



George Deukmejian
Governor

Department of Fair Employment & Housing
Mark Guerra, Director

State & Consumer Services Agency
Shirley R. Chilton, Secretary

**ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF
FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
1984 - 85**

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
1984-85 ANNUAL REPORT

State of California

George Deukmejian
Governor

State and Consumer Services Agency

Shirley R. Chilton
Secretary of the Agency

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

Mark Guerra
Director



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mg:wpc

Director

Mark Guerra

The Department is working closely with community groups, professional organizations, businesses, and other governmental agencies, to ensure that the rights of California's residents to employment, housing and public accommodations are protected.

During the past year, the Department reorganized to reduce administrative costs and streamline operations. New procedures were developed to expedite case processing, improve relationships with the public and private sector, and to establish greater visibility statewide. Improved administrative procedures were introduced to support enforcement activities.

This annual report summarizes the major accomplishments and activities of the Department of Fair Employment and Housing for Fiscal Year 1984-85.

1201 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-4547

STATE AND CONSUMER SERVICES AGENCY
**Department of Fair
Employment and Housing**



10	SUMMARY
11	Employment Tables
17	Housing Tables
25	Public Service/Accommodations Tables

STATISTICAL TABLES ON EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

8	CONCLUSION
6	Round Tables
7	Public Presentations & Technical Assistance
8	Publications, News Releases, & Audiovisual Materials

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATION

5	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES
5	Automation
5	Forms Revision
6	Case Accounting Tracking System
6	Improving Facilities and Equipment
4	SIGNIFICANT LEGAL DECISIONS
4	Employment - Pregnancy Disability
4	Housing - Age Discrimination
3	LEGAL ACTIVITIES
3	Enforcement Activities
2	Complaint Processing
2	Settlement Compliance
2	Contract Compliance
3	Disability Compliance
3	Licensing Compliance

1984-85 ACHIEVEMENTS

1	Mission and Scope of Responsibility
1	Jurisdiction and Authority

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Page

ANNUAL REPORT OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING 1984-85 TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Department Mission and Scope of Responsibility

The California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) enforces State laws prohibiting discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations and public services. The Department's jurisdiction covers more than 220,000 businesses employing five or more persons; 200,000 private sector contracts granted by the State of California; 113 departments of State government; local government agencies; and thousands of individuals and companies providing housing, accommodations, and services to the public. The Department employs a staff of 250 people in 12 offices throughout the State.

Department Jurisdiction and Authority

The Department enforces laws that:

- o Protect an individual's rights and opportunities to seek, have access to, obtain and hold employment without discrimination because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical handicap, cancer-related medical condition, marital status, age (40 or over), or sex;
- o Protect the rights of tenants and those who seek to rent, lease or buy housing without discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, or ancestry;
- o Assure individuals equal access to accommodations, facilities, and privileges or services in business establishments within the State;
- o Assure that those contracting with the State of California comply with equal opportunity and nondiscrimination employment laws; and
- o Assure that State agencies provide nondiscriminatory treatment and access to programs and activities to persons with disabilities.

1984-85 ACHIEVEMENTS

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

Complaint Processing

The Department's primary responsibility is to enforce antidiscrimination laws by processing and resolving discrimination complaints affecting employers and employees, property owners and tenants, and recipients and providers of public services and accommodations. Tables 1 through 20 numerically summarize complaints processed from July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1985.

During this time period:

- o The Department began processing complaints alleging age discrimination in housing, under the Unruh Civil Rights Act. As a result, housing related complaints exceeded 9 percent of the total caseload for the first time in several years.

- o The average case processing time was improved almost 7 percent, to less than 200 days, although the number of cases filed increased over previous years.

During the past fiscal year, the Department handled a growing caseload with a staff that remained constant. The caseload grew by 200 cases due to the addition of cases involving children rejected by rental housing providers. In addition, the caseload grew by another 117 cases due to other causes. Yet, the Department continued to work with 92 investigating consultants, a figure that has remained constant for several years.

Settlement Compliance

During 1984-85, a computerized monitoring system was implemented to assure respondent compliance with settlement terms. The Department monitors payment of monetary remedies and compliance with other relief provided by settlement agreements or Commission decisions. In this fiscal year, the Department staff verified compliance with 278 agreements.

Contract Compliance

Contract Compliance assures that private businesses contracting with the State develop nondiscrimination policies and procedures and implement programs to correct underutilization of minorities, women and the disabled.

A computerized monitoring system randomly selected contractors for periodic desk compliance evaluations and on-site compliance

reviews. Staff participated in technical assistance seminars to assist contractors to comply with nondiscrimination laws. The Contract Compliance staff work cooperatively with the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, which monitors federal contractors. Federal and State duplication is thereby avoided and voluntary compliance is encouraged.

