

PRESBYTERY OF THE TWIN CITIES AREA
2115 Cliff Drive
Eagan, MN 55122



December 16, 2025

Dear Members of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area,

This is the packet for the special meeting of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area for Saturday, January 10th, 2026. This meeting will be held at **Westminster Presbyterian Church (1200 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Mn, 55403).**

The Presbytery Leadership Team made the decision to **move** the location of this meeting after concerns were raised about the limited parking available at Lake Nokomis Presbyterian Church *and especially the difficulty of the available street parking during snowy winter days.*

I am grateful to Westminster, Minneapolis for their willingness to host this called meeting of the Presbytery. The meeting will be in person only and will begin promptly at 10 a.m. The meeting is scheduled from 10 am to 12 noon.

The Presbytery Leadership Team affirmed its decision to meet **in person only**. The PLT acknowledges that there are limits to a meeting of this kind and also desires to be an embodied community as we discern together the path forward.

The Office of the Stated Clerk is offering a **Zoom-only Listening Session** to the wider Presbytery on **Tuesday, January 6th, 2026, from 12:30 pm – 1:30 pm**. There is a lot of information included in the packet for this meeting. The Listening Session is intended to be a resource for members of the Presbytery to seek clarity, gather facts, and to listen and learn from one another in anticipation of the work of discernment at the special meeting. I encourage anyone who plans on attending the meeting to please read the information provided here carefully in preparation. The Packet for this meeting contains the following:

- Call to Meeting
- Docket for the meeting.
- Stated Clerk's Report
- Pastoral Letter from Co-Executives Anna Kendig Flores and Zach Wilson
- Updated FAQ Resource
- Memorandum from legal counsel Rocky Rockenstein
- A Grounded Community Norms Resource
- A Statement from the Presbytery Leadership Team

With Gratitude,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John H.G. Curtiss", is written over a horizontal line.

John H.G. Curtiss
Stated Clerk

Call to Special Meeting
Saturday, January 10th, 2026
10:00 am – 12 noon
In Person Only
Westminster Presbyterian Church
1200 Marquette Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55403

In accordance with the Book of Order, Form of Government G-3.0304 and Article VI of the Bylaws of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area, the Presbytery Leadership Team has called a Special Meeting of the Presbytery.

Notice is Hereby Given that the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area will meet in Special Session beginning at 10:00 am on Saturday, January 10, 2025. This meeting will be held in person only. There will not be the opportunity to participate over Zoom. This is the rescheduled called meeting.

The Special Session will address the following business:

- To receive a report from the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team including proposed Terms of Dismissal between Church of All Nations, Columbia Heights and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area.
- To receive and act upon the recommendation of the Presbytery Leadership Team to approve the Terms of Dismissal between Church of All Nations, Columbia Heights and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area.
- To authorize the Presbytery Leadership Team and/or the officers of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area to implement the Terms of Dismissal, as appropriate.

No further or additional business shall be entertained or transacted by the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area at this special meeting, as required by Article VI of the Bylaws.

This Packet for this meeting will be published on December 16th, 2025. *This Packet will be available earlier than normal and is intended to get the necessary information out for the Presbytery, in acknowledgement that this called meeting occurs shortly after Christmas and the New Year.*

The Presbytery Leadership Team decided to reschedule this meeting for two main reasons. First, the Presbytery Leadership Team desired to provide additional opportunities for members of the Presbytery to receive accurate and complete information related to the proposed business for this meeting. Second, the Presbytery Leadership Team desired to pause in order to begin a thoughtful, honest, and faithful conversation with the signers of a letter addressed to the Presbytery. A process will begin after Thanksgiving to engage those who signed that letter for dialogue, support, and more, as described in the Gracious Separation policy to “extend significant care to congregation members that wish to remain in the Presbyterian Church (USA)” and to care for those affected by the decision to graciously separate.

The Packet for this meeting will contain several items of important information. All Presbyters are encouraged to read and carefully review prior to the meeting date. The Packet will include the agenda, the Terms of Dismissal, an updated FAQ, and a statement from legal counsel Rocky Rockenstein.

With gratitude,

John H.G. Curtiss
Stated Clerk

Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area

Special Called Meeting

Saturday, January 10, 2026

10:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon.

**Westminster Presbyterian Church,
Minneapolis MN**

The Presbytery Leadership Team has called a meeting of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area for the purpose of receiving a report from the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team including the recommended Terms of Dismissal between the Church of All Nations and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area. The Presbytery is being asked to either approve or disapprove the Terms of Dismissal and, if appropriate, to take action to authorize the officers of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area to implement the Terms of Dismissal.

Agenda

- I. Call to Order and Opening Prayer - RE Elsa Kendig, Moderator
- II. Forming the Roll

Voting members of Presbytery shall be instructed to use the rename feature on Zoom and must indicate that they are either a Teaching Elder or a Ruling Elder commissioned by a congregation. Voting members of the Presbytery shall be given instructions on how to participate in the zoom voting.

If there are guests or observers present, guests and observers shall be instructed to rename themselves as guests or observers and shall be given instructions on how to not participate in the zoom voting.

- III. Declaration of a Quorum - RE Elsa Kendig, Moderator
- IV. Stated Clerk's Report - TE John Curtiss
- V. Gracious Separation Negotiating Team - TE John Nelson, RE Hikari Nakane, TE Denise Dunbar Perkins, RE Sue Goodspeed

Presentation, including the Terms of Dismissal

VI. Recommendations:

Motion 1: To approve the Terms of Dismissal, as presented.

Motion 2: To authorize the officers of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area to undertake the actions to implement the Terms of Dismissal, including specifically and without limitation, 1) for the Presbytery to purchase the church property at 4301 Benjamin Street N.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55421 from the existing church corporation that is the Church of All Nations, not to exceed \$1.00 (one dollar) and 2) for the Presbytery to sell the church property to the new church corporation, for a price not to exceed \$1.00 (one dollar).

VII. Closing Prayer

Terms of Dismissal between Church of All Nations and The Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area

Negotiating Team: Denise Dunbar-Perkins, Sue Goodspeed, Hikarl Nakane, John Nelson

*** We are requesting that Church of All Nations (CAN) not be required to be “dismissed to a Reformed Body.” This is not a “dismissal” but rather a dissolution of the congregation, to be reformed as an independent congregation**

- 1. Church of All Nations (CAN), as a member congregation of the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (PTCA), will be dissolved, to be reestablished as Church of All Nations, an independent congregation.**
- 2. Church of All Nations will continue to use its name after reincorporation.**
- 3. PTCA will release its interest in the property occupied by Church of All Nations, 4301 Benjamin St. NE, Columbia Heights.**
- 4. Financial assets held by Church of All Nations will be transferred to the new entity.**
- 5. Church of All Nations and the Synod of Lakes and Prairies have renegotiated their outstanding loan to the satisfaction of both parties.**
- 6. Church of All Nations will file all reports required by the Presbytery for statistical reporting, with the Stated Clerk.**
- 7. All references to the PC(USA) or PTCA in corporate, legal, or financial documents of Church of All Nations will be eliminated.**
- 8. Church of All Nations will complete payment of its 2024 per capita assessment, of \$2,656.50.**
- 9. Expenses incurred in the transfer of title of property will be covered by the PTCA.**
- 10. Expenses incurred in the establishment of the new congregation’s 501c3 will be covered by CAN.**
- 11. Church of All Nation’s insurance policies do not refer to instrumentalities of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).**
- 12. TE John Nelson and TE Dana Caraway, staff at Church of All Nations, are in discernment with the Commission on Ministry of the PTCA regarding their membership status. Neither is a member of a Board of Pensions benefit category (pension or medical).**

ANNOTATION:

(1) Church of All Nations has had a continuous relationship with the PTCA, having been birthed through the Korean Presbyterian Church of Minnesota in 2004. It has evolved into an inclusive, unconventional congregation with a diverse, dynamic, and relatively young membership. Their sense of their ministry involves the leadership of Dr. Jin S. Kim, a former PCUSA pastor.

The “Reformed denominations” to which most congregations requesting Gracious Separation are dismissed would not be good “homes” for Church of All Nations, or would not recognize the leadership of Dr. Kim. Therefore, we are requesting the congregation be dissolved in order to reestablish as an independent congregation. We have identified a number of Christian communities with which CAN is already partnering, including: Reba Place Fellowship, Ched Myers’ Bartimaeus Cooperative Ministries, Anathoth Farm of the Catholic Workers’ Movement, and Jubilee Multicultural Church in Seoul, Korea. We feel that an accountability of leadership and ministry can be maintained through strengthening and formalizing these relationships.

(3 & 5) Both the Synod of Lakes and Prairies, in their renegotiation of the outstanding loan, and the Presbytery Leadership Team of the PTCA, have expressed hope that Church of All Nations be “dismissed to flourish.” This goal has driven much of the discussion relating to the transfer of title to the property and other financial aspects of dismissal. It is the sense and conviction of the team that, while possible or enforceable by policy, extracting a financial payoff is not “gracious” nor would it allow survival, let alone “flourishing,” of this band of Jesus followers.

Stated Clerk Report

From: TE John Curtiss, Stated Clerk, Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area

To: The Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area

November 15, 2025

Gracious Separation Process – Overview and Update

I. Background leading up to the Gracious Separation Process

On **August 30th, 2024**, the Clerk of Session of Church of All Nations, Columbia Heights, received an email. This email is a written allegation.

- The *Book of Order* states: “The disciplinary process begins when a written statement alleging that an active member of a congregation or a minister of the Word and Sacrament of the Presbyterian Church (USA) has committed an offense is submitted to the clerk of session or stated clerk of the presbytery having jurisdiction over the member.” (D-7.0102).

On **September 2, 2024**, the Clerk of Session shared this written allegation with the Session and with then Pastor Jin Kim. Then Pastor Kim advised the Clerk of Session to forward the allegation to the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery.

On **September 6, 2024**, the Stated Clerk received an email from then Pastor Jin Kim in which Pastor Kim renounced the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church (USA).

On **September 8, 2024**, the Clerk of Session forwarded by email to the Stated Clerk a copy of the written allegation claiming that the church’s session had done some discernment work and believed that the allegation was untrue.

On **December 5, 2024**, the Stated Clerk reported to the Presbytery the following:

“It is my duty to report that TE Jin Kin was the accused in a disciplinary process when he renounced the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church (USA). It is also my duty to report that the nature of the alleged offense is of a boundary/boundaries violation and sexual misconduct in nature.”

The *Book of Order* states: “No congregation or entity under the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church (USA) shall be permitted to employ, for pay or as a volunteer, a former minister of the Word and Sacrament (teaching elder) who has renounced jurisdiction in the midst of a disciplinary proceeding as the accused.” (G-2.0509).

On **December 5, 2024**, the Presbytery Leadership Team recommended that the Presbytery form an Administrative Commission, as described in G-3.0109b(5): “visiting particular councils, congregations, or agencies over which they have immediate jurisdiction reported to be affected with disorder, and inquiring into and settling the difficulties therein, except that no commission of a presbytery shall be empowered to dissolve a pastoral relationship without the specific authorization by the designating body.” The Presbytery tabled the creation of this Administrative Commission in order to seek clarity between Presbytery leadership and the Church of All Nations.

