

SESSION I

The Presiding Clerk, Margaret Mossman, opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. with worship. Jane Peers, Reading Clerk, read excerpts from the epistles of Canadian Yearly Meeting, Northern Yearly Meeting (in Madison, Wisconsin), and Central Alaska Friends Conference. Friends introduced themselves, stating their roles in Representative Committee.

The Clerk reviewed the agenda. The Assistant Clerk explained new procedures for coordination of reports and other documents.

Nominating Committee

Joe Magruder, Clerk of the Nominating Committee, asked Friends to submit their preferences for service to the Yearly Meeting. The Nominating Committee brought us three nominations:

Co-Registrar 1999-2001 Roena Oesting, La Jolla
Clerk, Children's Program Committee 1999-2000 Paul Robins, Redwood Forest
Children's Program Committee 1999-2002 Gail Coonen, Humboldt

These nominations will be considered for approval later today.

Naming Committee

Our Friends were needed to serve as the Naming Committee (to nominate members of the Nominating Committee). Four people were suggested by Friends present at this meeting:

Rob Roy Woodman Davis Meeting
Winnie Sunshine La Jolla Meeting
Elsa Glines Strawberry Creek Meeting
Joshua Vura-Weiss Palo Alto Meeting

These recommendations will come before the Meeting later today for approval.

Faith and Practice Revision Committee

Marie Schutz, reporting for Lincoln Moses, Clerk of the Faith and Practice Revision Committee, told us that our revised book of discipline has been completed after nine years of preparation. She explained how copies will be made available. Each monthly meeting will receive three free copies, and others will be provided by order.

PYM RepCom 2000-1 Friends thanked the Faith and Practice Revision Committee, some of whom have served for nine years.

Thirty people have served on the revision committee. We were reminded that this revision is considered preliminary, to be reviewed after a year of use.

Brief Reflection on PYM 1999

Janet Leslie, Assistant Clerk, summarized evaluations Friends gave of PYM's August 1999 sessions. Approximately 190 people submitted evaluations. The majority had attended Yearly Meeting many times. Overall, evaluations were positive. Concerns varied by age group in ways that were somewhat reflective of physical restrictions. Orientation practices need improvement. There were expressions of a need for more time devoted to matters needing discussion and less to routine reports, more attention to religious education of children, and more focus on worship and worship sharing. In other respects, Friends' evaluations showed a diversity of assessments and requests. A written report of evaluations accompanies these minutes [Attachment A]. The Assistant Clerk asked Friends to give suggestions for improvement to her and to the Arrangements Clerks.

We received a tentative schedule for PYM 2000, intended as a stimulus for our discussion today on the use of plenary session time.

Ministry and Oversight Committee - Considerations on the Right Holding of Yearly Meeting
Marilee Eusebio, the Clerk of the Ministry and Oversight Committee, reminded us that when the Committee on Right Holding of Yearly Meeting was laid down it passed its remaining work to the Ministry and Oversight Committee. She summarized the Ministry and Oversight Committee's report, which accompanies these minutes. Friends were asked to respond to this report, and to the queries provided in our agenda:

Knowing how precious plenary time at Yearly Meeting is, how shall we use it? What are the implications for Yearly Meeting as a whole and for Representative Committee? What are the implications for my committee and me?

The Ministry and Oversight Committee's first recommendation responded to requests for more plenary session time for discussion and reflection. The Committee recommended that PYM be lengthened by one day, when Representative Committee would meet and all interested Friends would be welcome to participate. The Committee also recommended that some reports be given in writing rather than verbally, with other "structural changes" as alternatives to verbal reports. The Recording Clerk's effort to convey the gist of our discussion follows.

The Clerk of the Peace and Social Action Committee told us that the Committee has devoted much of its time to these same important issues.

We were reminded that timely communication and completion of tasks that are prerequisite to Committee work can reduce the burdens of our committees and release time through efficiency.

We are a faith-based community, reliant for guidance on the spirit that moves at a pace we do not control. How do we reconcile our search for decisions led by the spirit with our agendas that allocate small blocks of time to large issues?