Disability Compliance

In January 1984, the Office of Statewide Compliance Coordination was incorporated into the Department of Fair Employment and Housing by Executive Order. This unit was established for a limited term to direct, evaluate and monitor actions taken by 113 State departments in meeting the requirements of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - Section 504, and State Government Code, Sections 11135 through 11139.5 relating to people with disabilities.

At the close of the fiscal year, the project was completed and the unit was absorbed into the Compliance Services program to assure continued monitoring.

Licensing Compliance

The Department examines procedures and practices in occupational licensing conducted by the State Department of Consumer Affairs, which issues 250 different licenses and certificates to over 215,000 persons annually. In addition, the Department investigates complaints alleging discriminatory standards in licensing.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

When an investigation indicates that discrimination has occurred and when a settlement cannot be reached, DFEL legal staff prepares the case for accusation and hearing. During 1984-85, the legal staff reviewed 129 complaints, issued 104 accusations, participated in 35 hearings before the Fair Employment and Housing Commission, and assisted in the settlement of 78 complaints.¹

The legal staff litigated in Courts of Appeal, conducted research, training, studies, and projects intended to assist the Enforcement Division.

¹ An "accusation" is a formal complaint that may be brought before the Fair Employment and Housing Commission for review and determination.

A staff attorney also supervised the University of California Boalt Hall Employment Law Clinic. The clinic assisted the Department in prosecuting cases and provided law students with "hands on" experience in preparing and litigating accusations.

SIGNIFICANT LEGAL DECISIONS

Pregnancy Disability Leave from Employment

In April, the U. S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal overturned an earlier decision by a federal district court judge and reinstated the California pregnancy disability law. As a result, the Department will resume processing complaints alleging that employers of 15 or more employees are illegally discriminating by not meeting the State's requirements for pregnancy leaves. In addition to accepting new discrimination complaints, the Department will begin investigating 180 pregnancy cases that were pending during the 16 months an injunction was in effect. During that time, the Department accepted complaints but did not investigate the charges because it was not clear whether the State law would be upheld or overturned.

Basically, the law states that if a woman is unable to work because of pregnancy disability, her employer must grant her a leave of absence of up to four months and must place her in the same job, or a similar one, when she returns to work. The intent of the law is to ensure that a woman's employment is not terminated, or jeopardized, by pregnancy disability.

Age Discrimination in Housing

In 1982, the State Supreme Court, in the case of Marina Point v. Wolfson, ruled that discrimination against children in housing is a form of arbitrary discrimination and is, therefore, a violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The Department did not immediately accept cases of this type due to numerous legal complexities involving differences between the Unruh Act and the Fair Employment and Housing Act.

In December 1984, the Fair Employment and Housing Commission rendered a decision on a case involving the Carefree Ranch Mobile Home Park. The Commission held that the park's policy of age restriction was a violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The Commission also stated that the Department does have jurisdiction, under Government Code 12948, to investigate and prosecute claims of discrimination in housing based on age.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Automation

The Department began using computers in new ways this past year to complete work assignments more rapidly and to save taxpayers' money. Several examples follow:

1. Computers now assist in the preparation of the letters each field office regularly sends to the U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In a typical year, the number of letters and copies prepared by clerical staff is 53,824. It is conservatively estimated that preparing letters and copies by computer has saved more than 2,900 hours of staff time.

2. The Department's accounting system has been better adapted to computer systems, resulting in a more flexible accounting system that can better identify cost information. Computerized spread sheets have eliminated math errors when staff makes accounting changes and permits selective sorting of data.

3. Preparatory work has been done on a system to monitor progress on work assignments. This system will improve staff's ability to keep track of many factors such as time spent on an assignment, progress information, work scheduling and cost data.

4. Initial work has been done to develop automated office systems for the Department's 11 field offices throughout the State. Computer systems will be developed to assist consultants in recording information during the intake process (receiving new complaints of discrimination), to improve the management of forms and form letters, and to track the progress of cases.

The Department's EDP staff has converted thousands of paper records to microfiche, resulting in the saving of paper and space. During fiscal year 1984-85, the Department produced 882,443 pages of microfiche at a cost of \$879.02. Had this same information been printed on standard computer paper, the cost would have been approximately \$10,000. The use of microfiche resulted in a net savings of about \$9,000 or 91.5 percent of computer paper production and storage. Although the State requires that any written reports exceeding 500 pages be converted to microfiche, the Department usually does so with any document of 150 pages or more.

