

AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL: Fox, Ralston Aoki, Lee, Beahen, Smith, Nailon, Kirkeeng, Dlugose, Murphy
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
3. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
 - A. Consideration of minutes from June 26, 2025
4. CHAIR REPORT
5. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. RPHC work and community engagement
 1. Obergefell event planning update
 2. August Night Out outreach at Parker Station Flats
 3. September community engagement event at Manor Park or South Halifax Park
 4. Main Street Meet and greet
 - B. Update on proposed ordinance to make temporary camping on city property a misdemeanor crime
 - C. Update on proposed equity charter amendment
 - D. Communications plan review and discussion
6. NEW BUSINESS
 - A.
 1. Participation in DEI Commissions event in Minnetonka, Sept. 30 at 6:00 PM, RSVP by 8/19
 2. Participation in Restorative Practices workshop on 8/1, hosted by Golden Valley
7. COMMISSIONER REPORTS:
8. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Questions from new members?
9. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes for RPHC Subcommittee Meeting on July 7, 2025

Present: Julie Ralston Aoki, Kristyn Lee, Patrick Nailon

Started at 6:05

- 1) Proposed equity amendment. Reviewed and discussed draft letter with proposed text based on discussion at the HRC meeting. Agreed that the letter accurately captured HRC comments and approved for sending.
- 2) Community engagement
 1. Discussed Parker Station Flats/National Night event. Plan is to share about HRC, who we are, what we do. Will bring copies of RPHC plan and info about QR code survey. Find out if there are likely to be kids—if so, Kristyn can paint faces and do balloon animals
 2. Robbins Landing: Recommend HRC should have a next steps meeting with any residents who are interested, aiming for August. To dos:
 - i. Kristyn to ask COPE about engagement;
 - ii. Julie will talk to Phillip about his ideas
 - iii. Julie to reach out to Carlos about follow up with Lilac Parkway and their interest in another meeting; if Carlos can't, Julie will
 3. Discussed additional outreach ideas. Recommend a fall event at South Halifax park or Manor Park, aiming for a Saturday morning or early evening in September. Details:
 - i. Would like to provide food—grill hotdogs, hamburgers?
 - ii. Patrick will reach out to Parks and Rec department about interest in collaboration on this event
 - iii. Parks are in Ward 4—Patrick will invite Aaron and ask if he has any ideas
 - iv. Julie to reach out to Phillip—could include police in some way, also ask about interest, helping with grilling?
 - v. Combine with other resources—backpack giveaways, or book giveaway; (Kristyn to look into options)
 - vi. Car seat giveaway? (Patrick to look into)
 - vii. Talk to Courtney about Lions support
 - viii. Find a speaker about landlord tenant rights—Hennepin ARS? (Julie to ask)
 - ix. Discussed ideas for publicity: Lit drop 2 weeks, publicize thru school district, and ask about distributing flyers in backpacks at Kristyn's school

Next subcommittee meeting: 7/28 at 6:30 PM Manor Park Building

Adjourned at 7:00 PM

Obergefell and Arthur – a love story

James Obergefell & John Arthur: A Love Story That Changed History

James Obergefell and John Arthur were a devoted couple from Cincinnati, Ohio, whose quiet life and enduring relationship would become the catalyst for one of the most significant civil rights cases in modern American history. They met in the early 1990s and soon formed a loving partnership built on mutual respect, shared values, and deep commitment. For over two decades, they built a life together in Ohio, a state that, at the time, refused to legally recognize same-sex relationships.

In 2011, John Arthur was diagnosed with ALS (Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis), a terminal neurodegenerative disease that quickly began to rob him of his physical abilities. As his condition worsened, the couple made the decision to marry—a symbolic and deeply personal affirmation of their bond. Because Ohio did not permit or recognize same-sex marriage, they had to travel to a state where it was legal. In July 2013, with Arthur's health in rapid decline, they chartered a medically equipped plane and flew to Maryland. On the tarmac at Baltimore-Washington International Airport, they were married in a brief, heartfelt ceremony, with John lying on a stretcher.

When they returned to Ohio, the state refused to recognize their marriage, even as John's death approached. This meant that James would not be listed as the surviving spouse on John's death certificate. Determined to have their marriage honored with dignity and legality, James filed suit against the state of Ohio, beginning what would ultimately become *Obergefell v. Hodges*.

John Arthur passed away on October 22, 2013. Though he did not live to see the Supreme Court decision, his and James's love story lived on. Their fight culminated in a landmark 5–4 ruling on June 26, 2015, which guaranteed same-sex couples the constitutional right to marry—securing their place in American legal and civil rights history.

Obergefell v. Hodges (2015) – Case Summary

Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. 644 (2015), was a landmark decision by the United States Supreme Court that guaranteed the fundamental right to marry for same-sex couples under the Constitution. Decided on June 26, 2015, the case effectively legalized same-sex marriage across all 50 states.

Background

The case originated when James Obergefell sued Richard Hodges, the Director of the Ohio Department of Health, for refusing to recognize his marriage to John Arthur, which had been legally performed in Maryland. Arthur was terminally ill, and the couple wanted Ohio to recognize their marriage on Arthur's death certificate. Ohio, however, banned same-sex marriage, both in performing and recognizing out-of-state marriages.

Obergefell's case was consolidated with other similar cases from Michigan, Kentucky, and Tennessee, all challenging state bans on same-sex marriage or the refusal to recognize such marriages performed legally elsewhere.

Legal Question

The central legal questions before the Court were:

1. Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex?
2. Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to recognize a same-sex marriage legally performed in another state?

Supreme Court Decision

In a 5-4 decision, the Court ruled in favor of Obergefell. Justice Anthony Kennedy delivered the majority opinion, stating that the right to marry is a fundamental liberty guaranteed by the Due Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court concluded that denying same-sex couples the right to marry violated their constitutional rights.

Impact

The ruling required all states to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples and to recognize marriages performed in other jurisdictions. It marked a historic moment in the LGBTQ+ rights movement and overturned bans in 13 states at the time of the decision.

Dissent

Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Scalia, Thomas, and Alito each wrote dissenting opinions, arguing that the Constitution does not address marriage and that such matters should be decided by the people through the democratic process—not by judicial decree.