

**MINUTES**  
**COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS**  
**Marriott St. Louis Airport, St. Louis, Mo.**  
**December 6–7, 2024**

**58. Opening Devotion and Adoption of Agenda**

Chairman Peters called the meeting to order with all members present. Following a devotion by Pastor Karner based, on Friday, on Isaiah 11:1—12:6 and a reading from Solid Declaration XI 39–42 and, on Saturday, on 2 Peter 3:1–10 and a reading from Augustine of Hippo on faith, hope, and love, the commission proceeded with its previously-distributed agenda, as follows:

**59. Southeastern District Bylaws, Potential Revisions (24-3041)**

By an email of Nov. 12, the Southeastern (SE) District Office of the President forwarded for review two overtures submitted to the district convention, one proposing to direct the district board of directors to amend the district bylaws to remove the term limit for the district president and the other, to petition the Synod to amend its Bylaw 3.1.2 (c) to “grant commissioned church workers the right to vote” and asking that this to apply to “subsequent district conventions, per the Synod bylaws.”

With respect to the overture proposing to direct the district board of directors to amend the district bylaws to remove the term limit for district president, the commission finds the possibility of removing such term limits to be in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod but suggests that the mechanism of amendment proposed is not clearly consistent with its understanding of SE Bylaw Article X, “Amendments.” It would seem an amendment to SE Bylaw Art. IV 3 to add “...in any given office other than President, which office shall be without limitation of tenure” could simply be put to the convention for adoption under SE Bylaw Art. X 1, with appropriate notice given in pre-convention publications. To such an amendment the commission gives its approval.

With respect to the overture to petition the Synod to amend its Bylaw 3.1.2 (c) to “grant commissioned church workers the right to vote,” the commission finds that this fundamental change in polity would require not only a bylaw but a constitutional change (see Const. Art. V, IX, XII 10), and that the overture as stated is therefore inconsistent with the Constitution of the Synod. The commission also notes that the 2023 convention reaffirmed by Res. 9-08A “the historical and theological position of the Synod from its foundation, that every parish is represented by one who holds the preaching office and one who holds the hearing office (Small Catechism Table of Duties).”

Finally, the commission notes that the copy of district bylaws provided does not seem to reflect the changes proposed and reviewed in Op. 22-2987. The commission’s remarks in that opinion remain relevant and the commission asks the Secretary to forward such again to the district for its review and preparation of suitable changes for adoption by the convention. The commission also requests for its review a copy of the district’s articles as adopted and filed with the District of Columbia (presumably as approved by the commission in Op. 19-2912).

**60. Rocky Mountain District Bylaws, Potential Revisions (24-3036)**

By emails of Sept. 24 and Nov. 5, the President of the Rocky Mountain (RM) District forwarded for the commission’s review two overtures proposing to amend his district’s bylaws, one proposing to remove term limits for the president, regional vice-presidents, district secretary, board of directors members, and circuit visitors of the district; the other, to empower either the district board of directors or affected circuit forums (depending on wording selected by the convention), upon request of the district president, to effect realignment of visitation circuits within the district.

In reviewing the district’s bylaws to assess these overtures, the commission noted that RM Bylaw 3.02 B 2 is inconsistent with Synod Bylaw 4.7.3 (b), which controls. The language needs to be changed as follows:

~~If no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast on the first ballot, a second or successive ballot(s) will be required; the candidate receiving the fewest votes and all candidates receiving less than 15 percent of the votes cast shall be dropped from the ballot, unless fewer than two candidates receive 15 percent or more of the votes cast, in which case the three highest candidates shall constitute the ballot and balloting shall continue until an election occurs by majority vote.~~

With regard to the overture treating term limits, it is important that this be put into terms of exact bylaw language to be adjusted. The commission understands this to amount to the striking of the second sentence of RM Bylaw 3.03 A 1 (except that this change would also remove the term limit on the first vice-president, which the overture as written would not accomplish; if this is the desired effect, then this sentence would be left to read “No *first vice-president* shall...”), and the striking of the word *board* in two instances from the second sentence of RM Bylaw 3.03 B (or, if the amendment were so worded to apply also to committees and commissions, the striking of that entire sentence). The commission’s opinion is with regard to all these alternatives.