The Commission on Ministry has appointed TE John Nelson, Member at Large, as moderator of the session, Church of All Nations. The CAN session has agreed to place Jin Kim on administrative leave until presenting issues between CAN and the PTCA could be resolved.

II. Initial Steps – What has already been done.

On March 17, 2025, the session of Church of All Nations voted to initiate gracious separation from the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area by requesting to enter into the process of Gracious Separation with the Presbyter as outlined by the Gracious Separation process.

The Presbytery Leadership Team voted on April 7, 2025, to enter into the process of Gracious Separation with the Church of All Nations as outlined by the Gracious Separation process.

A Gracious Separation Negotiation Team was appointed. Representing the CAN session, TE John Nelson and RE Hikari Nakane; representing the PLT, TE Denise Dunbar Perkins and RE Sue Goodspeed. The Gracious Separation Negotiating Team followed the process outlined in the policy and developed Terms of Dismissal. Orientation and support were provided by TE John Curtiss, Stated Clerk. The terms of dismissal require approval from the CAN session, the PLT, the CAN congregation, and the Presbytery.

In late August 2025, an anonymous survey of the members of the Church of All Nation was conducted through the office of the Stated Clerk. The survey results were tabulated on September 11, 2025, by the Stated Clerk and under the observation of three representatives from the Church of All Nations and TE Zach Wilson.

117 individuals were invited to participate in the survey. 83 individuals responded.

The results of the survey are:

73 - "I agree with the decision of the CAN session to request gracious separation from the PCUSA."

10 - "I disagree with the decision of the CAN session to request gracious separation from the PCUSA."

Within these 10:

5 indicated the following: "I disagree with the decision because I desire that CAN remain a PCUSA congregation."

2 indicated the following: "I disagree with the decision because I desire to remain a member of a PCUSA congregation"

1 had no further indication

2 indicated both statements: "I disagree with the decision because I desire that CAN remain a PCUSA congregation" and "I disagree with the decision because I desire to remain a member of a PCUSA congregation."

The Terms of Dismissal were approved by the CAN session on September 24, 2025.

The Terms of Dismissal were approved by the Presbytery Leadership Team on September 29, 2025.

The Terms of Dismissal were approved by the congregation of Church of All Nations at a duly called congregational meeting on October 30, 2025. 72 members attended the meeting. The results of the vote to approve the Terms of Dismissal were 69 Yes; 1 No, 1 Abstain, or 97% of those present and who voted, voted In favor of the Terms of Dismissal.

III. Current Steps – What is happening today

The Presbytery Leadership Team has called a Presbytery meeting for Saturday, November 15, 2025, at 10:00 am over Zoom. The Presbytery will be asked to vote to approve/disapprove the Terms of Dismissal and to grant authority to the Presbytery officers to implement the terms of dismissal.

The Gracious Separation Policy states: “Upon approve of a request for dismissal by the congregation, the Presbytery will vote on the dismissal terms. Presbytery shall be guided and informed by the results of the mailed poll. If at least 60% of the membership of the congregation voted affirmatively in the mailed poll in favor of dismissal and subsequent vote at the meeting of the congregation favored requesting dismissal, the Presbytery shall ordinarily approve the request of the congregation to be dismissed and the dismissal terms and dismiss the congregation. If the votes in the mailed poll are less than 60%, the Presbytery may approve the request of the congregation to be dismissed and the dismissal terms and dismiss the congregation. If the Presbytery does not confirm, the Presbytery, after receiving recommendation from the Presbytery Council, will determine next steps and communicate these steps to the session and congregation.”

The results of the mailed poll were: 73 in favor of dismissal and 10 opposed to dismissal.

The results of the congregational vote were: 69 in favor of the Terms of Dismissal; 1 opposed to the Terms of Dismissal and 1 abstention.

At the called Presbytery meeting on November 15, 2025, the Presbytery is being asked to approve the Terms of Dismissal, as recommended by the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team and approved by the CAN session, the Presbytery Leadership Team, and the CAN congregation.

- A vote to ***approve*** the Terms of Dismissal means that the Church of All Nations will complete the process of being dismissed from the Presbyterian Church USA and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area. The current Church of All Nations, as a PCUSA entity, will be dissolved and the Church of All Nations will reincorporate as a new entity.
- A vote to ***disapprove*** the Terms of Dismissal means that the Presbytery will commit all necessary resources to helping the Church of All Nations remain a PCUSA congregation, bound by our commitment to uphold our covenantal understanding of our polity, as guided by the Book of Order.

IV. What happens next

If the Presbytery votes to approve the Terms of Dismissal and to authorize the PTCA officers to implement the Terms of Dismissal, then the PTCA offices will initiate the steps described in the Terms of Dismissal. This will ultimately result in the Church of Nations being dissolved as a PCUSA congregation so that Church of All Nations can reincorporate as a new church and new legal entity. This would end the relationship between the PTCA and the CAN.

If the Presbytery does not approve the Terms of Dismissal, then the Gracious Separation Policy states: "the Presbytery Council will commit the resources necessary to help the congregation recovery unity in its mission and its relationship to the Presbytery." Additionally, the policy states: "If the Presbytery does not confirm, the Presbytery, after receiving recommendations from the Presbytery Council, will determine next steps and communicate these steps to the session and congregation."

V. A note for those who desire to remain within the Presbyterian Church (USA)

One of the duties of the Presbytery, throughout the process of Gracious Separation is to be mindful of those who desire to remain connected to the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area as a member of a PC(USA) congregation. To that end, anyone who desires to remain a member of the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area is encouraged to reach out to either myself (John Curtiss, statedclerk@ptcaweb.org) or the members of the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team (RE Sue Goodspeed and TE Denise Dunbar Perkins). We stand ready to support you. If anyone within the PTCA becomes aware of a member of CAN who wishes to remain connected to the PTCA and the PCUSA, please encourage them to reach out directly to myself or members of the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team.

With respect and gratitude,

John H.G. Curtiss

Stated Clerk

Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area

November 15, 2025

“Be devoted to one another in love.” - Romans 12:10a

Grace to you and peace,

We are writing to you in these days before the Thanksgiving holiday to express our concern, our hopes, and our prayers regarding our ongoing process separation with Church of All Nations (CAN).

Many Teaching Elders and Ruling Elder Commissioners in our presbytery have been receiving letters of concern over the past two weeks over the Terms of Dismissal for CAN put before the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (Presbytery) in a packet on November 5th. For the most part, these letters sent out to some of our Teaching Elders have not been directed to the Presbytery Leadership Team (PLT). These communications were sent directly to different groups of people in the Presbytery and beyond to advocate voting against the negotiated terms, supporting related proposals, or expressing concern. The Presbytery Leadership Team cannot share any of these letters directly for transparency and clarity in this conversation, because they contain (likely inadvertent) errors of fact.

We should note that one of the letters circulated was written by current and former members and participants in Church of All Nations, most of whom we were not aware of or able to contact before this time. This letter created a *distinct* responsibility of care from what obligations existed already in our Gracious Separation process, and one that invites our entire Presbytery to tend to those who have felt harmed. We take this obligation seriously and are working to provide opportunities for these people to speak, for our presbytery to hear, and for us to work together to figure out how, by the power of the Holy Spirit, we might make space for healing, agency, and witness in due time.

Other letters or proposals have come from Presbytery members who were *not* participants in Church of All Nations. While we understand the passion for justice, wholeness, and care that may have motivated these letters, we also must note the departure from our community norms of direct discernment in Presbytery meetings and listening sessions that these letters represent. Those who are not current members of the Presbytery may not be expected to know this, or even adhere to it, but we do note this for our own Presbytery membership, *not to constrain dissent*, which is a natural part of being in community, but to invite reflection on *how well and thoughtfully alternative means of questions, engagement or resolution were engaged. To ask ourselves: if we were looking at these same dynamics occurring in our own congregation, how would we think or feel about it?*

We are aware that some of the dynamics in past weeks have been created by the short original timeline for voting. Stated Clerk John Curtiss addressed this issue during the Listening Session on November 6th. The FAQ aims to explain some of the reasoning behind it, while also acknowledging that it created anxiety and urgency, which may not have supported the most constructive engagement.

With the awareness of those who have expressed feeling harmed by CAN in particular, the Presbytery Leadership Team has rescheduled the meeting until January 10th, which allows time for:

- The start of a process *for those who have felt harmed by CAN*, as desired (which has been in the works since Nov 11th, just a few days after the Listening Session), with a circle-keeper experienced in holding repair work;

- An invitation to *engagement with our own Presbytery members* who wrote letters and alternate proposals to come to a table for clarity and conversation, if desired, with an outside facilitator skilled in conflictual conversations;
- An additional Listening Session for all Presbytery members, **Tuesday, January 6, 2026, from 12:30pm to 1:30pm.**

Acknowledging all this, **we therefore write with hope.** As we turn the corner into Advent, of this Already-Not-Yet time of yearning for God’s justice even as we seek to be co-curators of it amongst ourselves, perhaps this pause can serve to en flesh our covenantal commitments to each other. These mutual relationships, grounded in the work and word of Jesus, are what can sustain us in this fretful moment.

As non-voting participants serving with the Presbytery Leadership Team, we have witnessed the hard work of colleagues in ministry—staff, officers, and other leaders—who have been tasked with taking up this challenging work of finding a way forward with a relationship that has come to a painful and problematic impasse. For many in this presbytery, the history dates back over 20 years with the CAN, and is laden with stories, griefs, joys, regrets, and hopes.

With this long history in mind, *there is no polity process that can heal or resolve all that we each bring to this moment*, despite how we might wish it were so. Much of what we are doing right now is discerning what *is* in our power to do as a Presbytery. We are also coming to terms with how to live with the uncomfortable realities of what we cannot fix. *What if the version of justice we long for is unattainable? How then are we called to relate, to pray, and to work in new ways for a healthier future?*

It’s important that we emphasize that the Presbytery Leadership Team and Negotiating Team have been *fully aware* of the ethical, moral, practical, and legal issues that face us in such a complex history, relationship, and potential separation. There has been deep prayer, meaningful and messy conversation, and every effort to think through the edges of risk and potential futures that could be seen. Presuming a lack of understanding or good will among colleagues in ministry will not move us towards a better outcome. **We hope a baseline assumption for us all going forward can be that we *all* care about peace, justice, wholeness, care for those who have been harmed, legal clarity and responsibility, and so much more.** The way we reflect these core assumptions in how we communicate and discern together does matter.

