The information contained in this publication is always subject to change, as new laws and policies are being enacted almost every day. The Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force will issue periodic updates of this publication to reflect these changes.

Please send any corrections, updates and comments to:
GLBT Civil Rights Laws Update
c/o The NGLTF Policy Institute
355 Lexington Avenue, 3rd Floor
New York, NY 10017
Tel: 212-697-5449
Fax: 212-697-7083
Email: pubcorrections@ngltf.org
Website: www.ngltf.org
Introduction

This publication lists state and municipal laws that concern gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender rights. These include hate crimes laws, sodomy statutes, domestic partnership laws and registries, anti-same-gender marriage statutes, and state, city, and county ordinances which include coverage against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Wherever possible, gay rights laws that have been repealed have also been included.

This report gives an overview of the legal status of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people nationally and state by state. It provides details about what kinds of discrimination civil rights laws ban, what benefits domestic partnership measures provide and what penalties the hate crimes laws enforce, what penalties anti-gay laws require. Whenever possible, details regarding the obstacles present in the enforcement of existing laws are given. Additionally, complex genealogies of laws have been provided when that information was available and relevant.

Municipal and state law making on issues affecting gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons is very dynamic. Laws are introduced, passed, challenged and even repealed each month. Researchers and readers would be wise to remember that any listing of laws in an area filled with as much activity as this will change rapidly and continuously. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force tracks local and state gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender laws and welcomes all corrections, additions and clarifications for future updates.

Summary of Civil Rights Laws Included in this Publication

Statewide Civil Rights Laws: For each state listed, numerical codes indicate what areas of coverage are included in civil rights laws, if any. For example, if a state has a civil rights law which protects all the residents of the state from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in public employment, a “1” will be listed next to the state name to indicate this coverage.

Hate Crimes Laws: Hate crimes laws include measures for data collection and/or increased penalty for crimes motivated by bias. States with such laws keep a record of bias crimes (crimes committed because of bias on the basis of race, age, national origin, sexual orientation or whatever categories are included in the law) and/or give a more severe punishment to people who commit crimes motivated by bias. In this publication, a footnote details if the law only covers data collection, but does not include an increased penalty.

Sodomy Laws: Almost half of the states in the U.S. still have statutes which criminalize “sodomy.” “Sodomy” is defined in a number of ways, always as sexual acts that are criminalized either because of the body parts involved or the gender of the persons engaging in sexual relations. This publication, lists whether a state has a sodomy statute and, if so, what it is called, whether it applies only to same-gender sex, and what punishment it entails.
**Local Laws:** Cities and counties can also pass civil rights laws which protect people from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. In this publication, cities with laws against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation are listed by state, and the scope of coverage provided by local laws is indicated by numerical codes.

**Domestic Partnership:** Domestic partnership is the general term for a number of different kinds of laws related to state recognition of the committed relationships of unmarried persons. Domestic partnership is important for same-gender couples because they are not permitted to marry by law in the U.S., so they do not have access to the rights and privileges that come with marriage. In some situations, domestic partnership can help such couples gain access to some of the rights and privileges of marital status.

One common confusion about domestic partnership is the difference between the policies of private companies and recognition by states and cities. Private domestic partnership policies are not included in this publication. Such lists are maintained by and available from the NGLTF Policy Institute. This publication only lists cities and states that recognize domestic partners.

Domestic partnership recognition in cities and states varies greatly, from allowing couples to register as partners with the state, city, or county, to providing partner benefits for state, city or county employees, to recognition which only extends as far as partner memberships in city swimming pools. Whenever available, detailed descriptions of the kind of domestic partnership benefits offered is provided. However, in some places the only information available was the existence of a domestic partnership policy; the scope of that recognition was not clear.

**Anti-Same-Gender Marriage Laws:** In all fifty states today, marriages are not allowed between persons of the same gender. Since the early 1990’s a law suit has challenged the state of Hawaii to grant marriage licenses to same-gender couples. The case is now on appeal, after a favorable lower court decision. Regardless of the outcome in Hawaii, many states have enacted a flurry of anti-gay marriage laws. In 1996, the U.S. Congress passed the “Defense of Marriage Act” (DOMA), a law which may be unconstitutional, giving states and the federal government the ability to refuse to recognize same-gender marriages granted in states which make them legal. States have also passed their own laws stating that they will not recognize same-gender marriages allowed in other states.

