### I. Non-Discrimination Laws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Public Accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score**: 28 out of 30

**FLEX**: Single-Occupancy All-Gender Facilities +0, Protects Youth from Conversion Therapy +0, City Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance +0

**Counties**

**Score**: 20 out of 28

**FLEX**: City Employee Domestic Partner Benefits +1

**Municipalities**

**Score**: 7 out of 12

**FLEX**: Youth Bullying Prevention Policy for City Services +1, City Provides Services to LGBTQ+ Youth +2, City Provides Services to LGBTQ+ People Experiencing Homelessness +2, City Provides Services to LGBTQ+ Older Adults +2, People Living with HIV or AIDS +2, City Provides Services to the Transgender Community +2

### 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.

### III. Municipal Services

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

### 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.

### V. Leadership on LGBTQ+ Equality

- Leadership's Pro-Equality Legislative or Policy Efforts +2

- **Score**: 7 out of 8

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

---

**Final Score**: 74

**CANNOT EXCEED 100**

---

**PTS FOR SEXUAL ORIENTATION**: +2, **PTS FOR GENDER IDENTITY**: +2, **FLEX 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.

**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.**