



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH
 CONSEIL JUDICIAIRE DE L'ÉGLISE METHODISTE UNIE
 RECHTSHOF DER EVANGELISCH-METHODISTISCHEN KIRCHE
 CONSELHO JUDICIAL DA IGREJA METODISTA UNIDA
 CONSEJO DE LA JUDICATURA DE LA IGLESIA METODISTA UNIDA



Petition for Declaratory Decision

This form is to be used by the Secretary of the body authorized to petition the Judicial Council for a ruling in the nature of a declaratory decision as to the constitutionality, meaning, application, or effect of (please check one):

- The Book of Discipline 2016* or any portion thereof (§ 2610.1)
- any act or legislation of a General Conference (§ 2610.1)
- any proposed legislation (§ 2609.2)

Name of body authorized to make a Petition (§ 2610.2): _____

Date of session: _____ (month/day/year) Location: _____

Name of Secretary: _____

Address: _____ City: _____

State/Province: _____ ZIP/Postal Code _____ Country: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ E-mail: _____

To be reviewed (indicate paragraph number, title of legislation and/or act where applicable):

Book of Discipline: _____

Legislation: _____

Act of General Conference: _____

Signature: _____

Secretary of the Conference/Body

Date: _____

(month/day/year)

The following must be attached:

- Text of the written Petition for Declaratory Decision as originally presented
 - Minutes of proceedings (relevant portions only)
 - List of names and addresses of interested parties, including e-mail
 - Other relevant materials (e.g. conference rules, resolutions, policies, reports)
- Eight (8) hard copies must be submitted via USPS or other delivery service to:
 Secretary of the Judicial Council, 5556 N. Sheridan Road, #610, Chicago, IL 60640, USA
 - Electronic copies in both Word and PDF (with security features disabled) must be submitted to:
 secretaryjudicialcouncil@gmail.com

Minutes for 2019 Annual Conference, Alaska UM Conference, May 31-June 1, 2019, relevant portions:

June 1, 2019—

Table Talk/Small group conversations

What are the pros and cons of the Conference withdrawing from the denomination?

There would be a potential for innovation if we start over. We can open avenues to becoming a united church.

What happens theologically and do we immediately separate from others?

There is danger of becoming less connected, more like a collection of nondenominational churches. There would be loss of funding, clergy, agencies, there is a lot to lose.

Would we withdraw alone or with partners that we haven't imagined? Are we limited to GNW or could it be completely different?

We would need to be a more committed congregation to be successful. There is worry of clergy and their membership in other Conferences.

How would we recruit more as needed? What happens to those in the midst of the candidacy process?

A withdrawal is not in stone but temporal as General Church is still up in the air. This would force a very focused discussion on what is our mission. Not random or unfocused. Would it force local congregations to vote? If we opt out, would we be able to opt out?

Menti poll: Are you in favor of the AUMC withdrawing from the denomination?

(laity) yes 3 no 27

(clergy) yes 12 no 12

10:38 Break

Tina Racy, alternate lay member for St. John UMC (participating because Lonnie couldn't be seated the whole time), is asking that Lonnie Brooks, the elected lay member, be seated in her place. The substitution is permitted by the body.

11:08am **Plenary VI –**

Petitions and Resolutions –

Motion made by Lonnie Brooks:

MOTION FOR REQUEST FOR DECLARATORY DECISION FROM THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

<https://app.box.com/s/qji644s43pd05gho0kl27xf2xnhstolo>

Bishop, I move that under authority granted to it in ¶2610.2.(j) the Alaska United Methodist Conference (AUMC) request of the Judicial Council a determination of the constitutionality, meaning, application, and effect of the *Discipline* as it relates to the decision under consideration by the AUMC at its 2019 Annual Conference whether or not to resolve to withdraw from The United Methodist Church.

Specifically, the AUMC requests answers to the following questions concerning the proposed action:

- 1) Does Judicial Council Decision (JCD) 1366 recognize and articulate that annual conferences have conditional authority to withdraw from the UMC?
- 2) Does JCD 1366 provide that the conditions of authority for withdrawal of an annual conference may be specified by the General Conference, under its authority provided in ¶16.3, at its discretion?
- 3) Is it the case that the General Conference at this time has specified no conditions that apply to the withdrawal of an annual conference?
- 4) In the absence of a specification by the General Conference of conditions for withdrawal is an annual conference free to establish for itself the conditions of withdrawal from the UMC under its authority provided in ¶33 as the basic body of the Church which has "such other rights as have not been delegated to the General Conference under the Constitution?"
- 5) Does ¶586 provide to the AUMC, a missionary conference created by the General Conference, as it seems to the AUMC to do, the authority of an annual conference in the matter of withdrawal from the UMC, since withdrawal is not one of the seven enumerated exceptions to the authority granted to missionary conferences to "be organized in the same manner and with the same rights and powers as an annual conference?"
- 6) Does any authority of annual conferences to withdraw from the UMC recognized and articulated in JCD 1366 include the authority to effect the concomitant withdrawal of the local churches included within the boundaries of an annual conference in the jurisdictions or associated with the annual conference in the case, such as with the Oklahoma Indian Missionary Conference, where boundaries overlap, without recourse to the so called

gracious exit provisions for local churches enacted by the General Conference of 2019 and declared to be constitutional by the Judicial Council in JCD 1379 as part of Petition 90066, which provisions will be included in the *Book of Discipline* as ¶2553, since that legislation made no reference, either explicitly or implicitly, to the withdrawal of an annual conference?

The motion was seconded.

The Bishop is appreciative of Lonnie and his knowledge of the workings of the church and its structure.

Judicial Council normally would meet next October. If approved, this motion would be before them and we would request oral argument of them.

This is to clarify the Judicial Council's position and interpretation of the above. This would apply to any Annual Conference.

Vote taken. It is **approved** with overwhelming majority. One abstention. No nays.

Lonnie requested Tina return to be lay member on the floor for St. John UMC. Request accepted.

Moved on to next petition.

Interested Parties –

Bishop Elaine Stanovsky, P.O. Box 13650, Des Moines, WA 98198-3650, 206-870-6810, bishop@greaternw.org
Rev. Carlo Rapanut, Superintendent, 1660 Patterson St., Anchorage, AK 99504, 907-333-5050, carlorapanut@gmail.com
Lonnie Brooks, lay, 2020 Muldoon Rd., Unit 344, Anchorage, AK 99504, 915-491-7646, lonnieinalaska@gmail.com
Rev. Karen Martin Tichenor, AC Secretary, P.O. Box 2633, Soldotna, AK 99669, 907-394-4849, hope4glory.kmt@gmail.com
Rev. Thomas A. Lambrecht, respondent, Vice President and General Manager Good News, PO Box 132076, The Woodlands, TX 77393-2076. Phone: 832-813-8327, revtom5@sbcglobal.net

Karen Martin Tichenor, AC Secretary
Alaska United Methodist Conference
P.O. Box 2633
Soldotna, AK 99669
907-394-4849
hope4glory.kmt@gmail.com

July 10, 2019

Dear Secretary of Judicial Council of the UMC,

Please find enclosed a completed copy of a Declaratory Decision request from the Alaska UM Conference.

There should also be 8 hard copies of the information you requested, plus contacts.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 907-394-4849.

Thank you for your help.

Blessings,

Rev. Karen Martin Tichenor, AC Secretary
Alaska UM Conference