**Executive Orders:** In many states, laws against discrimination are won through executive orders issued by governors. This publication indicates when an anti-discrimination law has been won through executive order. In some states, executive orders are automatically passed on to a new governor unless s/he specifically chooses to remove them. In other states, executive orders are not passed on to a new governor unless s/he specifically chooses to re-issues them. When executive orders appear in this publication, the year indicated is the year that they were first issued. If an anti-discrimination executive order is in danger of being removed at the end of a governor’s term, it is so indicated.
Methodology

The information in this report was gathered through phone calls to local civil rights organizations, city clerks, human rights commissions, governors' offices and human resource offices in the places listed, as well as through reference to city, county and state webpages. The research began with the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund list of gay rights ordinances, a list of places with domestic partnership provided on the Human Rights Campaign's webpage, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force's publications All Politics Is Local and Capital Gains and Losses. The information from these publications was confirmed and corrected, and additions were made through phone and Internet contacts.

Every effort was made to include all civil rights achievements in cities, states and counties in the US in this report, but it is inevitable that some were missed and that some changes will occur between the time of writing and the time of publication. We apologize for any omissions or mistakes, and encourage you to contact us with updates and corrections so that we can continue to report the most up-to-date information possible. Many thanks to those who contributed information to this publication, and to the activists, politicians and voters who have promoted an anti-discrimination agenda.

Discussion

Throughout the process of gathering information which would give a sense of the climate of the places surveyed for lesbian and gay civil rights, what was continually apparent was the diversity of ways in which gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender rights are secured and protected. Behind almost every accomplishment or setback, there is a long story of compromise and struggle. These stories range from the passage of domestic partnership legislation which is immediately undermined through defunding (D.C.); to hate crimes bills which fail to include heightened criminal penalties for hate crimes involving sexual orientation (MT, UT); to slow, incremental achievement of employment non-discrimination laws through continued negotiation with state government (CA). Prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation are located not only in legislation that passes city councils and state legislatures, but also in personnel policies and human resource guidelines. The politics that surround the acquisitions of these policies are often heated, especially as right-wing politicians and activists target these developments. The result is too often the repeal of laws detailed throughout this report, such as the case in Salt Lake City, Utah where an anti-discrimination law passed in December, 1997 and was repealed in January, 1998. Additional problems occur when, after much hard work to pass an anti-discrimination ordinance, courts refuse to enforce the legislation (TX), or when a law is unenforceable because some fundamental part of it, like the right to go to court with claims (Northampton County, PA) or the funding to enforce it (Lancaster, PA), is omitted from the legislation. In these ways, the work of activists is often undermined or compromised.
Civil rights legislation that includes sexual orientation is often hard won, but can be achieved in some of the most unlikely places, and through surprising tactics. In Shorewood Hills, WI, the first domestic partnership legislation passed only covers city pool memberships. This seems small, but it is the doorway through which activists there are now making far greater steps toward equal benefits for unmarried partners. In Troy, ID, a city of less than 700 people, anti-discrimination legislation in public employment has been protecting lesbian and gay employees since 1994. These cities are examples of the ways in which civil rights advances are made in small steps, and through strange chronologies, but can, nonetheless, prevail*.

This report is filled with examples of the gradual expansions of civil rights laws to include people previously not protected against discrimination because of their sexual and gender identity. In the past few years, many cities have considered, and some passed, anti-discrimination ordinances and policies that specifically protect transgendered people. However, such laws are still too rare. Hopefully expansions will continue, and repeals will be warded off by activists and supportive political leaders working hard for equality in their local communities.

Federal Civil Rights Laws

Currently, there is no federal civil rights law which prohibits discrimination in public employment, public accommodations, private employment, education, housing, credit, and/or union practices. However, there are some federal civil rights laws and policies which are relevant to the status of GLBT people in the US.

Executive Orders: On May 28, 1998, President Clinton signed an executive order entitled Further Amendment to Executive Order 11478, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government. The order provides a uniform policy for the Federal government which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the federal civilian workforce. It is the first time that the policy has been stated in the executive order of the President. This executive order adds “sexual orientation” to the list of categories for which discrimination is prohibited in Executive Order 11478 (i.e. race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, or age).