Could an extra day serve us best if it were devoted to worship, with brief business meetings?

North Pacific Yearly Meeting's practices may offer us a useful model of a gathering with less emphasis on business.

A friend spoke of the desires of some of our committees to share and to invigorate, rather than to merely report to Friends. Many Friends work full-time during Yearly Meeting; can we avoid adding yet another day of full-time work?

We were advised to use relatively unstructured time in worshipful ways, including an informal companionship of the spirit, even as we achieve such routine tasks as our individual registration. Can we be more selective in our choices of items to present in plenary sessions?

We were asked if adding a day would have the unwanted consequence of increasing costs enough to deter some Friends from attending.

Suggestions were offered for ways of using Friends' evaluations as specific guidance, to incorporate the views of more people into our decisions on right holding of Yearly Meeting.

Assignment of plenary time may not coincide with the emergence of leadings for decisions. We were urged to season issues from earlier plenary sessions, so that we may bring insights based on worship to the plenary sessions that occur later.

Scheduling specific events in advance can facilitate participation by Friends whose availability depends on others, such as parents of young children.

Attention to the causes rather than to the symptoms of our dissatisfactions may relieve the pressures we feel. Do we bring the hierarchical structures from our lives outside Quakerism into PYM, with practices developed there which run counter to the foundations of Quaker practice? Would thorough seasoning prior to consideration of issues at Yearly Meeting sessions change our pace and nourish a balance we seek?

We were invited to think of the levels of organization within our Yearly Meeting as concentric circles, rather than as hierarchy, and to return from a splintering into affinity groups to a community of the whole. We were advised to form interest groups around queries and topics that could be brought to plenary sessions, asking for each what it

means to walk in the light.

We attempt to function both as a Yearly Meeting and as a conference, combining business with education, fellowship, and support for actions in witness. We need to review our history, our purposes, and our evaluations of gatherings through the years. We need to discover our purposes, so that we can fulfill them.

Will the benefits of an extra day justify the added burdens of expense and time?

Our attention was directed to the idea of adding one day without additional business, perhaps reserving one day in the middle of our week for spiritual pursuits without business.

The conditions of Mt. Madonna Center erect some barriers to community-building that are not present at other sites, including time spent moving among locations. Can we provide a day without a plethora of options, so that we may find it easier to come together for the events that involve us as a whole community?

We need to keep in mind the virtue of focus on large issues of enduring importance, rather than to displace our time for them with diversion to what may feel like pressing short-term decisions.

A Friend told us that one monthly meeting is experimenting, somewhat apprehensively, with a reduction in business meetings. Can we dispense with some plenary sessions?

Perhaps what we have asked for is what we fear most: a truly spirit-led Yearly Meeting. Could we begin our sessions in worship, asking what the spirit truly calls on us to bring to our gathered community much as we ask whether our ideas are divinely inspired and meant to be given as ministry? We were advised to distinguish plenary sessions for reports from plenary sessions devoted to worship and to spirit-led seeking for unity.

Could an added day be allocated to business some Friends may prefer to omit, so that their attendance on the remaining days could be less dominated by business?

We were urged to season the ideas offered today, rather than merely to re-open these issues in August when we reconvene for Yearly Meeting.

In the past, we were told, Representative Committee served as a forum for the selection of topics. Working sessions followed, and then plenary sessions when decisions were made. Evaluations of that process were positive, and time felt more open. Can we devise a similar process?

We were asked if we can phrase questions and discussion points that representatives can

carry to their meetings, so that seasoning can be focused and coherent.

The Presiding Clerk told us that she had heard no unity on the recommendation from the Ministry and Oversight Committee that we add a day for business to our Yearly Meeting sessions. However, she did hear support for adding a day, with suggested uses other than business -- uses that are spiritually important to us. The Clerk asked Friends to consider how we respond when we ask for agenda time for an item and that time is not provided. The Clerk reflected a sense among Friends here today that active seasoning of these issues should go forward in monthly meetings. The Ministry and Oversight Committee was asked to prepare queries on right holding of Yearly Meeting for distribution to monthly meetings as a resource for discussion.