With regard to the overture treating circuit alignment, the commission’s opinion is with regard to the two alternative forms.

The commission finds the proposed amendments to be in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod and urges the district also to adopt the change indicated to RM Bylaw 3.02 B 2.

The commission also notes, at 3.01 B 4–5, a use of the nominating committee or its chairman in the election of the district president, which appears on the face to conflict with Bylaw 4.7.2’s prohibition of the same. The commission suggests that, particularly at 3.01 B 5, it may be more appropriate for the district secretary to determine the timing of closure of nominations for president. The district secretary may also be capable of performing the count referenced in 3.01 B 4. The commission grants approval also to such changes.

These are approved for presentation to the district convention for adoption. The district and its president are thanked for sending these documents for review and reminded to send a clean copy of the bylaws as finally adopted to the Office of the Secretary for the commission’s files.

## **61. Minnesota South District Bylaws, Proposed Revision (24-3035)**

By an email of Sept. 20, the Secretary of the Minnesota South (MNS) District forwarded for review a draft revision of the articles and bylaws of his district. The commission notes in its review:

### **(A) Articles of Incorporation**

- Article II, Section 1 a: a comma should be inserted after the first instance of “Synod.”
- Article II, Section 2 d: The language “in regards to theological or doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters” may lead to uncertainty of application and should be removed (Cf. 2004 Res. 4-11). This was not in the article language reviewed in Op. 11-2615; articles were not reviewed in Op. 15-2676. This language is present in the district *Handbook* reviewed in Op. 17-2831, and the articles received the commission’s approval at the time, although no approval was given by the commission or the Synod in convention or board of directors for what was at the time apparently not realized to have been a change. The commission requests documentation of all changes made to articles by the MNS district convention since 2011 and copies of the articles as filed with the State of Minnesota in 2012, 2018, and 2022. The commission finds this particular language to be in conflict with Article II, Section 2 b. It is also constitutionally problematic, as the district is subject not only in some respects to the acts of Synod in convention but in all respects (see, e.g., Bylaws 1.4.1, 4.1.1–4.1.1.3). The noted phrase must be removed.
- Article II, Section 2 f: The language inaccurately reproduces what was required to be included by 2004 Res. 4-11, which explained that the approval required is “of the Synod, in convention, or the Board of Directors of the Synod.” The commission does not understand that permission for

modification of the language was ever granted. It understands “of the Synod” here to be subject to the elaboration of 2004 Res. 4-11, so that the Board of Directors of the Synod could authorize correction of this section.

- Article III, Section 3 a (ii) and (iv): These broad provisions, especially (iv), allow the board of the district potentially unconstitutional authority to assign to the president duties outside of those he is required by the Constitution and Bylaws to undertake, which would be at his option to assume and subject in any case to the authority of the board.
- Article III, Section 3 a (iii): The commission also notes the weighty responsibility, related to business, property, and legal matters, that accompanies the district president signing in the name of the district, as in item (iii), although this may relate to a constitutional responsibility of the district president in Const. XII 9 d. This observation is referred to the Board of Directors of the Synod for consideration as relevant to its study of agency governing documents.
- Article III, Section 3 e 5–6: The proposed changes appear to load the district president with ultimate responsibility for establishing new ministries and congregations and developing mission-focused leaders and congregations. These are not native responsibilities of the district president under the Constitution and Bylaws of the Synod. Unlike on the Synod level—where there is an extensive mission apparatus built under the leadership of the President—the district board is not excluded by the Bylaws of the Synod from the program side of the district’s operations. The commission recommends replacing 5–6 (especially since this section deals with the “business and legal affairs...to be managed by the board”) with “5) To provide for implementation within the district of decisions of the national and district conventions” and “6) To allocate necessary funds for the support of the national and district budgets” (cf. Synod Bylaws 4.5.1 [d] and 3.3.4.5).
- Article IV: The district should note the option available in Bylaw 3.9.2.2.3 (b), which would need to be incorporated here for the district to make future use of it.

