SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 1/2
2021 MUNICIPAL EQUALITY INDEX SCORECARD

I. Non-Discrimination Laws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<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

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
Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits
City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance
Inclusive Workplace

**Score:** 28 out of 28

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
NDO Enforcement by Human Rights Commission
LGBTQ+ Liaison in City Executive’s Office

**Score:** 12 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.

LGBTQ+ Liaison/Task Force in Police Department
Reported 2019 Hate Crimes Statistics to the FBI

**Score:** 22 out of 22

V. Leadership on LGBTQ+ 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
Leadership’s Pro-Equality Legislative or Policy Efforts

**Score:** 8 out of 8

TOTAL SCORE 100 + TOTAL FLEX SCORE 11 = Final Score 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.

PTS FOR SEXUAL ORIENTATION PTS FOR GENDER IDENTITY PTS FOR CRITERIA NOT ACCESSIBLE TO ALL CITIES AT THIS TIME.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT CITY SELECTION, CRITERIA OR THE MEI SCORING SYSTEM, PLEASE VISIT HRC.ORG/MEI.

All cities rated were provided their scorecard in advance of publication and given the opportunity to submit revisions. For feedback regarding a particular city’s scorecard, please email mail@hrc.org.