Federal Employment: In 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act established the US Office of Special Council to investigate allegations of prohibited personnel practices in the Civil Service. In 1980, the act was interpreted to include sexual orientation discrimination as a prohibited personnel practice. This interpretation was reiterated by James King, Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in a 1994 letter. However, no cases have yet been ruled on by the Office of Special Council under this interpretation. Sources at the Federal government report that the agencies do not routinely inform employees about their right to file complaints of sexual orientation discrimination. The President's recent executive order seeks to create a uniform policy and establish channels for redress in keeping with preexisting policy.

Hate Crimes: The Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990 requires the Justice Department to collect statistics on bias crime committed on the basis of a number of categories, including sexual orientation. In 1996, the act was reauthorized and data collection extended to the year 2002. This act only requires data collection and does not give the federal government authority to prosecute anti-GLBT crimes. Prosecution of bias crimes is currently a local and state matter. Currently, under the Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act, an anti-GLBT crime can be prosecuted federally only if it occurs on federal property, such as a national park. In order to expand federal prosecution of hate crimes, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act (HCPA) has been introduced into the U.S. Congress. The HCPA would enable federal prosecution and enhanced penalties for crimes manifesting bias based on perceived, or real, sexual orientation, race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender and disability.

Sodomy: The Uniform Code of Military Justice includes a sodomy provision. This provision makes sodomy punishable by imprisonment. It is generally enforced in cases of non-consensual sodomy, especially cases involving minors, but it has been enforced in cases involving consensual sodomy between adults.

Domestic Partnership: Currently, there is no federal domestic partnership benefits policy.
Key to the States

On the following pages you’ll find an alphabetical guide to state and local laws and policies concerning sexual orientation. It is designed to be as “user friendly” as possible. Both state and local laws have been analyzed and charted into a grid corresponding to seven different categories of protection. They are:

- public employment = 1
- public accommodations = 2
- private employment = 3
- education = 4
- housing = 5
- credit = 6
- union practices = 7

Below is a model demonstrating the layout of information:

Any State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Rights Protections (if any)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State hate crimes legislation (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of state sodomy law(s) (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State anti-same-sex marriage law (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State domestic partnership law (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City (County) Year of Passage

Civil Rights Protections

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Domestic partnership laws: Locality (Year of Passage)
State By State

Numerical Codes for Civil Rights Laws:
- public employment = 1
- public accommodations = 2
- private employment = 3
- education = 4
- housing = 5
- credit = 6
- union practices = 7

Alabama

Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1998

Alaska

Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1980)
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Arizona

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
Sodomy laws: M 13-1411, Crime Against Nature (anal intercourse), 30 days/$500; M 13-1412, Lewd and Lascivious Acts, 30 days/$500
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Phoenix (Maricopa) 1992 1 1,012,230
Tucson (Pima) 1997 1 3 415,079


Arkansas

No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
Sodomy law: M 5-14-111, Sodomy, 1 year, $1000, same-gender only.
Passed and signed into law by governor in 1977.
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed 1997

California

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (Repealed in 1976)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Alameda County 1990 1 1,345,900
Alameda City 1978 1 5 6 78,500
Berkeley (Alameda) 1978 1 3 4 5 6 7 101,724
Cathedral City (Riverside) 1987 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 33,570
Cupertino (Santa Clara) 1975 1 41,723
 Daly City (San Mateo) 1976 1 93,358
Davis (Yolo) 1986 1 2 3 5 6 7 47,191

2 Arizona hate crime data collection law includes sexual orientation, but hate crime penalty laws do not.
4 1979 by executive order under Gov. Jerry Brown. California also has protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in insurance. In 1990 the state Health and Safety Code was revised to add section 1365.3 which prohibits discrimination by HMO’s.
5 1951.
6 1979-1990. Protection against discrimination in private employment has been incremental. In 1979 openly gay people gained this protection in a California Supreme Court’s decision. The Court understood sections 1101 and 1102 of the Labor Code which protect employees’ political actions and affiliations to protect an employee’s choice to be openly homosexual as a political act. This was extended to closeted homosexual employees by an attorney general’s opinion in 1985 which ruled that the choice to not be open about one’s homosexuality is also a political act and employers may not discriminate against closeted homosexuals as well. In 1990, Gov. Wilson signed into law the addition to the Labor Code, section 1102.5, which made discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in private employment illegal and punishable through fines and civil penalties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayward (Alameda)</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>115,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach (Orange)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>123457</td>
<td>23,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>438,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>3,489,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>66,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland (Alameda)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>373,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica (San Mateo)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside (Riverside)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento (Sacramento)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>382,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (San Diego)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>1,148,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco (San Francisco)</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>728,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>369,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>87,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>123456</td>
<td>35,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**Colorado**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen (Pitkin)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>5,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder (Boulder)</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>89,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>225,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crested Butte</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver (Denver)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>123457</td>
<td>483,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>106,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>498,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telluride (Denver)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

