

Sioux Falls HR Ordinance Chapter 39 Amendment

On June 14, the Sioux Falls City Council will vote on a controversial Amendment to the city's personnel ordinance (Section 39) giving special rights to individuals based on their "gender identity," a term that is undefined in the Amendment.

There are many concerns about the Amendment. Here are a few:

- It endangers the right to privacy and safety of city workers and citizens visiting government facilities.
- Any city-owned facility where city employees work on the premises will now be required to open all sex-segregated facilities to gender-confused men and women.
- An open bathroom policy gives legal permission for voyeurs and sexual predators to enter opposite sex restroom and locker rooms. Since gender identity is a personal, internal "sense" that cannot be questioned when an individual enters a sex-segregated area, this policy creates an environment where the protection of the right to privacy and safety can only take effect **after** someone is harmed. Then it's too late.
- "Gender identity" is not restricted to only two sexes – male and female. Facebook currently lists over 60 possible "gender identities," and gender activists claim there are an infinite number. Most people have the misconception that gender identity is defined only as men who think they are women, and vice versa.
- "Gender identity" does not mean men have to be dressed like women to use sex-segregated facilities. Just recently, for example, a man dressed in jeans and a t-shirt with a stubbly beard decided to use the women's dressing room in a Texas department store simply because the store's "gender identity" policy allowed it. Policies and laws like the proposed Amendment create the conditions where these types of invasions of privacy are becoming commonplace.
- The Amendment's supporters are hoping you won't focus on this Amendment because it's just about "city employees." But Sioux Falls city employees deserve to have their privacy and safety protected, as do citizens visiting the city's public facilities.
- This Amendment is just the beginning of the transgender activists' "wish list." If this Amendment passes, there will soon be a proposed ordinance requiring that all "private" businesses follow suit.
- State lawmakers have rejected similar legislation that would jeopardize the safety and privacy of women and children.

Federal law already covers employment non-discrimination. So do the state laws of South Dakota. There's no need to create a controversial new "civil right" just for Sioux Falls that endangers its citizens and denies basic protections.

It would be better to **strike** most of the existing language in Chapter 39.042, and **replace** it with a statement similar to the City's current Equal Opportunity statement:

"The City of Sioux Falls does not discriminate in the provision of services and in employment. The City treats all people with respect based on their dignity and worth as a human being, which cannot be enhanced or diminished by government. The City hires, employs and promotes individuals based solely on individual merit and job performance. No person in the civil service shall be appointed, reduced or removed, or in any way favored or discriminated against on any unlawful basis, consistent with South Dakota and federal law."

TAKE ACTION NOW by contacting the Sioux Falls City Council Members (<http://siouxfalls.org/council/members>) and respectfully ask them to **VOTE NO** on the **HRO Ch. 39 Amendment** and 'if needed' replace it with the verbiage above.