To that end, no matter what we collectively discern as the Presbytery voting body, we can do it holding to the basic theological commitments of our polity that we continue to seek to uphold and strengthen together:

- To engage in conversation *in ways worthy of the Gospel we proclaim*, with humility, love, mutual forbearance and love that transcends positive feelings (F-1.0302)
- To affirm in our actions and words that *our foundations are in relationship* within and between congregations and leaders, and “are not designed to work without trust and love” (G-1.0102)
- To listen not simply to our will or the will of the people, but to “seek together to find and represent the will of Christ” (F-3.0204)

Practicing courage, hope, trust and love, will take groundedness and prayer. This will be built into the design

of the January 10th meeting, but is also something we can each bring to our own spiritual and embodied practices in the coming weeks.

So read the updated [FAQ](#) and the [Terms of Dismissal](#), as well as the forthcoming Factual Review (will be included with these documents in an updated packet on Dec 15th). Connect with your “why,” and pray with groundedness and holy listening. We have been and will be doing likewise, and we will be ready to hold steady space together in the midst of it all, confident that God is with us, before us, behind us, and upholding us through it.

In hope,

Anna and Zach

TE Anna Kendig Flores and TE Zachary Wilson

Acting Co-Executives of the PTCA

FAQ: The request to approve the Terms of Dismissal for Church of All Nations

This document lays out what is (and is not) a part of the discussion and votes for the *rescheduled January 10, 2026*, special stated meeting of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (Presbytery). It also outlines some of the distinctions and ethical questions that might arise. For an overall timeline of events between Church of All Nations (CAN) and the Presbytery, the Stated Clerk's report offers some basic dates.

This version has been updated to address some of the questions and concerns that were raised both during the November 5, 2025, Listening Session and in response to the Presbytery Leadership Teams (PLT) decision to postpone the Called Meeting until January 10, 2026.

FAQ: The request to approve the Terms of Dismissal for CAN	1
Why are we considering terms for Gracious Separation?	2
What exactly is the Presbytery being asked to approve at the Called Presbytery meeting?	2
Why is the Presbytery being asked to vote on the Terms of Dismissal now?	3
Why is this process moving so quickly all of a sudden?	3
Who is on the Negotiating Team?	4
What are "Terms of Dismissal"?	4
But why can't we hold Jin Kim accountable?	4
Is it ethical to let CAN depart the denomination if it means Jin Kim may continue to operate as a leader in that space?	5
Can't we just sit down with CAN and talk about all this, with the goal of moving toward compliance with the Book of Order?	6
What is at stake in this decision?	7
Other pragmatic questions about the separation process	7
How is the Presbytery addressing issues of liability in the separation process?	7
Why is the recommendation to dissolve the congregation rather than to dismiss the congregation?	8
Is the loan between the Synod of Lakes and Prairies (Synod) and CAN really renegotiated to both parties' mutual satisfaction?	8
Will any minister members of the Presbytery continue to be engaged in ministry at CAN after all this?	9
On what topics were the General Assembly (GA) offices consulted? Did it, or how did it, affect the terms we see?	9
What about the Accuser and other possible people who have been harmed by the conflict at CAN?	9
How will the Presbytery offer to extend pastoral care to any affected by this process, especially the former members of CAN who have left over this time period and/or those who desire to remain connected to a PC(USA) congregation?	10
What about the long-term legal liability issues that have plagued spaces like the Roman Catholic church? How and what are we liable for when it comes to Jin?	10

Why are we considering terms for Gracious Separation?

In January of 2025, Stated Clerk John Curtiss sent a letter to the session at CAN outlining major concerns about governance. He offered three pathways forward:

- 1) an Administrative Commission to *accompany the session* in addressing these issues
- 2) Jin Kim requesting to have his ordination reinstated and going through disciplinary process; or,
- 3) initiating a process of Gracious Separation

These options were offered because it was clear that significant disagreement existed about the desired future role for former Teaching Elder Jin Kim at CAN. In light of Jin Kim's renunciation of jurisdiction on September 6, 2024 after accusations of misconduct, the Book of Order offered no room for former Teaching Elder Kim to serve or be present in any way at CAN. CAN disagreed with the Presbytery's interpretation of the Book of Order – despite the fact that this was an interpretation that was verified with the Assistant Stated Clerk for Judicial Process of the Office of the General Assembly.

In this case, Gracious Separation acknowledges that we have critical disagreements about the requirements of the Book of Order concerning pastors who renounce jurisdiction after accusations of misconduct; that CAN no longer wishes to engage with PC(USA) polity around this matter; and therefore, the next step is to depart the denomination. The "Gracious" part of the process is about engaging in enough dialogue to settle key issues around property, records, and outstanding financial obligations and allow CAN to depart in good order.

What exactly is the Presbytery being asked to approve at the Called Presbytery Meeting (rescheduled for January 10, 2026)?

→ Our discussion on January 10, 2026, will only be about *whether the Presbytery will accept the Terms of Dismissal put forth by the Negotiating Team*.

It should be clear: *No action regarding former Teaching Elder Jin Kim is on the agenda*. As already named above, we are clear that disputes about Jin Kim's role at Church of All Nations (under the Book of Order) are what led us to this point, but discussion or decisions about his guilt or innocence are not a part of the votes you are being asked to make. A process for addressing the accusations against Jin Kim is described later in this FAQ, if helpful. Despite deep, ongoing concerns about his renunciation of jurisdiction after an allegation of misconduct, we would encourage all participants to refrain from statements that presume former Teaching Elder Kim's guilt or innocence, especially in the context of a conversation that is not directly about him.

Why is the Presbytery being asked to vote on the Terms of Dismissal now?

This is one of the steps outlined in the Gracious Separation policy necessary to complete the process. The Gracious Separation Negotiating Team was tasked with drafting the Terms of Dismissal and recommending the terms be approved.

The Gracious Separation policy states that once the Terms of Dismissal are drafted, they are submitted first to the CAN session. The CAN session voted to approve the terms on September 24, 2025. Once approved by the CAN session, the terms are submitted to the Presbytery Leadership Team (PL)T. The PLT voted to approve the terms on September 29, 2025. Once approved by the PLT, the terms are submitted to the CAN congregation *at a meeting called by the Presbytery and moderated by one appointed by the PLT*. The PLT called a congregational meeting at CAN on October 30, 2025, and appointed TE Becca Fletcher as moderator of this meeting. *The CAN congregation voted to approve the Terms of Dismissal with a 71 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.*

The PLT then called a Presbytery meeting for November 15, 2025, and later rescheduled this meeting for January 10, 2026, for the purpose of voting to either approve or disapprove the Terms of Dismissal.

Why is this process moving so quickly all of a sudden?

We wanted to acknowledge this, because while the pace may feel quick, and while that may raise alarm or anxiety, there was no desire to disrespect our leaders or the process. Dynamics included:

- Staff and Advent schedules for the Presbytery and our volunteer leaders
- The Gracious Separation process document requires the Presbytery to wait to call a meeting until CAN had their congregational vote, which occurred on October 30th.
- The current practice of sharing a stated meeting packet 10 days before a stated meeting, and the four working-day turnaround between the 30th and November 3rd. *On the other hand, the updated packet for the rescheduled meeting of January 10th will be published Dec 15th to account for staff vacations and the multiple holidays between.*
- The desire to honor the process by holding a special Presbytery meeting to allow for the floor conversation time necessary to *discern & deliberate* this issue in community. PLT believed that adding the business of voting on the Terms to a regular meeting seemed disrespectful either to this or other items already on the agenda.

None of these are shared as excuses but simply to add context. We understand, however, that the *impact* for some has been frustration and concern about why things were so sudden, why the packet sharing and Listening Session were so close together, etc. We understand and receive that these are significant frustrations. We are also aware that there are big emotions some are carrying to this conversation, either due to life experiences, or, for some, a history that goes back over 20 years with CAN. We, indeed, meant no disrespect to any of what the wider Presbytery is bringing

to the table in this conversation, *but that doesn't change the outcomes*, and we are sincerely sorry for impacts that affected/affect people's capacity to engage the materials, the Listening Session, or be able to schedule in or prepare for the November 15th special meeting. We continue to hope for a prayerful time of discernment, asking questions that are needed, adding information and context that helps, and sharing and praying with one another honestly.

Who is on the Negotiating Team?

The Gracious Separation Policy requires equal representation from, in this case, the Presbytery and CAN. Appointed to the negotiating team were TE Denise Dunbar Perkins and RE Sue Goodspeed (representing the Presbytery) and TE John Nelson and RE Hikari Nakane (representing CAN).

What are "Terms of Dismissal"?

These Terms are part of a wider process described in detail within the Gracious Separation Negotiating Policy and are negotiated by the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team. *These are purely about property, records, and outstanding financial obligations.* They are *not* a determination of guilt or innocence or a debate about prior history or situations.

Presenting Gracious Separation terms to the Presbytery does not imply that Presbytery leadership agrees with the choices or future plans of CN. Gracious Separation simply allows CAN to depart the PC(USA) and determine their own independent future, given the impasse we have arrived at over the past year.

A vote *in favor* of these terms neither condones nor agrees with any future decisions CAN makes.

Likewise, a vote *against* these terms does not secure a future in compliance with the Book of Order for CAN

But why *can't* we hold Jin Kim accountable?

Because Jin Kim renounced jurisdiction of the PC(USA) and is no longer a Presbyterian minister or a member of the Presbytery, we do not have jurisdiction over a further process like a formal investigation or judicial commission. Secular charges can be pursued in some cases of misconduct, but this is *not* one of those cases.

The Administrative Commission for Truth Seeking, however, still seeks to address what *can* be learned. ACs of this type were made possible via a Book of Order amendment created as a result of cases where Teaching Elders renounced their ordinations after accusations of misconduct. The goal of the amendment was to provide some capacity for a PC(USA) system, like a presbytery, to seek out what *can* be learned, even in a much more informal and partial process. Systems deserve

ways to address situations of interrupted accountability for *our own learning and growth*, even if ideas like “closure” or “clarity” may not be possible due to the lack of cooperation from various parties. The Administrative Commission has submitted their report to the PLT and to the Presbytery. **This report is included in the Presbytery Packet for the December 6, 2025, Presbytery Meeting. It is included as part of the Stated Clerk’s Report.**

As we move ahead, it is therefore necessary for us to be crystal clear about what we mean when we use the word “accountability.”

If, for us, the outcome of “accountability” would mean *preventing Jin from being a part of CAN until he faced the accusations against him*, we will frankly never achieve that. It is simply not in the control of the PTCA, either via polity or by secular legal means.

If we hope the outcome of an accountability process is about *property*, yes, we can engage an Administrative Commission, but we believe that will get litigious and expensive very quickly. We are aware that in November 2024, the CAN congregation voted to change their bylaws to remove any reference to the PC(USA)¹. **We simply do not believe meaningful accountability for possible **ethical and theological issues** will come through litigation about a property title.**

We also frankly don’t believe that arguing about the property is a faithful use of the time, talents, and resources of the Presbytery *not because we don’t care about the ethics* but because we do not believe it will serve those impacted* or ourselves in any functional way.

What we **can** control, however, is whether CAN remains in the PC(USA) without being willing to abide by the Book of Order.

**An earlier version of this document read “victims” instead of “those impacted.” This was an error. The words we collectively use should not imply knowledge of investigated facts or determination of guilt.*

Is it *ethical* to let Church of All Nations depart the denomination if it means Jin Kim may continue to operate as a leader in that space?