¹¹In California, all domestic partnership registries and benefits for city workers apply to opposite-sex and same-sex couples with the exception of some benefits in Oakland. The dental and vision benefits granted to domestic partners of city employees in Oakland in 1995 were for same-sex and opposite-sex couples, but the medical benefits added later were specified only for same-sex couples. This is currently being challenged by lawyers who assert that this distinction is not legal under California state laws.

¹²In 1989, Los Angeles extended sick leave and bereavement leave benefits to domestic partners. In 1994, medical, dental and vision benefits were added.

¹³San Francisco has a domestic partnership registry only, and does not have domestic partnership benefits for city employees.

¹⁴In 1995, West Hollywood got its domestic partnership registry. The benefits for city employees were added in 1987.

¹⁵Amendment 2, an anti-gay ballot initiative passed in 1992, forbid the implementation of local civil rights laws. On May 20, 1996, the US Supreme Court ruled 6-3 in the historic case Romer v. Evans to declare Amendment 2 unconstitutional.

¹⁶Repealed in 1972.

¹⁷Repealed in 1978.
Delaware

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1973)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Statewide domestic partnership (1992)

District of Columbia

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1993)
No anti-same-gender marriage law
Districtwide domestic partnership (1992)

Florida

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: M 800.02, Unnatural and Lascivious Act, 60 days/$500
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed 1997

### Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta (Fulton)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>394,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>648,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lythia Springs</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tybee Island</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic partnership: Atlanta (1993)

---

### Hawaii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu (Honolulu)</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>371,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu County</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>836,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic partnership: Honolulu (1997)

---

### Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Illinois

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champaign (Champaign)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>64,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago (Cook)</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,768,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5,105,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston (Cook)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>74,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>15,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park (Cook)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>54,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana (Champaign)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>36,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

### Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>61,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>45,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lafayette</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>26,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic partnership: Bloomington (executive order, 1997)

---

### State By State Numerical Codes for Civil Rights Laws:

- **Public employment** = 1
- **Public accommodations** = 2
- **Private employment** = 3
- **Education** = 4
- **Housing** = 5
- **Credit** = 6
- **Union practices** = 7

---

**Georgia**

- No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
- Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

- Atlanta (Fulton) 1996: 1
- Fulton County 1992: 4
- Lythia Springs 1997: 1
- Tybee Island 1996: 1

Domestic partnership: Atlanta (1993)

**Hawaii**

- No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1973)
- Anti-same-gender marriage measure which will go to voters for possible ratification in 1998 passed in 1997
- Statewide domestic partnership (1997)

- Honolulu (Honolulu) 1988: 1
- Honolulu County 1988: 1

**Idaho**

- Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
- Sodomy law: F 18-6-605, Crime Against Nature, 5 years to life
- Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

- Troy 1994: 1

**Illinois**

- Sexual orientation included in hate crimes law.
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1962)
- Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

- Champaign (Champaign) 1977: 1
- Chicago (Cook) 1988: 1
- Cook County 1993: 1
- Evanston (Cook) 1980: 1
- La Grange 1993: 1
- Oak Park (Cook) 1993: 1
- Urbana (Champaign) 1979: 1


**Indiana**

- No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1977)
- Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1997

- Bloomington: 1
- Lafayette: 1
- West Lafayette: 1

Domestic partnership: Bloomington (executive order, 1997)