The Clerk told us that one focus of this year's Yearly Meeting sessions will be on our revised book of faith and practice. A second focus will be on the presence among us of visitors who have participated in the Triennial Meeting of Friends World Committee for Consultation.

These minutes were approved. The meeting concluded at 1:00 p.m. for lunch.

Faithfully submitted,

Jamie Newton, Recording Clerk Margaret Mossman, Presiding Clerk

Attachments:

Attachment A: Report of evaluations of Yearly Meeting 1999

Attachment B: Ministry and Oversight Committee report on right holding of Yearly Meeting

PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING Representative Committee
Third Month, 4th Day, 2000
La Jolla Friends Meeting House, La Jolla, California

PYM Representative Committee, 3/4/2000 - Session I Page 1

PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING Representative Committee
Third Month, 4th Day, 2000
La Jolla Friends Meeting House, La Jolla, California

SESSION II

Session II opened at 1:50p after lunch break, Margaret Mossman presiding.

Friends broke into small working groups to discuss the following query: As the Yearly Meeting proceeds to discuss Visalia as a permanent site, how shall we structure that discussion? What do we already know? What questions will we need to ask?

At 3:45p the meeting resumed after a short break with reports from the working groups. The fruits of our discussions will be itemized in a separate report and incorporated as part of these minutes.

Pacific Friends Outreach Society

Shan Cretin, clerk of PFOS, suggested that a permanent site can be more than a place to meet for a week in the summer. Some committees are already meeting there. PFOS currently has a contract with the Lovetts under which at least \$1 million must be spent on site development within five years of obtaining a plan. A separate group is in escrow to buy the adjoining 30 acres for the purpose of a permanent living site. PFOS has enough money now to hire someone to facilitate development of the conference center. PFOS has drafted a job description for the developer, which will be released soon. Some large gifts of money have been donated. Also, proceeds from the sale of the San Fernando Valley Friends meeting house are designated for PFOS. Elaine Wadle is a liaison and spiritual advisor from PYM to PFOS. The full report from PFOS is attached. Some of us are not yet clear on what PFOS needs from PYM. There is concern that PYM used the creation of PFOS as a way of sidestepping the opposition to having a permanent site. The clerk observed that we have raised deep issues for which we do not currently have answers.

Finance Committee

Harry Bailey addressed us on this year's Session Budget, attached. Attention was drawn to the section for PYM Session, budgeted and projected. Total cost last year was \$108,200. Six thousand dollars will be transferred from reserves. The session attendance subsidies last year were about \$9000, half of which were from local meetings. This year, total subsidies are expected to be \$10,000, again with half from the meetings.

PYM RepCom 2000-2 Friends approved the budget.

\$250 needs to be added to item 5204 to cover the cost of copying PYM minutes. The

transfer from reserves, therefore, needs to be increased by \$250 to effect a balance.

PYM RepCom 2000-3 Friends approved adding two hundred fifty dollars to item 5204 to cover the cost of reproducing PYM minutes and increasing the transfer from reserves by \$250 to effect a balance.

Registrar

Claire Gorfinkel offered a report on the proposed fees for the PYM 2000 session, report attached. Young Friends are advised that subsidies are available so that they can attend. Young Friends brought a request for an indoor sleeping space for people in sleeping bags. There is a question about how much people on scholarships should actually pay in order to qualify for the 5% early registration discount.

PYM RepCom 2000-4 After lengthy discussion, Friends approved referring this matter to the Registrar, Finance Committee and M&O Subcommittee on Special Funds to establish a policy for people needing financial assistance to attend PYM.

East-West Relations Committee

Carl Anderson presented a report which accompanies these minutes. The committee offers a minute to change the role of the East-West Relations Committee. The full minute is contained within the above mentioned report. Friends approved having the Finance Committee review the financial implications of the minute, with the East-West Relations Committee to come back to us in August. Representatives are asked to season this concern in their monthly meetings.