There is no way to respond to this concern without acknowledging that there are sometimes no “simple” ways forward when it comes to ethical dynamics within institutions, systems, and congregations – *especially among adults who can consent to being in whatever space they choose, and can choose to associate however they prefer outside the ethical and polity commitments of a Christian organization like the PC(USA).*

¹ CAN shared that they changed their bylaws at a Nov. 20, 2024, congregational meeting. They also shared, “We have since made two additional rounds of changes to our Articles and Bylaws – one on Jan. 5 and another at our annual meeting on Feb. 2. The last two rounds passed unanimously. We made clear to the congregation that while our desire was not to exit the PC(USA), we also needed to retain the ability to govern ourselves in the event of Presbytery overreach.” - c.f., CAN Bullet Point response to PTCA Jan 30 letter, March 16, 2025

The basic issue is still this:

- The Presbytery is clear that there is no scenario in which Jin Kim could continue to associate with CAN, as a member congregation of the PC(USA), without facing the misconduct charges against him.
- On the flip side, CAN has made it clear that they did not wish to proceed forward as a congregation *without* Jin Kim. This is a fundamentally unacceptable outcome within the PC(USA).

While none of the actual ethical concerns change, once CAN exits the PC(USA), CAN is simply a group of adults who can choose to associate in whatever form they choose. Frankly, there is ample information, whether online or by asking, that could put new or current members on notice about the range of experiences and opinions about CAN. Naming this is neither indifference nor blithe acceptance, but rather a grounded realism about the actual “edges” of the authority of the PC(USA)’s Book of Order and our theological and practical capacity to define outcomes for other adults.

We must be clear: the Presbytery *does not and cannot* support or agree with the leadership of Jin Kim in any congregational or ministerial role if he does not face the charges against him. Simultaneously, we also cannot control the behavior of those who *do not wish to be governed by the ethics or polity of the PC(USA)* – and, in essence, that is what Church of All Nations is affirming by choosing to leave the denomination. Likewise, Jin Kim has already made this decision for himself by renouncing jurisdiction. We mourn these choices and remain concerned for the future of CAN but are clear about the bounds of our control.

Can’t we just sit down with CAN and talk about all this, with the goal of moving toward compliance with the Book of Order?

This has been an option between the Presbytery and CAN for the last 10 years. CAN has been frustrated with the Presbytery for a reluctance to come to the table, but in 2022, an extended engagement and listening process was engaged, with a group of about 8-10 Presbytery leaders who included representatives from COM, CPM, at-large participation in the Presbytery that dated back to the time of the trial, current officers, the Antiracism Coordinator, etc. The goal of the meetings was to find ways to normalize the relationship between CAN and the Presbytery, and was at the invitation of CAN.

What became clear in that process is that while there were sincere efforts on both sides to pray and listen together, there were significant theological differences around the role of church discipline, the role of the Presbytery in the life of a congregation or session, and the interpretation and understanding of the trial process. There are disagreements between CAN and the Presbytery about how and why the last phase of this process did not occur on the part of the Presbytery, but it is true that the process itself was engaged with integrity on both sides, *and a genuine desire to find a way forward.*

That said, we were aware that, even if the process did normalize relationships, significant and challenging conversations remained in our future about the exact sticking points named above about church polity and mutual accountability in the context of the PC(USA) and its bodies and polity. What the events of the last year have clarified is that *these very matters are irreconcilable at this point*. We need to *believe what CAN* says when they say that they desire Jin to be their leader and do not believe the accusations against him hold merit.²

Any future attempts at a “conversation” or dialogical process (which likely may still need to occur within the container of an AC if polity dynamics are central) would need the agreement of both sides, and a great deal of effort, focus, and likely staff and paid consultant time to engage. The “effort” should not be a primary consideration, but such costs should be named to convey what it would take.

What is at stake in this decision?

The voting members of the PTCA are entirely free to reject the terms of Gracious Separation, as described in the stated clerk’s report. If rejected, however, *there is no way to “renegotiate” the terms* at this juncture. The PTCA and CAN would simply revert to where we were in January of 2025 and continue to hold the legal responsibility and risk of being in association with a congregation that does not wish to fully engage with the requirements of the Book of Order around leaders with unaddressed allegations of misconduct. It will, most likely, require the formation of an Administrative Commission and long-term engagement with CAN to negotiate for different outcomes for the congregation within the bounds of the Book of Order.

Other pragmatic questions about the separation process

How is the Presbytery addressing issues of liability in the separation process?

Rocky Rockenstein serves as presbytery counsel for legal matters, and was part of the team who drafted the Gracious Separation process the PTCA currently uses. He consulted with Stated Clerk John Curtiss when it became clear that some of the language of the original policy did not apply to the situation of Church of All Nations, and they could not be dismissed to another Reformed denomination. He worked with the Negotiating Team itself as well to be sure that any new process would honor the *intent* of the original process, and that the legal and liability issues were covered.

² From a June 26, 2025, letter from CAN regarding the AC for Truth Seeking: “The session has made clear to the PLT that we believe that the accusation against Dr. Jin S. Kim is without merit. He will continue to serve as our Senior Pastor because we have complete trust in his character and integrity throughout his 32 years as a full-time congregational minister.”

Included in the Presbytery Packet for the January 10, 2026, Called Meeting will be a MEMO from legal counsel Rocky Rockenstein. This will address both the concerns (raised by the Stated Clerk in early 2025) and the concerns about liability.

There were a couple of questions asked about the property issues named by the Stated Clerk in a letter written to the CAN session on January 30, 2025. All the charges were reported to the appropriate authorities by the Presbytery, which is the limit of what we are able to do. As CAN has shared, several of the government entities that received the charges have investigated and found no violations. This remains outside any purview covered by our polity.

There is little risk to the Presbytery because all the charges involved actions by CAN as a corporate entity, not the property it owned. Nevertheless, it is standard practice when transferring property to provide a protection for the new owner against costs related to the property's use before transfer (for example, the late attachment of special assessments). We plan for this to be part of the property transfer documentation when the CAN transfers its property to the Presbytery.

Why is the recommendation to dissolve the congregation rather than dismiss the congregation?

Due to the timing and original reasons for its drafting, the Gracious Separation policy assumes that the congregation asking to leave the denomination will be dismissed to another denomination member of the World Council of Churches (WCC).

In this case, that is not possible. CAN has indicated that none of the WCC member denominations are good landing places for their congregation. Initially, the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team asked if it would be possible to simply dismiss CAN as an independent congregation.

However, our polity does not allow us to dismiss a congregation to become an independent congregation. Therefore, the CAN session, through the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team, requested that they be dissolved as a PC(USA) entity so that they might reincorporate as a new entity and independent congregation.

Although this *is* a departure from the practice described in the Gracious Separation policy, it is a recommendation that makes sense in our current moment and given the very specific situation that CAN is choosing as a pathway forward. One might argue an Administrative Commission could have been appointed to do their work with no reference to the policy because the necessity of dissolution puts it outside the scope of the Gracious Separation Policy. This policy, however, outlines a process that most closely speaks to the Presbytery's situations with CAN – which is why we chose to be guided by it in this situation. By dissolving the CAN congregation, as outlined in the Terms of Dismissal, CAN leadership can then reincorporate to achieve the independent status they desire.

Is the loan between the Synod and CAN really renegotiated to both parties' mutual satisfaction?

One of the comments at the listening session informed us that although the Synod and CAN had renegotiated the loan to the satisfaction of both parties, the renegotiation assumed that CAN would be dismissed to another denomination instead of dissolving. Since the Listening Session, there has been a conversation between Stated Clerk John Curtiss and Synod Treasurer Jim Koon to seek clarity. The Synod loan document includes the language that the loan is between the Synod of Lakes and Prairies and the Church of All Nations *and any successor organizations*. This means that the current loan between CAN and the Synod will remain between the new entity CAN and the Synod once the terms have been implemented. The Synod will be involved in documenting the property transfer to ensure the property remains subject to the Synod's loan and mortgage.

Will any Teaching Elders of the Presbytery continue to be engaged in ministry at CAN after all this separation?

Conversations between the COM and the two Teaching Elders and minister members of the Presbytery are currently ongoing ([Policy on Membership Status and Validated Ministries](#)) in case the separation does pass. The Gracious Separation policy invites exactly these sorts of thoughtful conversations to occur about Teaching Elders who continue to serve or worship in departing congregations.

On what topics were the GA offices consulted? Did it, or how did it, affect the terms we see?

It was shared by John Curtiss at the Listening Session of November 5th that outside advice has been sought in the wider PC(USA) on this case to make sure we are responsibly interpreting the Book of Order in such a high-stakes situation. Our actions and recommendations have been in line with the advice and counsel of parliamentary, legal, and polity experts in the PC(USA), including RE Flor Velez-Diaz, Assistant Stated Clerk for Judicial Process of the Office of the General Assembly.

In terms of advice about the terms, since there is a lot of leeway to negotiate a settlement to the desire of both the departing church and the presbytery, the current terms were not subject to consultation other than for the process specific to CAN being unable to join another reformed denomination. It also reflects the financial condition of CAN among other factors in the negotiations process. The representatives from the Presbytery advocated clearly for the interests of the Presbytery, while also seeking to find a viable way forward.

What about the Accuser and other possible people who have been harmed by the conflict at CAN?

It is important to note that the accuser has *not chosen to engage with the Administrative Commission for Truth-Seeking's process*. This is their right. Many of the congregants who left have also walked away from the process of engagement during this period of voting and discernment within CAN, and some prior session members also declined to have any conversations with the AC for Truth Seeking.

An email from the accuser was forwarded to Stated Clerk John Curtiss and to Transitional Executive Presbyter Libby Shannon. Libby reached out to the accuser to extend an invitation for prayerful conversation and pastoral support in September 2024. Later the Administrative Commission for Truth Seeking also extended an invitation for the accuser to have a conversation with the AC during their process in summer 2025.

Honoring the agency and self-determination of adults who feel they have experienced harm is critical in our hopes for justice and care in our community. Adults are not compelled to either officially report or follow up on acts of harm that happened to themselves. The call of our polity does not extend beyond consent or rely on hearsay or assumptions. There are also no secular legal charges that can be filed by the Presbytery in this case, and no legal reporting that would apply.

For these reasons, we stand ready to offer support and report or investigate where our duty and the polity allows, but we simply cannot confuse our *interest and compassion* with our responsibilities to *honor the agency* of other adults.

How will the Presbytery offer to extend pastoral care to any affected by this process, especially the former members of CAN who have left over this time period and/or those who desire to remain connected to a PC(USA) congregation?

At several points during the process, the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team has made statements to CAN membership indicating that the Presbytery has a desire and obligation to extend pastoral care and invitations have been made to contact the Presbytery through the office of the Stated Clerk. Now that we have reached the point of the Gracious Separation Process in which the CAN congregation has voted to approve the Terms of Dismissal and the Presbytery is being asked to vote, the Presbytery continues to stand ready to extend pastoral care to those who would like it.