---

*2By executive order, 1996.
*Anti-discrimination efforts in Bloomington do not assign punishment to sexual orientation discrimination that is equal to the punishment for discrimination on the basis of the other characteristics included in the laws. In sexual orientation cases, fines cannot be applied and people cannot be called in for testimony. The only power given by this ordinance is the power to publicize the case and damage the reputation of the person practicing the discriminatory practices.
Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1978)
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1998

Ames (Story) 1991 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 46,672
Iowa City (Johnson) 1997 1 2 3 6 7 59,313

Domestic partnership: Iowa City (1994)

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law based on any characteristics
Sodomy law: M 21-3505, Sodomy, 6 months/$1000, same-gender only
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Lawrence 1995 1 2 3 5 67,824
Witchita 1991 1 271,746

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (Struck down in Commonwealth v. Wasson, S.W.2d 487 (1992)
Anti-same-gender marriage bill passed in 1998

Henderson 1994 1 26,453
Louisville 1991 1 271,038

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
Same-gender marriage ban enacted in 1803

New Orleans (Orleans) 1991 1 2 3 5 489,595


---

In 1994, the Iowa City anti-discrimination ordinance was expanded to include transgendered people.

4 In 1977, Wichita passed an ordinance which protected against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in public housing, but repealed that law in 1978. Also, Wichita has a city-wide hate crimes law which includes sexual orientation as a basis for which a person can be prosecuted for bias crime (1990).

5 Henderson's protection occurred not through an ordinance passed by the city council, but through the revision of a policy in the city's personnel department.

6 Louisville has a city-wide hate crimes law.

7 Louisiana used to have a statewide executive order which protected against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in public employment, but when the current governor took office he did not choose to continue the previous governor's order, so it is no longer on the books. It stopped being effective in August of 1996.

8 The Louisiana sodomy law is currently being challenged.
### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>Portland (Cumberland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>38,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws</th>
<th>Sodomy law: F 27-553, Sodomy, 10 years F 27-554, Unnatural or Perverted Sexual Practices, 10 years/$1000. Found not to apply to noncommercial, heterosexual activity in private.</th>
<th>No anti-same-gender marriage law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore 1988</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 F 27-553, Sodomy, 10 years F 27-554, Unnatural or Perverted Sexual Practices, 10 years/$1000. Found not to apply to noncommercial, heterosexual activity in private.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard County 1976</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 187,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery County 1984</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 757,027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince George County 1991</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 729,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockville (Montgomery) 1990</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 45,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takoma Park (Prince George) 1993</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 16,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Massachusetts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amherst 1976</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 35,288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston (Suffolk) 1984</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 557,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge (Middlesex) 1984</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 93,554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malden (Middlesex) 1984</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 53,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester 1986</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 163,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 1995, a statewide anti-gay ballot measure was defeated in Maine. In 1997, Maine passed a statewide civil rights law. It was subsequently repealed by the voters in 1998 without ever taking effect.  
Lewiston had a civil rights ordinance which was passed and then repealed in 1993.  
Executive Order 1995.  
Maryland hate crime data collection law includes sexual orientation, but hate crime penalty laws do not.  
Protection in Union Practices passed in 1989. In addition to these statewide protections, the Governor's office of Massachusetts oversees the Safe Schools program for Gay and Lesbian Youth.
Missouri
Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: M 566.090, Sexual Misconduct, 1 year/$1000, same-gender only
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

- Columbia 1992: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 73,078
- Kansas City (Clay Platte) 1993: 1 2 3 4 5 7 431,553
- St. Louis 1992: 1 2 3 4 5 6 383,733

Domestic partnership: St. Louis (1997)

---

Minnesota
Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: M 609.293, Sodomy, 1 year/$3000
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1997

- Ann Arbor 1978: 1 2 3 5 6 7 109,766
- Birmingham 1992: 2 19,997
- Detroit (Wayne) 1979: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1,012,110
- East Lansing 1986: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 48,513
- Flint (Genesee) 1990: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 139,311
- Ingham County 1987: 1 282,912
- Saginaw (Saginaw) 1984: 1 4 5 70,719
- Ypsilanti 1997: 1 3 5 24,846


---

Mississippi
Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: F 97-29-59, Unnatural Intercourse, 10 years
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1997

---

Michigan
Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: 750.158, Crime Against Nature, felony with 15 year maximum
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