(B) Bylaws (cited as renumbered)

- Bylaw 2.1: Better would be to say, “The members of the Minnesota South District shall be as determined under the constitution and bylaws of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.”
- Bylaw 2.2: Const. Art. VII and VI significantly limit the force of the *shall* in this provision; this should be recast in terms of encouragement.
- Bylaw 2.3: The first sentence should read, “All organized congregations that have joined the Synod and are members of the district hold voting membership ~~and are entitled~~. Each congregation or parish is entitled to two votes (one ordained minister and one lay person).”
- Bylaw 3.1.2: Language in quotation of main paragraph and in subparagraphs (a–c) needs to be updated to reflect 2023 changes to Synod Bylaw 3.1.3.1. Subparagraphs (d–e) should be numbered as Bylaw 3.1.3 (cf. Synod Bylaw 3.1.3.2), as these deal with both voting and advisory delegates and therefore should not be subsumed under Bylaw 3.1.2, dealing only with the latter.
- Bylaw 4.4: The commission questions whether this paper-intensive process (“triplicate”) is still being required, or whether this should be restated to prevent confusion about filing requirements.
- Bylaws 4.7 and 4.7.1.2: The election procedures of Synod Bylaw 4.7.3 should either be elaborated or referenced with regard to the various elections.
- Bylaws 4.11.1–2: These seem to be more germane to the previous section, 4.10, than to 4.11, which treats of terms of office; perhaps they should be relocated there.
- Bylaw 4.12.3 (b–d) and 4.14: Synod Bylaws 1.5.3.1–4 speak of governing boards organizing *themselves* and appointing committees. Here, the district president seems to be appointing

committees, with the board simply (and arguably, obligatorily) ratifying his selections. Generally, the district should review its use of committees in light of these bylaws.

- Bylaw 4.12.5: meeting shall be held “at least ~~four times each calendar year~~ quarterly” (Synod Bylaw 1.5.3).
- Bylaws 4.12.7 (j) and 4.14.2–4.14.2.1: As regards the board’s ratification of a selected LCEF district vice-president and the finance committee’s role in LCEF loans, the commission suggests that the district confer with LCEF to ensure that these provisions should still be in place as set forth; about their accuracy the commission can issue no opinion.
- Bylaw 4.12.12: A subparagraph (b) is missing. Establishment of compensation packages for staff, regardless of their reporting structure, would be a business and legal function of the district belonging to the board (Synod Bylaw 4.5.1), not to the president (see also creation and abolition of staff positions, Bylaw 4.15).
- Bylaw 4.13: The last paragraph deals with employees rather than officers (and does not apply, for example, to the Treasurer, who is an officer but “non-rostered”). It may best be relocated to another place. The district is reminded also of Synod Bylaw 3.11.1, which provides the same as the default for all non-term-elected/appointed executives and staff. (Bylaw 4.13.1’s subparagraphs start at “b.”)

The district has incorporated provisions from Synod Bylaws 1.5.8–1.5.8.1 dealing with officers but does not seem to have addressed removal of board members (Synod Bylaws 1.5.7–1.5.7.1), which provisions may also be necessary to include or reference.

- Bylaw 4.14.2: The finance committee seems to have been removed from the list of “advisory” committees in Bylaw 4.12.3 (b), perhaps suggesting it is more than advisory. The use of “will ratify” suggests that the board of directors has no independent authority *not* to ratify a loan approval by this committee. Is this the intended sense?
- Bylaw 4.14.4: The district does not itself, and the assistant to the president does not himself, “formulat[e] and carry[] out a comprehensive program of Lutheran education.” It would be best to describe this work as aiding the congregations and schools of the district to do so (Cf. Const. Art. III 5).
- Bylaw 4.15.1: Is the provision dealing with called workers of application beyond the assistants to the president? If so, this item should be reorganized.
- Bylaw 7.1: This should read “Amendments made ~~subsequent to~~ without prior approval by the Synod [C]ommission on [C]onstitutional [M]atters ~~may shall~~”

The commission notes with concern that the district’s proposal would commit to a form of governance in which its current and future district presidents would have to shoulder not only the ecclesiastical supervisory and instrumental-executive functions described in the Bylaws of the Synod but also the responsibility to shape, staff, and supervise all program areas of the district’s work (see above, as well as Bylaws 4.15–4.15.1). This responsibility is not assigned to the district president and may well come to interfere or compete with those duties that are assigned exclusively to him. The commission reiterates its concerns regarding “policy-based governance” and its conflict with the specific assignment of duties by Synod Constitution and Bylaws to district presidents and boards of directors, as noted in Op. 20-2934, its review of the Missouri District Policy Manual (in which it also references similar issues in North Dakota, Eastern, and Michigan district materials):

