I. Non-Discrimination Laws**

This category evaluates whether discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity is prohibited by the city, county, or state in areas of employment, housing, and public accommodations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accommodations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 30 out of 30

**FLEX**

- Single-Occupancy All-Gender Facilities: +2
- Protects Youth from Conversion Therapy: +2

**Score:** 7 out of 28

II. Municipality as Employer

By offering equivalent benefits and protections to LGBT+ employees, awarding contracts to fair-minded businesses, and taking steps to ensure an inclusive workplace, municipalities commit themselves to treating LGBT+ employees equally.

| Non-Discrimination in City Employment | COUNTY | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits | COUNTY | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance | COUNTY | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Inclusive Workplace | COUNTY | 0 | 2 | 0 |

**Score:** 7 out of 28

**FLEX**

- City Employee Domestic Partner Benefits: +1

III. Municipal Services

This section assesses the efforts of the city to ensure LGBT+ residents are included in city services and programs.

| Human Rights Commission | COUNTY | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| NDO Enforcement by Human Rights Commission | COUNTY | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| LGBT+ Liaison in City Executive’s Office | COUNTY | 0 | 5 | 0 |

**Score:** 0 out of 12

**FLEX**

- Youth Bullying Prevention Policy for City Services: +2
- City Provides Services to LGBT+ Youth: +2
- City Provides Services to LGBT+ People Experiencing Homelessness: +2
- City Provides Services to LGBT+ Older Adults: +2
- City Provides Services to People Living with HIV or AIDS: +2
- City Provides Services to the Transgender Community: +2

**Score:** 0 out of 12

IV. Law Enforcement

Fair enforcement of the law includes responsible reporting of hate crimes and engaging with the LGBT+ community in a thoughtful and respectful way.

| LGBT+ Liaison/Task Force in Police Department | MUNICIPAL | 0 | 10 |
| Reported 2019 Hate Crimes Statistics to the FBI | MUNICIPAL | 12 | 12 |

**Score:** 12 out of 22

V. Leadership on LGBT+ Equality

This category measures the city leadership’s commitment to fully include the LGBT+ community and to advocate for full equality.

| Leadership’s Public Position on LGBT+ Equality | MUNICIPAL | 0 | 5 |
| Leadership’s Pro-Equality Legislative or Policy Efforts | MUNICIPAL | 0 | 3 |

**Score:** 0 out of 8

**FLEX**

- Openly LGBT+ Elected or Appointed Leaders: +2
- City Tests Limits of Restrictive State Law: +2

**Score:** 0 out of 8

**Final Score:** 51

**TOTAL FLEX SCORE** 2

**TOTAL SCORE** 49

CANNOT EXCEED 100

**On June 15, 2020, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia that sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination are prohibited under federal sex-based employment protections. Nevertheless, it is imperative that localities continue enacting explicitly LGBT+-inclusive comprehensive non-discrimination laws since it will likely take additional litigation for Bostock to be fully applied to all sex-based protections under existing federal civil rights law. Moreover, federal law currently lacks sex-based protections in numerous key areas of life, including public spaces and services. Lastly, there are many invaluable benefits to localizing inclusive protections even when they exist on higher levels of government. For these reasons, the MEI will continue to only award credit in Part I for state, county, or municipal non-discrimination laws that expressly include sexual orientation and gender identity.**

**For more information about criteria not accessible to all cities at this time, please visit hrc.org/mei.**

**For feedback regarding a particular city’s scorecard, please email info@hrc.org.**