counsel: The assembly, by a two-thirds vote, may grant permission for consideration of a resolution that a voting member wishes to bring to the floor, but which has not met the imposed deadline of the Reference and Counsel Committee. ~~If the assembly is one day, whether in person or virtual, a~~ Any resolution not meeting the original deadline MUST be submitted one week prior to the assembly AND be granted permission for consideration by the two-thirds vote as indicated above. NO RESOLUTION WILL BE CONSIDERED PAST THIS DEADLINE.

Pr. Sellers raised the concern that there be a process by which an emergent issue might be raised at the Assembly. It is possible that some issue may arise that is not known before the week's deadline, and there should be some way to address the issue. Perhaps if we worded this such that an item beyond the deadline would need to be emergent, and would require a 90% vote of the Assembly for consideration.

Secretary Richard questioned how we might define "emergent," and how we then determine what would qualify for a 90% threshold. If there is an issue that is significant enough to require special attention, we do have the ability to call a special Assembly for that issue.

Pr. Sellers: Yes, but that has a significant financial cost.

Pr. Joseph Klinger, our new parliamentarian, noted that there is a provision by which the Assembly can suspend the rules of procedure, and bring anything it wants to the floor.

Pr. Sellers concurred and withdrew her concern.

Pr. King asked if that is possible if this is a constitutional provision. We can overrule the rules of procedure; can we overrule the Constitution?

Pr. Sellers: Since this is a continuing resolution, the Assembly can change it at will if it desires to do so.

Secretary Richard: As it is a continuing resolution, this is so. If it were a bylaw, that would require different action.

Pr. Klinger concurred.

With no further discussion the vote was called.

The Synod Council adopted the resolution.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Ms. Neff summarized many of the items in her report. She noted that investment losses are still impacting the overall balance sheet, but our overall financial position is good.

The Synod has received an estate gift of just over \$375,000, designated “for God’s Work.” This has been placed in the Restricted Fund.

Bishop Davenport also noted that we received generous gifts from two of our congregations. The Welcome Church made a gift of \$3,000, and Good Shepherd, King of Prussia, tithed a gift made to them, making an extra gift above their stated intent. We are grateful for such acts of generosity and are blessed by them.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Bert Glenn, chair, made the report.

The Finance Committee has not met since the last Synod Council meeting. There is a process begun to consider how we might allocate mission dollars from the Grace Trust. Letters to rostered ministers advising them of the process and opportunity to apply for Seminary debt relief are being sent.

REPORT OF THE FUND FOR MISSION

Mr. Glenn also gave the report on the Fund for Mission.

He noted that there are two uses for the money from the Fund for Mission. One is to supplement the Mission portion of the Synod’s budget. The second is to make funds available for projects recommended by our Directors for Evangelical Mission. Each year 5% of the Fund is available for use. Following the allocation of the amount for the Mission portion of the budget, the remainder is available for projects from the Directors of Evangelical Mission. If we do not use the full 5%, the remainder is kept in reserve for future projects that may require significant additional funding, e.g., a new mission start. We “take out” the 5% each year, even if we do not use it all in that particular year.

The Fund for Mission Trustees approved the following:

1. to use funds from the FFM to pay for the projected deficit in the Synod’s proposed Mission Budget for the fiscal year February 1, 2024, to January 31, 2025. This amount is projected by the budget to be \$176,443.
2. to provide \$20,000 for the ministry of St. Michael, Kensington; \$13,000 for 2023, and \$7,000 for 2022.
3. To provide \$4,000 for the ministry of Atonement, Fishtown.

Other projects are being formulated, and requests for funding will be proposed at the next meeting of the Trustees.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Investment Committee

Pr. John Heidgerd, chair, stated that in the interest of time, he commends his written report to the Council for their review and consideration.

Forward Together in Faith

Ms. Ellen Daneke shared a document with the final disbursements that were made for 2023. Twelve congregations received grants totaling \$24,958. The areas of focus included: Networking – \$1,750; Communicating – \$4,208; Innovating – \$9,500; Equipping – \$9,500.

Nominations Committee

Pr. Joseph Klinger, chair, noted that nominations are coming in, but we still have a way to go. We still need nominees for some of the conference restricted seats. We are still looking for at least one more rostered minister. We are also in need of names for the Consultation Committee.

Constitution Committee

Pr. Marie Sager, chair, noted that there are five congregations in the process of updating their constitutions. They are in different stages. When they are complete, their revised documents will be brought to the Synod Council for ratification.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m. with prayer by Pr. Bryan Penman.

The next meeting of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod Council will be March 30, 2023, at 6:00 p.m., and will be held via Zoom.

Respectfully submitted,
The Rev. Karl M. Richard, Secretary
Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod, ELCA

Approved by Synod Council, March 30, 2023