The difficulty with using a Policy Governance model ... is that it loses sight of the distinction between the primary responsibilities for the district president (“president”) vis-à-vis the District Board of Directors (“board”). Here again, Policy Governance might serve

as a rigid model for a general not-for-profit, but not for a district of the Synod, in which the board does not govern all and the president is not strictly or even chiefly the board's executive. The balance and dynamic between the president and the board have both been clearly delineated in the responsibilities and accountability as set forth in the Synod Bylaws and Article XII of the Synod Constitution. Although it is certainly appropriate for the board to be concerned with setting policies consistent with the Constitution, Bylaws and resolutions of Synod and to seek assistance from the district president as chief executive (Bylaw 4.4.1) to ensure that such are properly executed within the district, this cannot alter the fact that the primary responsibility for the accomplishment of the board's duties lies with the board, regardless of whether the district president has agreed to guide and direct implementation of the same. (Bylaw 4.4.1 elaborates the district president's role as "chief executive" in terms of the execution of resolutions of the district [*i.e.*, district convention], *not* in terms of the carrying-out of board directives or policies, and specifies that he is to report to the district convention [not to the board].)

Moreover, the fact that the district president may have agreed to take on this additional responsibility in no way changes the fact that his *primary* responsibilities are as an elected officer representing the Synod in his district (Bylaw 4.4.2) and for the ecclesial supervision of those within his district and under his charge. The board may establish procedures for evaluating the president's performance of activities for responsibilities outside of those set forth in the Synod's Constitution and Bylaws ...; however, such evaluation may in no way address, impair, or interfere with the president's responsibilities under the Synod's Constitution and Bylaws, which must take precedence over other activities the board may have delegated to him. These delegated duties are extensive..., requiring what seems to be a great deal of the attention and energy of the district president, potentially impinging on his primary, ecclesiastical role. Both board and president are constitutionally obligated to prevent this from happening.

[...]

[T]he Constitution and Bylaws of the Synod delineate distinct roles for the boards and presidents of the Synod and of the several districts. While there certainly may be aspects of the Policy Governance model that may help a board focus on governance and effectively develop clear policies, delegate authority, and monitor performance, the model is not directly and strictly applicable to the constitutional design of the Synod and the districts. Practically speaking, the authority, time, and energy of the district president to carry out his primary duty of ecclesiastical supervision, counsel, and care of the district's congregations and workers must be safeguarded.

The commission requests a revised draft of the articles and bylaws reflecting the needed changes and addressing its concerns with the model, as well as the other materials requested above, so that it may review and approve for presentation to the district convention as in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. The district and its secretary are thanked for sending these documents for review.

## **62. California-Nevada-Hawaii District Bylaws, Proposed Revisions, Revised and Extended (24-3032B)**

By an email of Nov. 26, the Secretary of the California-Nevada-Hawaii (CNH) District forwarded for review draft bylaw revisions for his district, revised in response to Op. 24-3032A and extended with an additional change to Article VI C (d-f).

The commission finds the revision to have addressed all concerns identified in its previous review and to propose changes in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. These are approved for presentation to the district convention for adoption. The district and its secretary are thanked

for sending these documents for review and reminded to send a clean copy of the bylaws as finally adopted to the Office of the Secretary for the commission's files.

For future reference, the commission notes that the district has not yet addressed items noted in Op. 24-3032 related to "Policy-Based Governance" (some, carried over from Op. 21-2968 and 22-2989). These items (involving at least CNH Bylaw Articles III A 3, B 2 c-i, and G d; IV A 2 a) will remain to be dealt with in a future revision and the district is asked to continue working toward improvement in these areas. The change to the district articles approved in Op. 22-2989, to include the relationship language required by Bylaw 1.5.3.6, has been adopted and filed with the State of California and the commission; there remain, however, historical issues with the wording elsewhere in the articles.