PYM RepCom 2000-5 Friends approved having the Finance Committee review the financial implications of the minute to change the role of the East-West Relations Committee, with the East-West Relations Committee to come back to us in August.

Secretariat.

Ellie Huffman, clerk of the Secretariat Committee, advised that a policy is needed on the management of the web site.

PYM RepCom 2000-6 Friends approved asking Ministry and Oversight to consider creating a subcommittee for web site management.

Ministry and Oversight will bring this matter to their April meeting. The Secretariat has recommendations for members of this committee. Friends expressed hope that some Young Friends will be included on this committee because many of them have expertise in this area. There is sufficient time for a Web site Management Subcommittee to meet between now and August. There are no funds budgeted for this subcommittee, so we may need to make a financial adjustment to the budget to cover the cost of their meeting. Young Friends, who currently use a list serve to communicate community announcements—

among themselves, are excited about the potential of the greater Pacific Yearly Meeting web site to further PYM's own communication.

Latin American Concerns Committee

Brian Vura-Weis submitted a report, which is incorporated as part of these minutes. Casa de los Amigos is sponsoring service projects for young people in Mexico City. Local meetings are encouraged to help sponsor people who wish to go. Young Friends are asked to communicate this concern via their list serve. Funds are available in the budget to invite Brinton Visitors to Casa de los Amigos to help support the Casa spiritually. Fluency in Spanish is not required to take advantage of this opportunity to do good work in Mexico as there are many English speaking people associated with the Casa.

Ministry and Oversight

Marilee Eusebio gave a report, which is attached. Ministry and Oversight recommended that PYM accept a transfer of the scholarship fund from Orange County.

PYM RepCom 2000-7 After discussion, Friends approved setting up a scholarship fund for Junior Yearly Meeting and Young Friends to attend Friends General Conference gatherings. Ministry and Oversight is to be responsible for oversight and distribution of the fund.

PYM RepCom 2000-8 Friends approved the following nominations:

Paul Robbins, Redwood Forest, Clerk of Children's program through 2000.

Gail Coonan, Children's Program Committee, through 2002.

Roena Oesting, La Jolla, Co-Registrar through 2001.

Rob Roy Woodman, Davis, Naming Committee (convener).

Winnie Sunshine, La Jolla, Naming Committee.

Joshua Vura-Weis, Palo Alto, Naming Committee.

Elsa Glines, Strawberry Creek, Naming Committee (alternate)

These minutes were approved. Meeting closed with shared silent worship at 9:10p.

Faithfully submitted,

Jeannie Graves, Recording Clerk

Margaret Mossman, Presiding Clerk

Attachments:

Attachment A: PFOS Fact Sheet

Attachment B: Finance Committee Report - Budget

Attachment C: Proposed Fees for PYM 2000 Session

Attachment D: Committee on East-West Relations Report.

Attachment E: Secretariat Committee Report.

Attachment F: Latin American Concerns Committee Report

Attachment G: Ministry and Oversight Committee Report.

Attachment H: Checklist for PYM Committee Clerks

Attachment I: Checklist for Meeting Representatives to PYM

DISCUSSION GROUPS INPUT:

Query: As the Yearly Meeting proceeds to discuss Visalia as a permanent site, how shall we structure that discussion? What do we already know? What questions will we need to ask?

(The assignment of numbers to groups in this document is arbitrary and not related to the group numbers assigned at the meeting.)

FIRST GROUP

Considerations:

1. Location
2. Air Conditioning ~ Cooling
3. Time: How flexible are we?
4. Surveys say 1st or 2nd week of August, and we're not flexible
5. Division of PYM?
6. We have confidence in PFOS.
7. Could Quaker Oaks survive on its own?
8. Ecology is a Quaker concern

Questions:

1. Finance.
2. Staffing.
3. Status of Quaker Oaks; is it permanent?
4. What input will PYM have to PFOS?
5. Will it be like College Park Quarterly Meeting, Ben Lomond Quaker Center, John Woolman School or FASE?
6. What are our requirements regarding: housing, camping, cooking/diet? (Needs vs. wants.)
7. Relationship of mutual housing association, PFOS and PYM?
8. How are we going to talk out this?
9. Pesticides in surrounding fields?