- Ann Arbor 1978: 1 2 3 5 6 7 109,766
- Birmingham 1992: 2 19,997
- Detroit (Wayne) 1979: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1,012,110
- East Lansing 1986: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 48,513
- Flint (Genesee) 1990: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 139,311
- Ingham County 1987: 1 282,912
- Saginaw (Saginaw) 1984: 1 4 5 70,719
- Ypsilanti 1997: 1 3 5 24,846

### Montana
- Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1997)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

### Nebraska
- Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1978)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

### Nevada
- Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1993)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

### New Hampshire
- Sexual orientation in hate crime laws
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1975)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex County</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>778,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark (Essex)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland (Essex)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Jersey
- Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1979)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex County</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>778,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark (Essex)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland (Essex)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Montana
- Montana's hate crimes law is called the Malicious Harm and Intimidation Act. This act provides a criminal penalty for harassment and intimidation, but does not include the heightened penalty for violence inspired by hate that is typically associated with hate crimes laws.
- 1998.

### New Jersey
- Executive orders in Newark and Vineland, both in Essex County, created protection against discrimination in public employment before the statewide law Against Discrimination was amended in 1992 to include protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Thus, the LAD made the city/county executive orders redundant because state law supersedes local law, but they still stand.

---

**State By State Numerical Codes for Civil Rights Laws:**
- Public employment = 1
- Public accommodations = 2
- Private employment = 3
- Education = 4
- Housing = 5
- Credit = 6
- Union practices = 7
**New Mexico**

- No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
- No sodomy law (repealed in 1975)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>398,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New York**

- Sexual orientation not in hate crime laws
- Sodomy law (Struck down in People v. Onofre 415 N.E.2d 936 (1980) but still on the books)
- No anti-same-gender marriage law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany (Albany)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred (Allegany)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton (Monroe)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo (1984)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>323,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampton 1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca (Tompkins) 1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City 1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,311,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburgh 1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester (Monroe) 1983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpoint 1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County 1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,321,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse 1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins County 1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy (Rensselaer) 1979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54,269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown 1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic partnership:

**North Carolina**

- No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
- Sodomy law: F 14-177, Crime Against Nature, 10 years/discretionary fine
- Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carborro</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh (Wake)</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**Numerical Codes for Civil Rights Laws:**
- Public employment = 1
- Public accommodations = 2
- Private employment = 3
- Education = 4
- Housing = 5
- Credit = 6
- Union practices = 7

---

*The executive order which protects against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in public employment was issued by Gov. Cuomo in the early 1980's and reissued by Gov. Pataki in 1994. New York also has some protection for same-gender couples in its rent control laws. A 1989 New York State Court of Appeals decision extended rent control to unmarried couples. In the 1997 legislation which revised rent control policies, unmarried partners were included.*

*Governor Cuomo issued an executive order which granted domestic partnership to all state employees who were involved in collective bargaining. In 1996 Governor Pataki extended this to all state employees with the exception of the NY State Senate.*
North Dakota
Sexual orientation NOT in hate crimes laws.
No sodomy law
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1997

Ohio
Sexual orientation not in hate crime laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1974)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td>21,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>364,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus (Franklin)</td>
<td>1984, 1992</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>502,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>642,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Springs (Greene)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1 2 3 5 6 7</td>
<td>1,412,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oklahoma
Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: F 21-886, Crime Against Nature, 10 years, same-gender only
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Oregon
Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1972)
No anti-same-gender marriage law
Statewide domestic partnership (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1 2 3 5</td>
<td>16,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis (Benton)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>44,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1 2 3 5</td>
<td>115,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland (Multnomah)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1 2 3 5</td>
<td>445,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic partnership; Corvallis (1997), County of Multnomah (1993), Portland (1994)

State By State
Numerical Codes for Civil Rights Laws:
public employment = 1
private employment = 3
education = 4
housing = 5
credit = 6
union practices = 7

North Dakota
641,000
Sexual orientation NOT in hate crimes laws.
No sodomy law
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1997

Ohio
1st
11,151,000
Sexual orientation not in hate crime laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1974)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Oklahoma
3,278,000
Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law: F 21-886, Crime Against Nature, 10 years, same-gender only
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Oregon
3,141,000
Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1972)
No anti-same-gender marriage law
Statewide domestic partnership (1998)