What about the long-term legal liability issues that have plagued spaces like the Roman Catholic church? How and for what are we liable for when it comes to Jin?

From Presbytery counsel Rocky Rockenstein: "As to future Presbytery liability for Jin Kim actions, the Presbytery is in a completely different legal position from the Roman Catholic Church. First, as you know, the Church of All Nations is a separate corporation from the Presbytery. Consequently, Jin's actions as a Pastor of the Church of All Nations accrue to the Church corporation (which is why our churches carry liability insurance covering their pastors in such situations). The Roman Catholic Church is an integrated whole so it could not make this argument. Second, the Roman Catholic Church knew about the predatory actions of its priests *and then put them in different positions where they could cause harm again, and then did it again and again*. In contrast, the Presbytery acted earlier to discipline Jin when misconduct was found. And as to the current allegations, Jin removed himself from the Presbyterian Church's jurisdiction before it could act on the allegations." This outlines a very different situation, and the PTCA has addressed every complaint with appropriate process as soon as we were advised.

FOCUS ON FACTS

Report prepared by Walter Rockenstein

I. Introduction

On October 27, 2025, the Presbytery Leadership Team (PLT) gave notice of a Special Meeting of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (Presbytery) to be held on Saturday, November 15, 2025. The business to have been addressed was receiving and acting on a report of the Gracious Separation Negotiating Team (Negotiating Team) including proposed Terms of Dismissal between Church of All Nations (CAN) and the Presbytery and acting on the PLT's recommendation to approve the Terms of Dismissal.

The Call to this Special Meeting occasioned the circulation of letters of concern about the Terms of Dismissal. For the most part, these letters were not been directed to the PLT. Rather, they were sent directly to different groups of people in the Presbytery and beyond to advocate voting for the negotiated terms, voting against the negotiated terms, or advocating different terms. Consequently, the PLT has set a Postponed Special Presbytery Meeting on Saturday, January 10, 2026.

To prepare for the January 10th Postponed Special Meeting, the PLT has chosen not to share any of these letters directly because they contain (likely inadvertent) errors of fact. Instead, the PLT has prepared this Factual Review on certain issues to assist Teaching and Ruling Elder Commissioners as they consider the proposed Terms of Dismissal. Every effort has been made to set forth the facts accurately and to acknowledge points in dispute where they occur.

II. Current Facts Regarding the 2024 Allegations About CAN Misconduct?

- A. In late 2024 the Stated Clerk received from a memorandum and a letter alleging various illegal activities by CAN. The memorandum was titled *Church of All Nations Pastoral Accountability and Legal Liability*, and it alleged various violations of state laws and local ordinances including property tax fraud and illegal residential occupancy of CAN's church building. The letter was from an individual and described actions constituting fraud in the application for and use of federal Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) funds.

1. In moments like this, the Presbytery is legally required, but also ethically obliged, to act considering the *entire* cooperative organization of 54 congregations in our Presbytery, and the ethical, legal, and financial duties it has and the services it provides to all those participants. To be sure we were taking appropriate action, on the advice of Presbytery counsel, Walter Rockenstein, the PLT retained a prominent criminal law attorney to advise the PLT on how to handle these allegations. The attorney said: First, the facts alleged, if true, could be felonies under both state and federal law. Second, the Presbytery had a legal responsibility to report the facts to the appropriate state, local, and federal authorities. Third, the Presbytery should *neither* investigate the allegations *nor* inform CAN that the Presbytery was reporting the allegations, since either action could be construed as criminal interference with any state or federal investigation that might be undertaken.

2. The PLT heard the advice and instructed Water Rockenstein to inform the proper authorities. As to the state and local law violations alleged in the memorandum, Mr. Rockenstein informed both the Anoka County Attorney's office, and, at their direction, the City of Columbia Heights. As to the federal fraud allegations in the letter, the criminal law attorney informed the United States Attorney for Minnesota, and Mr. Rockenstein was interviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

3. *What is the actual outcome of this reporting?* CAN in its *Response from the CAN Session to the PTC Regarding the Campbell Letter* dated Nov. 16, 2025 (CAN Nov. 16th Response), states, "Further, all charges were refuted during the "Listening Session" for presbyters on Nov. 6, 2025, when Stated Clerk John Curtiss quoted attorney Rocky Rockenstein who stated that civil authorities have investigated and found no violations." This statement is only partially accurate. As to the alleged state and local law violations, the City of Columbia Heights has investigated and found no violations. However, as to the alleged federal fraud allegations, both the U.S. Attorney and the FBI remain silent, so, we do not know if they are investigating or not or have made a determination as to the whether the alleged federal fraud occurred or not. All we can say is that an unsubstantiated allegation has been properly reported to federal authorities and that the Presbytery has no further action to take, nor any influence on the timeline or results of any future action by federal authorities.

III. The Facts About The Synod Loan

On December 20, 2007, The Synod of Lakes and Prairies (Synod) and CAN entered into a Promissory Note whereby the Synod loaned \$200,000 to CAN. On the same date, the Synod and CAN entered into a Mortgage on CAN's property at 4301 Benjamin Street NE, Columbia Heights, Minnesota 55421 (Church Property) to secure the loan. On November 9, 2025, the Synod reported that the outstanding principal and interest owed to the Synod are \$78,848.58 and \$10,464.05 respectively. For a period during the COVID pandemic and extending through March 31, 2022, the Synod offered and CAN agreed that payments would be suspended and interest would be waived through March 31, 2022. Since April 1, 2022, interest has been accruing at an annual rate of 3.80% (\$242.35 per month based on current outstanding principal). The Presbytery is not a guarantor of this loan.

The Promissory Note includes a clause which states in part:

Termination of Use. Borrower hereby represents and warrants that it has not taken and will not take an action during the term of this loan to cease to use the property securing this Note in accordance with the *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*. This Note shall become immediately due, payable and collectible upon an act of termination of use of the property described in the *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*, in the sole opinion of the Synod after consultation with the Borrower's next higher governing body.

If CAN were to use the Church Property in a manner not in accord with the *Constitution*, it would constitute a default under the Note's provisions. To enforce the Note, the Synod would have to give a default notice to CAN. CAN would then have 30 days to cure the default. If CAN failed to cure the default, the Synod could seek payment immediately. If CAN paid the amounts owing, the Note would be satisfied, the mortgage

would be satisfied, and CAN would have clear title to the Church Property. If payment were not forthcoming, the Synod could foreclose on the Church Property.

Recently, to accommodate the Presbytery's Gracious Separation process, the Synod agreed with CAN not to demand payment in full of the loan when CAN is dismissed from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), with the understanding from CAN that monthly loan payments of \$560.77 would begin at dismissal. If paid as agreed, this amount would cover monthly interest accrual and full amortization of the principal owing in 15 years, leaving any unpaid interest due and payable at the end of that schedule.

IV. The Facts About The 2012 PJC Decision Against Dr. Kim

Several of the letters previously referred to have made opinion statements about the 2012 Complaint against Dr. Kim tried before the Presbytery's Permanent Judicial Commission (PJC). Rather than try to reconcile these opinions, the PLT presents here the actual ruling in the case and a follow-up Report from a task force of the Committee on Ministry about the "Rehabilitation of the Rev. Jin Kim". Ruling and Teaching Elder Commissioners should read these and draw their own conclusions. Please note that although five complaints were made against Dr. Kim, the PJC only upheld one.

INSERT: (1) *The Permanent Judicial Commission Of The Presbytery Of The Twin Cities Area Of The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Decision, Investigation Committee PTCA, Complainants v. Rev. Jin S. Kim, Respondent*; AND (2) *Report From The Task Force Of The Committee On Ministry Of The Presbytery Of The Twin Cities Area On The Rehabilitation Of The Rev. Jin Kim*.

Subsequent to the PJC decision, Dr. Kim made a public apology for his actions before a meeting of the Presbytery.

.....

THE PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION OF
THE PRESBYTERY OF THE TWIN CITIES AREA OF
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.)

DECISION

PJC Case 2012-1

*As it appears in the Stated Meeting Minutes of
November 13, 2012, page 256*

INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE PTCA,

Complainants

v.

REV. JIN S. KIM,

Respondent

ARRIVAL STATEMENT

This is a disciplinary case which has come before this Permanent Judicial Commission of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area for trial.

HISTORY

The Permanent Judicial Commission finds that it has jurisdiction, that the Complainant has standing to file the case, that the case was properly and timely filed, and that the Complainant states a claim upon which relief can be granted (D-6.0305).

FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

The Investigating Committee found that there was probable cause that Reverend Jin S. Kim had violated the Book of Order and the Book of Confessions as well as Guidelines adopted by the Presbytery and denomination concerning appropriate boundaries and, therefore, charged the Rev. Kim with the following offenses:

1. On or about the 12th day of June, 2009, you, the Rev. Jin Kim did commit the offense of infringing on the rights and views of others in regard to their freedom of conscience, contrary to G-2.0105 in that you invited an intern, Angelie Ryah, into your hotel room at midnight and criticized her and subjected her to words and actions that exploited her past abuse and vulnerability. You "launched into a long tirade about" how she did not listen to her own body and trust what it was telling her "and that she "didn't trust him either".

That evening you also demanded that she remain alone with you, hold your hand, reveal her weaknesses to you, and to agree to fully trust you if she wanted to remain in the program. These demands took advantage of her vulnerability and created "an intimidating and offensive environment" contrary to your vows of ordination and the lessons and guidelines of the Level One Training of the Advocates for Integrity in Ministry. It also did not honor the duties of equals as is called for in the Book of Confessions, The Larger Catechism (7.241), which states that equals "regard the dignity and worth of each other."

2. On several occasions, as stated to us by witnesses, you have not sought humility as stated in The Second Helvetic Confession (5;157) that professes that: The Lord has "prohibited dominion for his disciples and has highly commended humility." Witnesses stated that you criticized and demeaned the interns and your colleagues, seeking to "break them down." You have rebuked and yelled at them. Furthermore, according to several people we interviewed, you exhibited controlling behavior and repeatedly told them to trust you in order to trust God and to "just follow me."

Witnesses also stated that they were bullied, berated, confronted and yelled at in a room alone, and as such put under undue stress.

3. On or about the 29th day of February, 2012, you made references to the Investigating Committee that showed a disregard of the accuser, Angelie Ryah, in a manner contrary to The Book of Confessions, in The Shorter Catechism (7.078) which states: "The Ninth Commandment forbade whatsoever is prejudicial to truth, or injurious to our own or our neighbor's good name," by bearing false witness to her character and mental health in saying that she was "unstable and mentally unfit."
4. Since the inception of the internship program, the interns have not been fairly compensated. The minimal compensation they receive may serve as a means of

control rather than a means of recompense by creating a structure of dependence. This is contrary to the Second Helvetic Confession (5.168) which states that "the worker is worthy of his reward."

The Prosecuting Committee recommended at trial that the degree of censure that should be imposed was temporary exclusion from the exercise of ordained office.