Ideas:

1. Get PFOS to expand fact sheet and explain their vision to PYM for investing and PYM's needs.
 - Send to all meetings and worship groups (representatives and clerks).
2. Do business in Spring (Yearly Meeting) and Conference in Summer.
 - Programs on conflict resolution as well as programs on other Friends values.

More questions:

- How is PYM going to discuss this?
 - Newsletter?

- Documents in Advance?
 - Interest group at Yearly Meeting?
 - Video!
 - Discussion groups lead by folks trained in conflict resolution?
- How will this site and PYM presentations meet PYM's (and all groups') needs?

* * * * *

SECOND GROUP

1. If designing a plenary session on the subject, it must be spirit led.
2. PFOS needs to provide information on site, goals and timing.
3. What are the requirements PYM Sites Committee uses for a site?
4. Does PYM want a permanent site? Do we want this one?
5. What is the relationship between PYM and PFOS in regard to site development?
6. What does PFOS expect from PYM?

* * * * *

THIRD GROUP

1. PYM must get all parties knowledgeable out the proposed site.
2. Can on-site visits be arranged?
3. Full participation of monthly and quarterly meetings in seasoning process (including those persons not currently attending PYM)
4. Do we want a permanent site anywhere?
5. How do we deal with the conflict which will arise in a discussion of this magnitude?
6. This is not a PYM topic. PFOS is on its own, we cannot stop it.
 - (The train is on the track, under its own steam, we might like it.)
7. There are several visions that do not overlap.
8. Why is this a PYM issue?
9. Could we have a threshing session at PYM (no decision need be reached)?
 - Information from PFOS
 - Advice to PFOS
10. Information must flow both ways between PFOS and PYM.

* * * * *

FOURTH GROUP

Issues:

Creation of a "Special Place" for children.

Who are we excluding? With site? With date? With cost?

Questions:

1. What would it take for PYM to consider use of Visalia site?

4. What are our expectations of a PYM site?
 - Are they realistic, compatible, or complimentary with Quaker values?
5. How great is the demand for a center for future generations that visibly represents Quakerism on the west coast?
6. What obligations do we have toward the donors?
7. Will we continue to spend money on a course of action because of what we have already invested?
8. What does the surrounding community of Visalia want?
 - What are their concerns?
9. Is there a possibility for a mutually supportive and beneficial relationship between the community and PYM?

* * * * *

SIXTH GROUP

Recommendations:

1. Using some worship sharing time.
2. PFOS members at a table throughout session to answer individual's questions.
3. A fact sheet prior to Yearly Meeting:
 - to each meeting for newsletter and/or
 - to everyone who registers for annual session and/or
 - to every household in the yearly meeting.
4. One plenary session devoted to PFOS/Permanent Site.

* * * * *

SEVENTH GROUP

What we know:

1. PFOS exists and is here to stay.
2. Finding adequate sites is a continuing challenge for Sites Committee.
3. We currently spend \$100k a year for PYM site rental.
4. There is a defined relationship among PYM, PFOS and QOMHA.
5. There is still opposition to a permanent site:
 - a. Philosophical (opposition to the concept).
 - b. Practical (concern with implementation).
 1. But many Friends yearn for a permanent spiritual home.

Questions:

1. What's the current status of the PFOS project?
2. What does PYM need in Visalia as opposed to other sites?
3. What does PYM need in a permanent site as opposed to what we need in a temporary site?
4. How soon would/could Visalia be ready for PYM?

5. What work (on-site) can PYM do to help PFOS?
6. What is the long term financial impact of owning Quaker Oaks?

structure of discussions:

We need multiple discussion formats

1. Fishbowls (for both supporting viewpoints and opposing viewpoints).
2. List objections and list possible solutions:
 - a. both philosophical objections and implementation concerns
 - b. objections pertaining to 'why' not 'what'
 1. Small groups interacting with plenary (not a huge plenary discussion)
 2. Wall charts out current status.
 3. Time-lines charting goals achieved and goals yet to be achieved.

