

Valparaiso Advisory Human Relations Council
Minutes of Meeting — March 22, 2016

Present: Heath Carter (Chair), Bill Oeding, Tatiana Cochran, Jacob Williams, Ivan Bodensteiner, Michael Glorioso, John Albers, Angelys Torres, and Marisa Johnson

Absent: Beth Wrobel, Bill Lewis, Ric Frataccia, Cicely Powell, Jake Klotz, and Mike Brickner

1. Minutes of the February 23, 2016 meeting were approved.
2. Heath Carter, Chair, introduced the layout of the meeting and asked Mayor Costas to say a few words about the proposed ordinance.
3. Mayor Costas thanked the members of the HRC and the audience for engaging in good conversations. He underscored the value of citizen input in the draft ordinance. He mentioned that reconciliation is an important piece of the ordinance and that there are about 19 other communities that have passed similar ordinances.
4. Patrick Lyp, General Counsel for the City of Valparaiso, provided an overview of the ordinance as it stands now. He prefaces it by saying that while the document is not perfect, it is a good starting point for conversation. Some of it has been crafted to reflect similar wording as other ordinances (South Bend, Carmel, Munster, etc.) but the goal was to make the document unique to Valparaiso. He notes that some communities did not address reconciliation. Another goal of the document is to make it readable and avoid *legalese*. Lyp stated that his role is not to defend the document but to try to explain some of the wording. He proceeded to read select portions of the proposed ordinance. He notes that sexual orientation and gender identity, unlike the other groups, do not currently have federal protections.
5. HRC members made a variety of comments including:
 - A. concerns about the religious exemption provided in Section 4(a)9 and the exclusion of the LGBT community
 - B. clarification required for Section 4(a)9 wording “provides services of a personal nature”
 - C. section 2 being called a “Policy” may be problematic, renaming or adding a separate section
 - D. concerns about providing religious preference
 - E. concerns about the danger in punishing those who bring forth complaints
 - F. concerns about disparate impact of certain communities
 - G. concerns about having such a small body to hear complaints, the possibility of adding more people to the Investigation & Reconciliation Committee
6. Heath Carter assured that all members of the HRC had an opportunity to speak before asking for audience input. Members of the audience expressed similar concerns, and additionally added:
 - A. the importance of this ordinance in light of the upcoming award for best communities
 - B. the issue that Whereas #5 is stated in the negative

- C. the possibility that Valparaiso University should have an appointment on the IRC
- D. the issue that the IRC gets involved late in the process, making a better timeline
- E. the idea of adding socio-economic status as a protected group
- F. support of a 5-person IRC committee
- G. looking into the number of clubs or organizations that would be excluded if the ordinance is passed as is
- H. the conflict of interest involved in having the City Attorney investigate these cases, what if a complaint is brought against the city

7. The next meeting is April 5th, 2016 at 5:30 pm at City Hall.

8. Meeting was adjourned at 7:02 pm.