FINDINGS OF THE PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION

After a day long trial and hearing numerous witnesses presented by both the Prosecuting Committee and the Accused, and after due deliberation, the Permanent Judicial Commission found the Accused Guilty of Charge 1 and Not Guilty of Charges 2 through 4.

The Permanent Judicial Commission determined that the appropriate censure should be Rebuke with supervised rehabilitation, under the supervision of Committee on Ministry (COM). The goal of the rehabilitation will be that Rev. Kim will develop a more complete understanding of his own issues of power, authority, and boundaries, which will then be reflected in his ministry. The actions required during the supervised rehabilitation are set forth below in the Order.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: Reverend Kim will undertake the following steps as part of his rehabilitation:

Required actions:

1. Rev. Kim shall apologize to the Angelie Ryah in the presence of assigned members of PTCA's Committee on Ministry (COM) and a member of the Prosecuting Committee for behavior that hurt her.
2. Rev. Kim shall agree that no reprisal will be forthcoming against any person who testified, assisted, or participated in the investigation.
3. Rev. Kim is required to undergo an evaluation and period of counseling by the North Central Ministry Development Center (NCMDC) which will focus on issues of power, authority, and boundaries. Rev. Kim will initiate this process within three months of the trial date. The stated clerk will send the PJC decision to the NCMDC, and the NCMDC will have access to all documents involved in this case and trial. The COM will receive the evaluation of the NCMDC, and will determine, based on recommendation of NCMDC, when rehabilitation has been satisfactorily completed.
4. Rev. Kim is required to resign from the Committee on Preparation for Ministry and is not eligible for reelection until the completion of the period of rehabilitation.

If COM determines the accused is not making a good faith effort to complete this rehabilitation, they shall report to the Stated Clerk who shall form a new investigating

Alternative Forms of Resolution

In accordance with D-10.0202(i) of The Book of Order, the Investigating Committee of PTCA suggests to the PJC the following Alternative resolutions agreed upon by this committee and the Rev. Jin S. Kim.

1. The Rev. Kim shall apologize to Angelie Ryah in the presence of assigned members of PTCA's Committee on Ministry and a member of the Investigating Committee for behavior that hurt Ms. Ryah but was not of a sexual nature. Rev. Kim shall agree that no reprisal will be forthcoming against any person who testified, assisted, or participated in the investigation. Furthermore, the Rev. Kim shall cease all references to Angelie Ryah's psychological or emotional well-being. This process is to protect the complainant and participants in the investigation of alleged misconduct. The chair of the Committee on Ministry shall report the completion of this apology to the PTCA's Office of Stated Clerk.
2. The Rev. Kim shall agree not to request or accompany any intern or subordinate into a room alone behind closed doors. The Session of the Church of All Nations shall create a policy that prohibits such behavior and upon adoption and approval by the session, shall submit this policy to the Office of the Stated Clerk.
3. The Rev. Kim shall retake Level One Boundaries Training at the next scheduled workshop or no later than the end of 2012. The Advocates for Integrity in Ministry (AIM) Committee will report the completion to the PTCA's Office of Stated Clerk.
4. The Rev. Kim shall agree to choose his language more carefully, so that it is useful for the building up of individual congregants, interns, and colleagues in ministry, so that his words may give grace to those who hear (Ephesians 4:29). His words should stir up the gifts of ordination; not a spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of sound mind (2 Timothy 1:6-7).

He shall always strive to demonstrate by word and deed the vows of ordination and the tenets of the Reformed Tradition.
5. The Church of All Nations' Internship Program shall be revised so that it is under the direct and conclusive supervision of the Session. This will be initiated, implemented and confirmed by PTCA's Committee on Ministry and communicated to the PTCA's Stated Clerk's office.
6. The Session of Church of All Nations shall agree to receive officer training from the PTCA's Committee on Ministry regarding its roles and responsibilities as the governing body of the congregation, particularly as the body who supervises the internship program and as those who "nurture the covenant community of disciples of Christ" (Book of Order G-3.0201c.) As such, the Session of the Church of All Nations shall seek to ensure that the work environment is not intimidating, hostile or offensive to all participants, and that members and staff need not submit to any one individual's teachings as a condition to obtaining or retaining participation in the internship program or church membership. Confirmation of this training will be communicated to PTCA's Office of Stated Clerk.

Rev Jin Kim accepts these Alternative Resolutions of the charges and agrees to fully cooperate with the Presbytery.

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) charges you, Rev. Jin S. Kim, a teaching elder and member of the presbytery with the following offense: Reference: The Larger Catechism No 7.261:

- I. On or about the 12th day of June, 2009 you, Rev Jin Kim did commit the offense of infringing on the rights and views of others in regard to their freedom of conscience contrary to G-2.0105 in that you invited an intern, Angelie Ryah Dahn, into your hotel room at midnight and criticized her and subjected her to words and actions that exploited her past abuse and vulnerability. You "'launched into a long tirade about' how she did not listen to her own body and trust what it was telling her" and that she 'didn't trust him either". This act was contrary to W-4-4003e. of the vows of ordination where Pastors pledge to be "friend among your colleagues in ministry, working with them, subject to the ordering of Gods word and spirit."

That evening you also demanded that she hold your hand. This created "an intimidating and offensive environment" contrary to your vows of ordination and the lessons and policy of the Level One Training of the Advocates for Integrity in Ministry. It also did not honor equals as is called for in the Book of Confessions, The Larger Catechism 7.241.

The witnesses in support of this charge who will be called are: Rev Donald Genereux, Angelie Ryah Dahn, Mauro Souza.

2. On several occasions throughout your years in ministry, you have not sought humility as commended by our Lord as stated in [The Second Helvetic Confession 5.157] in that you regularly put the interns down and yelled at both the interns and your colleagues in ministry. According to several people we interviewed, you exhibit very controlling behavior and work to have a "one piece model." You have repeatedly told them to trust in you rather than to trust God and to "just follow me."

These actions are contrary to the vows of ordination [W-4.4003e, f, g, i] in that you were not "a friend to colleagues in ministry," did not "love your neighbors, and work for the reconciliation of the world," did not seek to promote "the peace, unity, and purity of the church," and did not "show the love and justice of Jesus Christ."

Throughout the investigation, the Investigating Committee heard testimony from those who revere and support the accused; those who feel threatened and angry by the accused and unduly make accusations as a result; and those who have been genuinely hurt and pained by the accused. It is on behalf of those who have been wounded and hurt and those who are vulnerable that:

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) charges you, Rev. Jin S. Kim, a teaching elder and member of the presbytery with the following offenses:

1. On or about the 12th day of June, 2009, you, the Rev. Jin Kim did commit the

offense of infringing on the rights and views of others in regard to their freedom of conscience, contrary to G-2.0105 in that you invited an intern, Angelie Ryah, into your hotel room at midnight and criticized her and subjected her to words and actions that exploited her past abuse and vulnerability. You "launched into a long tirade about" how she did not listen to her own body and trust what it was telling her" and that she "didn't trust him either".

This act was also contrary to W-4.4003e of the vows of ordination where Teaching Elders pledge to be "a friend among your colleagues in ministry, working with them, subject to the ordering of God's Word and Spirit."

That evening you also demanded that she remain alone with you, hold your hand, reveal her weaknesses to you, and to agree to fully trust you if she wanted to remain in the program. These demands took advantage of her vulnerability and created "an intimidating and offensive environment" contrary to your vows of ordination and the lessons and guidelines of the Level One Training of the Advocates for Integrity in Ministry. It also did not honor the duties of equals as is called for in the Book of Confessions, The Larger Catechism (7.241), which states that equals "regard the dignity and worth of each other."

The witnesses in support of this charge who may be called are: Rev Donald Genereux, Angelie Ryah, Mauro Souza and Nancy Ellis.

2. On several occasions, as stated to us by witnesses, you have not sought humility as stated in The Second Helvetic Confession (5.157) that professes that: The Lord has "prohibited dominion for his disciples and has highly commended humility."

Witnesses stated that you criticized and demeaned the interns and your colleagues, seeking to "break them down." You have rebuked and yelled at them.

Furthermore, according to several people we interviewed, you exhibited controlling behavior and repeatedly told them to trust you in order to trust God and to "just follow me."

Witnesses also stated that they were bullied, berated, confronted and yelled at in a room alone, and as such put under undue stress.

This is contrary to W-4.4003 e. of the vows of ordination where Teaching Elders pledge to be a "friend among colleagues in ministry, working with them," rather than breaking them down.

These actions are also contrary to the vows of ordination W-4.4003g in that you did not promote "the peace" and "unity" of the church and W-4.40003i(3) in that you did not show care for your people.

The witnesses in support of this charge who may be called are: Rev Donald Genereux, Angelie Ryah, Robert Boller, Nancy Ellis, Mauro Souza and Herb Perkins.

3. On or about the 29th day of February, 2012, you made references to the Investigating Committee that showed a disregard of the accuser, Angelie Ryah, in a manner contrary to The Book of Confessions, in The Shorter Catechism (7.078) which states: "The Ninth Commandment forbade whatsoever is prejudicial to

truth, or injurious to our own or our neighbor's good name," by bearing false witness to her character and mental health in saying that she was "unstable and mentally unfit."

The witnesses in support of this charge who may be called are: Members of the Investigating Committee, Rev. Ted Nordlund, Dr. Helen Cepero and Dr. Greg Meland.

4. Since the inception of the internship program, the interns have not been fairly compensated. The minimal compensation they receive may serve as a means of control rather than a means of recompense by creating a structure of dependence. This is contrary to the Second Helvetic Confession (5.168) which states that "the worker is worthy of his reward." The witnesses in support of this charge who may be called are: Rev. Donald Genereaux, Angelie Ryah, Lucy Mungai, Nancy Ellis, John Nelson and Hikari Nakane.

All of the above charges are aggravated by the principles outlined in The Larger Catechism, specifically stated in Question 151 (7.261) which states that these offences are aggravated if the persons offending are "of riper age, greater experience, or grace, eminent for profession, gifts, place, office, guides to others, and whose example is likely to be followed by others."

This document was dated and signed in April of 2012.

122 West Franklin Ave
Minneapolis MN 55404

Regarding the Investigation of the actions of Pastor Jin Kim

Dear Ms Grittmann:

This is to report that we have concluded our investigation into the alleged conduct of Pastor Jin Kim. Our investigation included interviews with the accuser, the accused and eight other people. We also had many meetings to discuss this matter and outlined possible charges.

Our conclusion is that the acts of Jin Kim do not rise to the level of offense under the Book of Order, violation of the vows of ordination or a clear violation of the scripture.

However, we do have concerns about Rev Kim's behavior that should be addressed -or at least communicated to him for the protection of the church and himself.

We believe that the Internship program should be revised so it is not under the direct and conclusive control of Rev Kim.

Rev Kim should be told that he should never be alone in a hotel room with an intern.

He should also be told not to make inappropriate remarks or comments that are possibly offensive or are contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the church.

He should apologize to Angelie.