Ashland 1993 1 2 3 5 16,234
Corvallis (Benton) 1992 1 2 3 4 5 44,810
Eugene 1994 1 2 3 5 115,963
Portland (Multnomah) 1987 1 2 3 5 445,458

Domestic partnership; Corvallis (1997), County of Multnomah (1993), Portland (1994)

Cincinnati passed a civil rights law in 1991. Issue 3, an anti-gay ballot initiative, passed in 1993 forbidding the implementation of the law. The law was repealed in 1995. Issue 3 remains on appeal to the US Supreme Court.
Pennsylvania

State By State

Sexual orientation not in hate crime law
No sodomy law (Struck down in Commonwealth v. Bonadio, 415 A.2d 47 (1980))
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Harrisburg (Dauphin) 1983 1 2 3 5 6 7 53,430
Lancaster (Lancaster) 1991 1 2 3 5 6 7 57,171
Northampton County 1996 1 247,305
Philadelphia 1982 1 2 3 5 6 7 1,552,572
Pittsburgh (Allegheny) 1990 1 2 3 5 6 7 366,852
York (York) 1993 1 2 3 5 43,301


Rhode Island

Sexual orientation in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1998)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Providence 1995 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 155,418

South Carolina

No hate crime laws based on any characteristics
Sodomy law: F 16-15-120, Buggery, 5 years/$500
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Columbia 1985 1 121,819

South Dakota

Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1977)
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1996

Minnehaha County 1979 1 123,509

*Executive order (1988): activists in Pennsylvania are currently working to pass a civil rights bill which would offer statewide protection against discrimination in employment, housing and public accommodations.
*This ordinance grants protection but is unenforceable because it was defunded so that no commission exists to enforce it.
*This ordinance grants protection in public employment but is unenforceable because it does not incorporate a right to go to court with these claims. One activist described it as more of a county “aspiration” than a commitment to protection against discrimination.
*Pittsburgh’s civil rights ordinance also protects against discrimination on the basis of gender identity, thereby offering protection against discrimination against transgendered people.
Vermont

Sexual orientation in hate crime laws
No sodomy law
No anti-same-gender marriage law
Statewide domestic partnership (1991)

Burlington (Chittenden) 1992 1 3 38,569


Texas

Sexual orientation not in hate crimes laws
Sodomy law same-gender only
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Austin (Travis) 1975 1 2 3 5 6 7 492,329
Dallas 1995 1 1,022,497
Houston 1998 1 1,800,000

Domestic partnership: Austin (passed 1993, repealed 1994), Travis County (1993)

Utah

Sexual orientation in hate crimes law
Sodomy law: M 76-50403, Sodomy, 6 months/$1000
Anti-same-gender marriage law passed in 1995

Salt Lake City (Salt Lake) 53 1 165,835
Salt Lake County 1992 1 159,936

50 The hate crimes law might be interpreted to include sexual orientation but is essentially unenforceable due to the statute's vague language.
51 The Texas sodomy statute has been deemed unconstitutional in court, but remains on the books. See State v. Morales,826 S.W.2d 957 (Tex App. 1993), and City of Dallas v. England, 846 S.W.2d 957 (Tex App. 1993).
52 The hate crimes law might be interpreted to include sexual orientation but is essentially unenforceable due to the statute's vague language.
53 The hate crimes law might be interpreted to include sexual orientation but is essentially unenforceable due to the statute's vague language.
54 The hate crimes law might be interpreted to include sexual orientation but is essentially unenforceable due to the statute's vague language.
55 The state Supreme Court of Tennessee allowed to stand without review an appellate decision upholding the trial judge's finding that Tennessee's sodomy statute violated the state constitutional right to privacy. Thus, although the statute has not been removed from the books, it is constitutionally void.
Wisconsin

Sexual orientation in hate crime laws
No sodomy law (repealed in 1983)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

Dane County 1986-7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 5,123,000
Madison (Dane) 1979 1 2 3 5 6 7 367,085
Milwaukee (Milwaukee) 1987 1 2 3 5 6 7 617,043

Domestic partnership: Madison (1990), Shorewood Hills (1991)
Wyoming

No hate crimes laws based on any characteristics
No sodomy law (repealed in 1977)
No anti-same-gender marriage law

