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#### I. Non-Discrimination Laws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Public Accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Non-Discrimination in City Employment</th>
<th>Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits</th>
<th>City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance</th>
<th>Inclusive Workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

#### II. Municipality as Employer

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

#### III. Municipal Services

- **LGBTQ+ Liaison in City Executive's Office**: +1

---
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#### IV. Law Enforcement

- **LGBTQ+ Liaison/Task Force in Police Department**: 0
- **Reported 2020 Hate Crimes Statistics to the FBI**: 12

#### V. Leadership on LGBTQ+ Equality

- **Leadership's Public Position on LGBTQ+ Equality**: 2
- **Leadership's Pro-Equality Legislative or Policy Efforts**: 1

---

**Total Score**: 70 + **Total FLEX Score**: 5 = Final Score 75

---

**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 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 mei@hrc.org.