He should be instructed to retake the level one and Level Two Training offered by the Presbytery.

We are concerned that if he does not take action to correct some of his behaviors, something will happen that will really harm one of his congregants or interns or himself.

.....

**REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON MINISTRY
OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE TWIN CITIES AREA ON THE
REHABILITATION OF THE REV. JIN KIM**

Report Dated: October 13, 2013

This Report represents the conclusions and recommendations of the special Task Force of the Committee on Ministry (COM) of the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (PTCA) which was appointed by the COM on November 19, 2012 to oversee the rehabilitation steps for the Rev. Jin Kim as set forth in the Decision of the Permanent Judicial Commission (PJC) of the PTCA dated November 7, 2012 (PJC Case 2012-1). The COM members appointed to the Task Force were Philip Bolinder, Megan Remtema, Kathleen Vellenga, and Stephen Robertson as Chairperson.

The Task Force

The Task Force met on several occasions and was provided with the transcript of the trial of the PJC dated October 24, 2012, the written Decision of the PJC dated November 7, 2012, and the written statement of the Moderator and the Stated Clerk which was read before the full membership of the PTCA at its meeting on November 13, 2012 representing the PJC-ordered public rebuke as specified in the PJC Decision.

In its process of supervising the PJC-ordered rehabilitation of the Rev. Kim, the Task Force also spoke to and/or met with the Rev. Kim, Angelie Ryah, the Stated Clerk of the PTCA Rev. William Davnie, and the Presbytery Executive Rev. Chaz Ruark. The Task Force authorized the North Central Ministry Development Center (NCMDC) to act in accordance with the PJC Decision to provide the professional evaluation and counseling service for Rev. Kim and in accordance with the PJC Decision, provided NCMDC copies of the trial transcript and the PJC Decision.

In accordance with the provision of required action #3 of the PJC Decision, the Task Force authorized the NCMDC to conduct an initial career evaluation with the Rev. Kim to guide the rehabilitation and counseling process. The Career Consultation Report for Rev. Kim dated January 30 and 31 (exhibit A) contains their findings and rehabilitation and counseling recommendations.

Further, the Task Force determined that it needed to more explicitly define in measurable terms what would be involved in the process of "rehabilitation" for the Rev. Kim as specified in the required action #3 in the PJC Decision. To that end, the Task Force developed with Rev. Kim the document Supervised Rehabilitation Plan for the Rev. Jin Kim (exhibit B) which sets forth in more specific detail the requirements of the Task Force for the period of rehabilitation.

Required Actions of the PJC Decision

The PJC Decision specified four required actions that were to be part of the rehabilitation steps for the Rev. Kim. (Please see the PJC Decision document for the complete text of these actions.)

1. Rev. Kim shall apologize to Angelie Ryah.

On August 29, 2013, the Rev. Kim met in the presence of the required participants and offered his apology to Angelie Ryah. A complete report of this apology event is included here. (Exhibit C)

2. Rev. Kim shall agree that no reprisal will be forthcoming.

To the knowledge of the Task Force, Rev. Kim has made no overt or covert threats or actions against or involving any person involved with the investigation, trial, or this rehabilitation process. In fact, the Task Force has found Rev. Kim cooperative in spirit and action to the PJC- ordered rehabilitation process.

3. Rev. Kim is to undergo an evaluation and period of counseling.

Following the recommendations of the initial evaluation by NCMDC (see Exhibit B), Rev. Kim entered a series of personal therapy sessions with Dr. Harriet Haynes, a qualified therapist recommended by NCMDC. (See Exhibit D for a report from Dr. Haynes confirming those rehabilitative therapy sessions.) Upon the recommendation of Dr. Haynes that Rev. Kim had achieved the goals of his personal therapeutic sessions, Rev. Kim was again evaluated by NCMDC. (Exhibit E) The report of July 26, 2013 by NCMDC concurs with the recommendation of Dr. Haynes that Rev. Kim has completed all the necessary requirements and recommendations of the personal therapy and counseling portions of the rehabilitation process.

4. Rev. Kim is to resign from the Committee on Preparation for Ministry (CPM).

Rev. Kim submitted his verbal resignation to the Committee as reflected in the minutes of the CPM on November 26, 2012. (Exhibit F)

Other Rehabilitation Requirements

Following the recommendations of the Career Consultation Report for Rev. Kim, the Task Force included other specific requirements in the Supervised Rehabilitation Plan for the rehabilitation for Rev. Kim beyond the requirement of personal counseling as specified in the original PJC Decision. All of these additional requirements were carefully enumerated in the Supervised Rehabilitation Plan for the Rev. Jin Kim. The first two items in that report relate to the process of the personal counseling as completed under item #3 above. The final item, #5, concerns the time period of the rehabilitation, which was determined to be a minimum of one year from the date of the PJC Decision (November 7, 2012.)

The Supervised Rehabilitation Plan also called for a limit to the number of interns on staff at the Church of All Nations (CAN) during the period of rehabilitation and sets forth a model for outside supervision and support of those interns during the period of rehabilitation. To the knowledge of the Task Force, there have been no new interns received by the congregation during this rehabilitation period, and no interns have come under these provisions of supervision. However, the Task Force continues to commend to CAN this model of supervision for interns in the future.

The Supervised Rehabilitation Plan also lifted up a concern for the general spiritual health of the Church of All Nations and the congregation's relationship with the PTCA following this extended time of investigation and rehabilitation. The proposed rehabilitative consultation as described in the Plan document is currently scheduled for December 14, 2013.

Costs for All Required Rehabilitation Requirements

The Costs for all personal evaluation, personal counseling, the congregational rehabilitative consultation, and all other actions required by the PJC Decision or the Task Force have been fully borne and paid for by the PTCA.

Task Force Recommendation to COM

It is the conclusion of the Task Force that the Rev. Jin Kim has completed all of the requirements for personal rehabilitation as set forth in the original PJC Decision and the Task Force's Supervised Rehabilitation Plan. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the COM notify the Moderator of the Permanent Judicial Commission and the Stated Clerk of the PTCA that effective on November 7, 2013 that the Rev. Jin Kim will have satisfactorily completed the requirements of his period of supervised rehabilitation and that this information be communicated by the Stated Clerk to the members of the PTCA at their next meeting.

Other Considerations of the Task Force

In the course of its work, the Task Force came across other related information outside of its particular scope and mandate of responsibility which it decided the COM and the PTCA should be aware of. Since the Task Force's mandate concerned one of Rev. Kim's supervisory relationships, it noticed: (1) the large number of church staff, interns, and other persons affiliated with the congregation who are in a subordinate position to Rev. Kim; (2) the amount of time and energy demanded of Rev. Kim by his heavy workload outside of the church; and (3) the opportunity to offer support for some of these younger CAN leaders that may exist outside the church.

Although there were no interns added during the period of Rev. Kim's rehabilitation, the Task Force took note of the number of staff members listed on the CAN web site. As of this writing, there are 16 staff members, including Rev. Kim (not including a current seminary student studying full-time in Atlanta), serving a congregation with a stated membership of 163. Rev. Kim explained that many of these are unpaid or minimally paid positions and some may serve in exchange for communal housing arrangements which CAN sponsors.

While it is the prerogative of each local congregation to determine how it staffs for leadership, CAN has an unusual number of young staff persons - many considering ministry in a college or seminary program - who likely need an increased level of supervision and mentoring. This places Rev. Kim in a direct supervisory relationship with a large number of young persons. And it was in this context that the original problem arose.

The Task Force has also noted the communal living arrangement which CAN has engaged in previously and which may be taking on new or expanded dimensions in the near future. The Task Force became aware of an Outpost Blog entry written by KC Kye, the Director of Youth Ministry at CAN, suggesting other partnerships with this housing and possibly incorporation of this communal housing as a separate worshipping congregation. This brings up questions concerning this particular arrangement, especially the degree to which residents will be supervised and/or mentored by Rev. Kim.

The original NCMDC Career Consultation Report (see Exhibit A) raised concerns about the format and process of supervision of interns at CAN, those who serve solely at the discretion of Rev. Kim without any other accountability or support. The Task Force wonders if some of these same concerns may apply to

these other staff members, and other young people focused on ministry as well.

The Task Force is also concerned about the degree to which Rev. Kim is able to sufficiently supervise and support all these staff members given his heavy outside work and travel commitments. Rev. Kim holds several positions and engages in a number of teaching, speaking, and consultation assignments beyond his full-time responsibilities as a solo pastor of Church of All Nations. According to the information on CAN's website, Rev. Kim "serves on the Minnesota Council of Churches' board, is active with ISAIAH, and continues to be engaged in the ecumenical movement through the WCC, NCC, and the Lausanne Movement. He also serves as PCUSA National Field Staff to support English Ministries, coaching & advising pastors/seminarians, continues to serve in multiple capacities for the PCUSA as adjunct faculty at Dubuque Seminary, and speaks widely in both Presbyterian and ecumenical arenas." In addition, Rev. Kim is a founding instructor for Princeton Seminary's Institute for Multicultural Ministry. The Task Force is concerned that these responsibilities take a considerable amount of Rev. Kim's energy, focus, and time and that as a result young staff members and interns may lack adequate personal and career supervision and support.

Finally, while the Task Force assumes that Rev. Kim will continue serving the PTCA in its work and ministry as he has done faithfully for many years, the Task Force believes it might be a good idea for him to serve in other ways, rather than on the Committee on Preparation for Ministry. Since CAN consistently has a number of Inquirers and Candidates under care of this Presbytery, those individuals may be well served by support and interaction with other committee members, not just with their supervising pastor, who already has highly influential personal and professional relationship with them. This again builds off the concern for supervisory relationships which was raised by the NCMDCC Career Consultation Report.

V. What Can Be Said About Dr. Kim's Claim That the PJC's Decision Was Racist And His Assertion That He Should Receive An Apology From The Presbytery For Its Decision?

Dr. Kim and the CAN Session's current position on the PJC Decision is set forth in the CAN Nov. 16th Response. In it, CAN maintains that,

"The 2012 PJC trial essentially came down to a disagreement about power dynamics and pedagogy. As even Presbytery leaders have acknowledged to us verbally (and CAN members witnessed for themselves at the trial), implicit racial bias impacted the trial, which affected interpretations of his ministry, mentoring, and the internship program at the time."

The CAN Nov. 16th Response also states,

"Dr. Kim renounced jurisdiction because neither he nor the CAN congregation trusted the PTCA judicial process. This was based on their traumatic experience during the 2012 ecclesiastical trial and the unsuccessful attempts at reconciliation with the PTCA that followed, including failed promises by Presbytery leaders to acknowledge implicit racial bias in the 2012 proceedings."

Dr. Kim has also repeatedly asserted that the Presbytery should apologize to him for the PJC trial experience and decision and that "reconciliation" must include an apology.

Rather than arguing about these statements and the facts presented – many of which the PLT would dispute – the PLT presents a May 2019 letter from the Presbytery leadership to Dr. Kim about this dispute.