480,000

State By State

Numerical Codes
for Civil Rights Laws:

public employment = 1
public accommodations = 2
private employment = 3
education = 4
housing = 5
credit = 6
union practices = 7
Listings of States, Cities and Counties by Type of Law

States** With Hate Crimes Laws (40):
** = includes sexual orientation (25)

Alabama  slide
Alabama**  slide
Arizona**  slide
California**  slide
Connecticut**  slide
Delaware**  slide
District of Columbia**  slide
Florida**  slide
Idaho  slide
Illinois**  slide
Iowa**  slide
Kentucky**  slide
Louisiana**  slide
Maine**  slide
Maryland**  slide
Massachusetts**  slide
Michigan  slide
Minnesota**  slide
Mississippi  slide
Missouri  slide
Montana  slide

Cities, Counties and States with Domestic Partnership (55)

Albany, NY (1994)  slide
Ann Arbor, MI (1991)  slide
Atlanta, GA (1993)  slide
Baltimore, MD (1994)  slide
Berkeley, CA (1984)  slide
Bloomington, IN (1997)  slide
Boston, MA (1993)  slide
Boulder, CO (1996)  slide
Brookline, MA (1993)  slide
Burlington, VT (1993)  slide
Cambridge, MA (1992)  slide
Carborro, NC (1994)  slide
Chapel Hill, NC (1995)  slide
Chicago, IL (1997)  slide
Corvallis, OR (1997)  slide
County of King, WA (1992)  slide
County of Multnomah, OR (1993)  slide
County of Pima, AZ (1998)  slide
County of Travis, TX (1993)  slide
Denver, CO (1996)  slide
District of Columbia (1992)  slide
East Lansing, MI (1993)  slide
Hartford, CT (1993)  slide
Iowa City, IA (1994)  slide
Ithaca, NY (1990)  slide
Key West, FL (1998)  slide
Laguna Beach, CA (1990)  slide
Los Angeles, CA (1989, 1994**)
Los Angeles County, CA (1996)  slide
Madison, WI (1990)  slide
Middlebury, VT (1996)  slide
New Orleans, LA (1993)  slide
New York, NY (1993)  slide
Oakland, CA (1995, 1996)  slide
Oak Park, IL (1997)  slide
Olympia, WA (1995)  slide
Palo Alto, CA (1997)  slide
Rochester, NY (1994)  slide
Sacramento, CA (1995)  slide
San Diego, CA (1993)  slide
San Francisco, CA (1991**)
San Mateo County, CA (1992)  slide
Santa Cruz, CA (1986)  slide
Santa Cruz County, CA (1990)  slide
Seattle, WA (1994)  slide
Shorewood Hills, WI (1991**)
Springfield, MA (1997)  slide
State of Massachusetts (1992)  slide
State of Oregon (1998)  slide
State of Vermont Employees (1991)  slide
Takoma Park, MD (1994)  slide
Tucson, AZ (1997)  slide
Tumwater, WA (1997)  slide
West Hollywood, CA (1985, 1987**)
West Palm Beach, FL (1992)  slide

*Including the District of Columbia where applicable.
### States With Sodomy Statutes (19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (same-gender only)</td>
<td>Missouri (same-gender only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Oklahoma (same-gender only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas (same-gender only)</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (same-gender only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the Basis of Sexual Orientation in Public Employment (10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Arizona's hate crimes data collection law includes sexual orientation, but the state's hate crimes penalty laws do not.**

**Maryland hate crime data collection law includes sexual orientation, but hate crime penalty laws do not.**

**The hate crimes law is not currently enforceable due to the statute's vague language.**

**Utah hate crime data collection law includes sexual orientation, but hate crime penalty laws do not.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**In 1985, West Hollywood got its domestic partnership registry. The benefits for city employees were added in 1987.**
States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the
Basis of Sexual Orientation in Private Employment (11)
Minnesota (1993)

States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the
Basis of Sexual Orientation in Education (9)
Minnesota (1993)

States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the
Basis of Sexual Orientation in Housing (9)

States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the
Basis of Sexual Orientation in Credit (7)
Minnesota (1993)

States with Laws Prohibiting Discrimination on the Basis
of Sexual Orientation in Union Practices (5)
Massachusetts (1989)

States with Anti-Same-Gender Marriage Laws (29)
Alabama (1998)
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