### **63. Florida-Georgia District Bylaws, Proposed Revision, Revised and Extended (24-3029A)**

By an email of Nov. 5, the Secretary of the Florida-Georgia District forwarded for the commission's review a draft of bylaw revisions for his district, revised in response to Op. 24-3029 and extended with addition of Bylaw D6.01. With regard to the latter, the commission understands "expectations of the current Synod Handbook relating to congregational constitutions and bylaws" to refer to items in Synod's Constitution and Bylaws to which a member congregation is required to adhere in order to be a part of Synod (namely, that "that they are in harmony with Holy Scripture, the Confessions, and the teachings and practices of the Synod," Bylaw 2.2.1 [b]; 2.4.1 [b]; Const. VI 5).

The commission finds the revision to have addressed all concerns identified in its previous review and to propose changes (taking into account the understanding above) in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. These are approved for presentation to the district convention for adoption. The district and its secretary are thanked for sending these documents for review and reminded to send a clean copy of the bylaws as finally adopted to the Office of the Secretary for the commission's files.

### **64. Concordia University System Articles and Bylaws, Proposed Revisions, Revised (24-3026A)**

By an email of Nov. 18, the Assistant to the President of Concordia University System (CUS) forwarded for the commission's review a revised draft of changes to the entity's articles and bylaws, pursuant to the commission's previous review in Op. 24-3026. The commission notes for future reference that the provided redlines are relative to the previously submitted draft, not to the documents as presently in force. In its review, the commission notes the following:

#### **(A) Articles of Incorporation**

- **Article Fourth:** The commission finds the first paragraph to have addressed its concerns; the second and third proposed paragraphs may be more detailed than required in articles and could be omitted. Alternatively, the second sentence of the second paragraph should likely be revised as follows: "Such visitations will provide support and ~~be held accountable~~ accountability for educational institutions of the Synod maintaining and strengthening ~~the their~~ Lutheran identity ~~of the educational institutions of the Synod~~, each receiving (1) regular ecclesiastical fraternal counsel and encouragement through annual, informal visitation; and (2) a formal in-depth ecclesiastical visitation and reporting at least once every three years."
- **Article Sixth:** The first sentence of the added paragraph, as a summary of the foregoing, detailed paragraph, is unnecessary and should be removed. The second sentence, "Any amendment to this provision shall require the affirmative vote of the Synod in convention," should be joined to the existing paragraph.
- **Article Eighth:** The language (printed here as clean) should be adjusted as follows:

These Articles of Incorporation shall be in conformity with the Synod's Constitution, Bylaws, and applicable resolutions of the Synod in convention. They may be amended by the Concordia University System Board of Directors adopting a resolution by majority vote

approving the proposed amendment(s). No amendment to these Articles of Incorporation may contradict the Constitution and Bylaws of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and all amendments shall be subject to approvals required by the Bylaws of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

Before becoming effective, ~~such instruments governing instruments of the corporation and any amendments thereto shall be reviewed and approved by Board of Directors of the Synod and the Commission on Constitutional Matters. A two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of the Board of Directors of the Synod or the delegates at a meeting of the Synod is required to amend the Articles of Incorporation, which is also the case to amend Article Fourth (objects and purposes of the Corporation), Article Sixth (distribution of net assets in the event of dissolution), and Article Eighth (procedure for amending the Articles of Incorporation).~~ A negative decision by either of these two bodies may be appealed to the Synod in convention, which retains the right on its own initiative to require amendments to such governing instruments.

Before becoming effective, any amendment of Article Sixth shall require, in addition, the affirmative vote of the Synod in convention.

- The articles should somewhere specify that the corporation has no members (see RSMo 355.096).

#### (B) Bylaws

- Article I, Section 1: The recitation of Bylaw 3.6.6.2.1 remains inexact, omitting “confession and” before “doctrinal positions.”
- Article I, Section 2: The first two sentences should be replaced with “Directors elected by the Synod in Convention shall serve six-year terms and until their successors are duly elected and qualified. Directors appointed to the board shall serve three-year terms. Members shall be ineligible for re-election or re-appointment after serving a total of two successive six-year or three successive three-year terms, as further detailed in the Bylaws of the Synod.”
- Article I, Section 4: The following sentence should be revised as indicated: “~~As is the case with every agency of the Synod, the Concordia University System~~ The Board shall hold quarterly meetings apart from the above noted exception unless otherwise stipulated except as allowed in the Bylaws of the Synod, and may allowing for a manner of meeting (e.g., electronic) consistent with ~~the~~ Synod Board of Directors policies.”
- Article I, Section 6: The new addition to the list of triennial appointments, “and a President as Chief Executive Officer (appointed by the voting members of the board),” is inconsistent with the five-year appointment period for the chief executive of a synodwide corporate entity (Bylaw 3.6.1.5).
- Article I, Section 7: In (f), the word “assuming” is lacking before “any operational...”
- Article IV: The final paragraph, starting “No amendment...” appears to be redundant and should be removed.

