### I. Non-Discrimination Laws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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**: 10 out of 30

**FLEX**:
- Single-Occupancy All-Gender Facilities: +0
- Protects Youth from Conversion Therapy: +0

**Score**: 14 out of 28

### II. Municipality as Employer

- Non-Discrimination in City Employment: +7
- Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits: +6
- City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance: +3
- Inclusive Workplace: +2

**Total Score**: 49

### III. Municipal Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Rights Commission</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDO Enforcement by Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTIQ+ Liaison in City Executive's Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score**: 5 out of 12

**FLEX**:
- City Contract Non-Discrimination Ordinance: +1
- City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance: +1

**Total FLEX Score**: 1

**Final Score**: 50

### IV. Law Enforcement

**Score**: 12 out of 22

### V. Leadership on LGBTQ+ Equality

**Score**: 8 out of 8

**FLEX**:
- Openly LGBTIQ+ Elected or Appointed Leaders: +2
- City Tests Limits of Restrictive State Law: +3

**Total Score**: 49 + **Total FLEX Score**: 1 = **Final Score**: 50

---

**Notes**:
- By offering equivalent benefits and protections to LGBTIQ+ employees, awarding contracts to fair-minded businesses, and taking steps to ensure an inclusive workplace, municipalities commit themselves to treating LGBTIQ+ employees equally.
- 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.
- This section assesses the efforts of the city to ensure LGBTIQ+ residents are included in city services and programs.
- 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 mai@hrc.org.
- **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 LGBTIQ+-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.**