Dear Pastor Kim,

We write in response to verbal requests, named in conversations over the past few years with Presbytery leaders and staff, asking for an apology from the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area related to the process

and outcome of the disciplinary investigation into your conduct and the Presbytery Judicial Commission's discernment and decision in your case in 2012.

First, we want to acknowledge the sense of pain and frustration we observe and perceive behind your request. The formal mechanisms for discipline within the church, while part of a system and authority to which we all subject ourselves, can touch our lives and ministries in profound ways. The process itself is not intended and is often not able to resolve the strong emotions that accompany its work. While it renders a decision, the process may not resolve how we collectively see truth.

That said, to address your request directly, we would be stepping beyond our bounds to offer an apology for this process. The process began when a woman came forward seeking to have her experience heard, and the Presbytery responded as required by our *Book of Order*. While we freely acknowledge that the only vessels for the disciplinary process are ourselves – sinful humans, limited by our own understanding – we also trust that *God enters into the process* and guides our wisdom and discernment.

Thus, we must honor the Presbytery Judicial Commission's decision, trusting that the Spirit was present in their work. This, however, is *also* not the "final word" on the matter. The work of being "re-formed" by God as a community of churches in the Presbytery is ongoing: "to restore the unity of the church by removing the causes of discord and division," as the *Book of Discipline* calls us to do. As a majority-white Presbytery, for instance, we must continue to search ourselves and our practices, seeking to "examine and test ourselves" related to how we live faithfully in community (2 Cor 13:5). The western, European roots of our polity and many of our procedures remind us that we, like any community of faith, are not a definitive witness to Christ's Church, and we must be deeply and truly *humble* about where we are being led by God to learn and grow.

As a Presbytery, we are committed to continuing this work and to always seeking the purity, peace, and wholeness of the Church. Our Reformed faith reminds us that while we are caught in an inescapable web of sinfulness, we are *also* caught up in the powerful grace and healing of God. We trust that, as we move forward in community, God will continue to guide and refine us all and knit us into a more lasting witness to the Good News of Christ.

We know that a written response cannot resolve the wounds carried forward by you or any others involved in this process, including the woman who stepped forward to be heard. We do hope it can name and clarify the ways the Presbytery continues to be committed to action, as well as how we seek to be guided by God in our work.

May God bless us in our individual lives of prayer and discernment, *and* to our communities, a better way forward together. We look forward to being in continued conversation, discernment, and prayer. And, finally, we hope you will decide to join us in this work.

In Christ,

Walter H. Rockenstein II, Moderator

Rev. Anna Kendig, Vice Moderator

Barbara Lutter, Stated Clerk

This remains the Presbytery's position on this question. None of the subsequent engagements with CAN, including the 2022 dialogue process, shifted from this position, despite quotes taken out of their wider dialogical context.

The Presbytery knows that intersectional race & equity work never arrives at completion or total decolonization, but rather requires the spiritual and pragmatic practice of ongoing and even generational deepening, attention, and engagement. The Presbytery has been clearly and specifically committed to this work since 2016, as evidenced by the 2019 start of the Institutional Race and Equity Assessment (IREA) Team, by the

Presbytery's unanimous 2023 approval of the Race & Equity Report, and by starting the current 5-year implementation of the recommendations and reassessment process. All along, we have been approaching the 2012 PJC trial decision and wider CAN dynamics from multiple angles, applying an intersectional lens. We are clear that misconduct in the context of pastoral authority can happen in any racial or cultural context, and that understanding and analysis of the power, responsibility, boundaries, and care, *requires nuanced analysis across many factors*, not limited to, but including, agency, authority, role, gender, sexuality, race, culture, age, and disability.

ROCKENSTEIN MEMO ENDS HERE

Grounded Community Norms:

At the invitation of the Racial Equity Report Implementation Team (RERIT), the Presbytery Leadership Team (PLT) would like to name grounded, community norms for the Jan. 10 presbytery meeting which will consider the gracious separation of Church of All Nations.

2 Key Values

1. Holding the both/and realities with clarity and focus on the current issue.

Because of the long history, and the issue currently at hand - we are aware we all are shaped by our current identities and the length and aspects we have engaged with regarding CAN before (as well as other experiences with racism, potential misconduct, etc). Knowing that this calls up memories for everyone that go far beyond the topics and terms of gracious separation, we will endeavor to speak to the issue at hand with clarity of focusing on what is before us today.

2. Holding a clear view of the I/Thou of each other

(a) I/Thou is a recognition that in many patterns of communication we can default to seeing our own position, ideas and self as whole and complex, while reducing others to caricatures. "Thou" therefore invites us to remember each other, our positions and our ideas as whole, complex people who are often working from similar hopes, if finding different answers. This attitude allows us to work from points of connection towards mutual respect, understanding and solutions.

(b) Furthermore, recognizing that many in the presbytery already have long histories with one another - whether wonderful or messy ...and that, in the future we will have many more opportunities to work together for the flourishing of God's creation, we will engage relationally with each other, allowing those past and future points of connection to hold us together in devotion and mutual trust.

How might this look?

- **Be present as fully as possible.** Be here with your doubts, fears and failings as well as your convictions, joys and successes, your listening as well as your speaking.
- **Speak your truth in ways that respect other people's truth.** Speak from your center, using "I" statements, trusting people to do their own sifting and winnowing.
- **Learn to respond to others with honest, open questions...** With such questions, we help "hear each other into deeper speech."
- **When the going gets rough, turn to wonder.** If you feel judgmental, or defensive, ask yourself, "I wonder what brought them to this belief?" "I wonder what they're feeling right now?" "I wonder what my reaction teaches me about myself?" Set aside judgment to listen to others—and to yourself—more deeply.

- **Trust and learn from the silence.** Silence is a gift in our noisy world, and a way of knowing in itself. Treat silence as a member of the group. After someone has spoken, take time to reflect without immediately filling the space with words.
- **Attend to your own inner teacher.** We learn from others, of course. But as we explore, we have a special opportunity to learn from within. So pay close attention to your own reactions and responses, which are your most important teacher.
- **Know that it's possible...** to leave with whatever it was that you needed when you arrived, and that the seeds planted here can keep growing in the days ahead.

*These norms are adapted from the **Circle of Trust® Touchstones**, developed by Parker J. Palmer and the Center for Courage & Renewal.*

Statement Regarding the Theology and Polity of The Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (PTCA) in the midst of its Separation from Church Of All Nations (CAN)

We, the Presbytery Leadership Team, feel called to speak for the record to the wider polity and theology we must hold as true at this significant moment in the relationship between Church of All Nations (CAN) and the Presbytery of the Twin Cities Area (Presbytery).

I. The Trust Clause and the Building

After our experience with the Eden Prairie church in 2018 we are aware that Minnesota civil law currently does not support upholding the our polity's trust clause (G-4.0203), and therefore that the Presbytery is not likely to prevail in civil court in regards to ownership of the building occupied by CAN.

The Trust Clause is a clarification of an essential tenet of Presbyterian theology, namely the belief that none of us exists alone, but that all of us – from individual church members to the Moderator of the General Assembly – are only empowered to do ministry because of the legal, financial, logistical, spiritual, and connectional support *provided by the entire body*. Each individual congregation and council exists because *all* of them exist, and the integrity of each individual relies on the integrity of the entire collective.

In the negotiations for Gracious Separation, CAN has been unwilling to engage in any consideration of the Trust Clause, instead insisting on retaining ownership of the building without further compensation to the Presbytery. CAN negotiators have also rejected inclusion of any form of a Reversion Clause, which had been included in previous Gracious Separation agreements.

In light of this refusal to negotiate, the Presbytery states again its belief that regardless of who might hold legal title to property in which a Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) (PC(USA)) congregation does ministry, the property truly belongs to Presbyterians everywhere for their use in glorifying God and preaching the Gospel. The Presbytery joins in lament with generations of former members of Shiloh Bethany Presbyterian Church who gifted their building to the nascent Church of All Nations in hope that it would nurture healthy ministry in the Reformed tradition for years to come.

II. Accountability

The concept of ministry in the PC(USA) is grounded in community, created by the Holy Spirit, and mutual accountability to God through this community. Every aspect of the life of the church—discerning a call to ordered ministry, entering into and dissolving pastoral calls, the governing of a council, ecclesial discipline—is done in community and grounded in relationships. When relationships are allowed to wither and decline, as the relationship between CAN and the Presbytery has, accountability often becomes a casualty.

Lack of accountability between CAN and the Presbytery is not a new phenomenon. Neither body has found resolution, and the chasm has widened. The breaking point was reached when CAN decided to circumvent PC(USA) polity regarding the reporting of potential clergy misconduct directly to the Presbytery, instead deciding to conduct their own internal investigation. When the allegations of misconduct were reported to the Presbytery months later, CAN had already made their own judgment about the allegations without allowing the full and proper process to unfold.

Before the Presbytery's investigatory process could begin, however, Jin Kim renounced jurisdiction and set aside his ordination stating that he did not trust that the Presbytery would treat him or CAN fairly in the disciplinary process. In other words, Jin Kim allowed fear of *potential* harm to him to take precedence over the *actual* harm that inevitably results from unaddressed allegations of clergy misconduct. Regardless of what the outcome of a full investigation might have been, the Presbytery believes that when allegations of misconduct by spiritual leaders are improperly investigated, there is lasting damage to the witness of the Gospel and the body of Christ.

The historical relationship of CAN and the Presbytery is complex and contains many stories of both joy and pain. As in any conflictual relationship, each party has its own understanding and experience, and no single person can contain or truly understand the entirety of this relationship. However, the Presbytery states firmly that Jin Kim's refusal to participate in the investigative, accountability, and disciplinary processes mandated by *The Book of Order* and his ordination vows is at the heart of the fracture between CAN and the Presbytery. As long as CAN continues to choose him as their leader, despite unanswered misconduct allegations, this is also the *primary and presenting reason* why there is no Reformed body that will receive the Church of All Nations while Jin Kim is their pastor.

We believe in the movement of the Spirit, and we live in the hope that Jin Kim and CAN will be moved to turn and face the now 100+ people who have

signed a letter dated November 7, 2025, who are seeking recognition, proper investigation, and repair for harms they say they've experienced during their time at CAN. In the meantime, the Presbytery has pledged to seek pathways to offer support and pastoral care for those who no longer find a church home at CAN.

We acknowledge that this season and this process have been painful for many, including current members of CAN, *former* members and friends of CAN, many participants in the Presbytery, and the wider body of Christ. We acknowledge the deep grief that results from the parting of ways between churches and denominations, and so we ground ourselves in the commitment to naming and caring for that grief. We in the Presbytery commit ourselves to continued learning, growth, care for others, engagement with boundaries and ethical ministry, and healing among our congregations and leaders.

Affirmed by the Leadership Team of the Presbytery Leadership Team

December 16, 2025

RE Elsa Kendig, PLT Chair

TE Paul Moore, Moderator

RE Sue Goodspeed, Vice-Moderator

TE Becca Fletcher, At Large PLT member

RE Rocky Rockenstein, At Large PLT member

TE Heather Grantham, At Large PLT member