With the above changes, the commission approves the revision of CUS Articles and Bylaws for adoption as in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. CUS is reminded to follow the remaining process specified in Bylaw 3.6.1.7 for adoption of its new governing documents, thanked for sending these documents for review, and reminded to send a clean copy of its documents as finally adopted for the commission’s files.

#### **65. Concordia University St. Paul Bylaw Revision (24-3028)**

The Secretary updated the commission on the university’s work to revise its bylaw proposal since the commission’s opinion. Progress is being made and a revised draft will be returned to the commission.

**66. Adjunct Seminary Faculty (24-3031)**

The commission again discussed aspects of this item, assigning a member to continue drafting its opinion.

**67. Individual Member as Journalist (24-3040)**

The commission reviewed a new item, a district president having asked whether a rostered minister of the synod who regards him/herself a journalist relinquishes the responsibilities outlined in the Bylaws and Constitution relative to Matthew 18, assigning a member to research and draft.

**68. Lutheran Church Extension Fund Real Estate Solutions (24-3042)**

The commission reviewed another new item, the President and CEO of the Lutheran Church Extension Fund (LCEF) having requested an opinion on whether a proposed approach to formation of special purpose entities for real estate development work would be compatible with the Bylaws of the Synod, assigning a member to research and draft.

**69. Concordia University Wisconsin Bylaws, Proposed Revision (24-3038)**

By an email of Oct. 24, the Concordia University Wisconsin (CUW) Office of the President forwarded a proposed change to CUW Bylaw 3.3 (c), specifying regent positions appointed by the board of regents, to replace the words “lay persons” with the word “members.” Noting that it continues to review the university’s bylaws as a whole as part of its Ag. 23-3023, the commission finds this proposed amendment to be in harmony with the Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. It is therefore approved for presentation to the board of regents for adoption. The university and its president are thanked for sending these documents for review and reminded to send a clean copy of the bylaws as finally adopted to the Office of the Secretary for the commission’s files.

**70. Pastoral Formation Committee and Existing Routes (24-3039)**

The commission reviewed this new item, an opinion request regarding the potential involvement of the Pastoral Formation Committee (PFC) in revising existing, approved routes to ordination and pre-seminary programs. A Bylaw 3.9.2.2 (b) request for input has been sent to the seminaries, universities, and Pastoral Formation Committee, with responses requested by December 20.

**71. Concordia Plan Services Property Casualty Insurance Program (24-3043)**

By an email of Dec. 3, the President and CEO of Concordia Plan Services (CPS) forwarded a request for opinion on a proposal, shared with the Board of Directors in November, to develop an alternative risk management solution, involving creation of a single-parent captive insurance company to serve Synod agencies (CPS has administered the insurance program for such for some years, but without a captive) and, for the first time, member congregations and schools. The commission reviewed this new item at length and assigned it to a member for research and drafting of an opinion.

**72. Review of Higher Education Governance Documents (23-3023)**

The Secretary noted development of files on the commission’s portal in which commission members may accumulate comments on the various higher education governing documents, in hope of making progress on its comprehensive review process. The commission looks to continue its review with the Bylaws of Concordia University Wisconsin.

**73. Doctrinal Review Bylaws (COH Action Item 23-003)**

Chairman Peters shared a COH item with the commission for its input and the commission discussed the item as reported in the Nov. 11, 2024, COH minutes.

**74. Plan for Next Meeting**

The commission has scheduled an internet conference meeting at 6:30 PM on January 7. The Secretary will poll the members as to the commission's next in-person meeting, possibly collocated near one of the members and in the early March timeframe. It was noted that Nashville may offer favorable airfares.

**75. Meeting Review and Adjournment**

The agenda being concluded, the commission adjourned.

John W. Sias, *Secretary*