* * * * *

EIGHTH GROUP

Questions:

1. No such thing as a perfect PYM site.
2. Time of yearly meeting vs. temperature.
 - Meet in June?
 - Would people in school not come?
3. How to raise funds? Pay somebody else vs. acquiring equity?
 - Need more detail to make decisions; appropriate to spend time on information.
5. Permanent site means perpetuity?
6. "Living community" aspects of PFOS.
7. Comfort vs. cost: air conditioning, passive interior climate control.
8. Compare influence of Quakers in Pennsylvania.
 - Example to others of Quaker Principles.
9. Lack of other sites open to Quakers.
 - Needs: size, mobility, camping, gay/lesbian.
10. How to handle transition?
 - With incomplete, temporary facilities.
11. Are there any other sites?

What ifs:

1. What if PFOS has financial problems?
 - Would PYM bail it out?
 - Contractual vs. informal responsibility
2. Would PFOS Board always be PYM Quakers?
 - What if PYM splits north/south?
3. Be mindful-prepare for differences of opinion out how PFOS center is run.
 - What role will Lovetts have?
5. Can experience of Pennsylvania Friends help?

6. What could go wrong?
7. What if it goes right?
 - Like monthly meetings getting their own meeting-house
 - Equals a sense of home, our own place, roots; familiar to our children
 - contrast belief that we are not tied to property
 - we can experiment with it, change it to fit our needs
 - over time, get better rail transport and busses, group tickets (Private rail car?)
 - Could it be expanded to hold thousands?
 - Provide resources not now available eg. regional ecology study center
8. Process Issues:
9. Discuss what it means to us if all things go wrong, and if they go right
10. Contingency planning (vs. deal with crises as they happen)
11. All need to know when and how decisions are made
 - How will we know?
12. Clarify what the questions are that lead to decisions
13. Publish history of issues dealt with and decisions made
14. What questions do not need to be addressed?
 - PYM's decisions may be separate from PFOS
15. Establish time-line for decisions to be made
16. Identify stakeholders
 - Communicate by queries among stakeholders to bring unspoken concerns out
17. Involve monthly meetings
 - Fishbowls - PFOS group and other stakeholders discuss plans in front of everyone
18. Facilitate discussions

* * * * *

NINTH GROUP

What we know:

1. Equally accessible to north and south (easy access)
2. Organizational leadership
3. Good physical environment
4. Room for expansion
5. Excellent water supply which is easily accessible
6. Availability of full range of services
7. Good recreational opportunity -- off site

Questions:

1. How much \$\$ is really needed - construction, operation
2. Where will it come from
3. Local attitude toward development
4. Projected programs (other than PYM)
5. Are there extended sojourning opportunities?

6. Potential Quaker uses

- Retreat center
 - Individual housing opportunities
 - Daytime use
 - Recreation
7. Who will facilitate management & staffing (scheduling, upkeep, etc.)?
 8. How large will this staff be?
 9. How many permanent residents?
 10. Will adequate development be permitted?
 11. Capacity?
 12. Estimated cost for PYM attendees?
 13. What are we willing to sacrifice to be there ASAP?

Structure:

1. Small group discussion with representatives from each group meeting
 - (Representatives from meetings to be mixed, north and south)
2. Questionnaire/survey -to individuals as well as meetings.
 - On discussion format
 - On personal views out Visalia

Purposes:

1. To get a survey of individuals' ideas
2. Outreach to those who don't attend annual session
3. To get people thinking out the questions/issues so small groups will have more direction

Process:

Survey =>

Monthly meeting =>

Plenary session =>

Small groups (representative from each monthly meeting) =>

Second survey to be answered by group.

This survey will be focused by assessing major issues from 1st survey.

Representatives from small groups => Plenary meeting.