Forms Revision

As part of the Department's continuing effort to streamline operations, a major project was completed this past year to assess, revise, consolidate, and/or eliminate unnecessary forms used by staff. Revising forms has improved some processes, saved staff

time, and updated certain procedures. For example, by eliminating unnecessary attendance forms, the Department saved an estimated 83 hours per month in processing and verification of data.

The Forms Revision Task Force identified 92 different DFEH forms used departmentwide. Nearly half were discontinued due to the Task Force's work. The remaining forms were either revised, consolidated or found to be adequate without change.

Case Accounting Tracking System

In December 1983, the Department initiated a computerized case tracking system to identify and allocate case processing time and costs for individual cases. Data collected will be used to identify and analyze significant trends and variations between offices, and to determine potential system improvements and effective resource utilization. During the past year this system was evaluated and identified problems were corrected.

Improving Facilities and Equipment

During the past fiscal year the physical environment of several DFEH offices was improved. For a number of years, some Department staff worked in cramped quarters, with inadequate equipment and furniture in disrepair.

Substantial progress has been made to resolve these problems, improve office layout, and relocate some offices to appropriate facilities. The biggest changes took place in Fresno and San Bernardino where both offices were relocated to better facilities. In other offices, furniture has been renovated, equipment has been updated, interior design and layout has been improved, and acoustical problems have been eliminated. In every case, this has been accomplished at modest cost. In most cases, the Department has rearranged and rehabilitated existing furniture rather than purchase new items. Those offices which have not yet been renovated will be improved during the next two years.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATION

Round Tables

In 1983, Director Mark Guerra initiated Employment and Housing Round Tables to educate the public about California's discrimination laws. The Round Tables consist of volunteers from private business and community organizations. There are two Round Tables dealing with employment discrimination - one in Northern California and one in Southern California. In addition, there are two Round Tables dealing with housing discrimination - one in Northern California and one in Southern California.

During the past fiscal year, the Round Tables launched the first of their educational activities. Those initial activities were so effective that the Round Tables are already being called on by businesses and community organizations as resources for dealing with discrimination problems. They are providing a valuable link to the business community.

In April, the Southern California Housing Round Table presented a day-long conference at the Los Angeles Hilton Hotel attended by several hundred representatives of the rental housing industry, local governments, and community organizations. The conference provided specific guidance on complying with California's fair housing laws. In June, the Northern California Employment Round Table presented a conference in Sacramento which provided similar information about dealing with employment discrimination issues. Several of Northern California's largest employers and community organizations participated in the conference.

As the fiscal year drew to a close, all four Round Tables were developing plans for additional educational conferences and for other activities to increase the understanding of discrimination among providers and users of services in California.

Public Presentations and Technical Assistance

April is Fair Housing Month throughout the nation. Every April, the State government, the Federal government, local governments, community groups, and private businesses declare their commitment to equal opportunity in housing for all Californians and sponsor educational activities promoting fair housing.

In 1985, the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) and the Southern California Housing Round Table sponsored a major conference in Los Angeles providing workshops on tenant/landlord issues, local fair housing programs, a federal view of fair housing and the process for filing a complaint with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Seminars on fair housing were also held in several Northern California cities, sponsored by the Northern California Housing Round Table and the DFEH. Speakers at the seminars included attorneys representing both owners and renters as well as DFEH staff.

Round Table members and DFEH staff also appeared on television and radio to explain discrimination law.

The Department distributes thousands of informational posters and publications through its offices, public events, community groups, and the State Department of General Services. During the past year, brochure format was revised to reduce publication costs by approximately fifty percent.

News releases are prepared on major settlements, precedential decisions, and educational seminars. These releases are distributed to minority and women's radio and television programs, and newspapers, in addition to major stations and publications.

CONCLUSION

During the 1984-85 Fiscal Year, the Department of Fair Employment and Housing absorbed an increase in caseload, while reducing case processing time and improving the overall enforcement activities.

STATISTICAL TABLES ON EMPLOYMENT
AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

STATISTICAL TABLES ON EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

SUMMARY

The following 21 tables show cases which were filed and/or closed between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985.

Employment data shows that the increasing trend in the number of employment cases filed has leveled out over the past several years, staying between 7,000 and 7,500. In fiscal year 1984-85, 7,256 employment cases were filed. The number of cases closed has generally been consistent with the number of cases filed during this same period of time.

The largest percentages of employment respondents (against whom the cases are filed) are in the manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, and services industries. For the 1984-85 fiscal year they constitute 67.3 percent of the respondents.

There were 679 housing cases filed in 1983-84. The total housing caseload is not reflected in the housing summary statistics because part of the cases are not being filed under the Rumford Fair Housing Act. Some are filed under the public accommodations sections of the Unruh Civil Rights Act.

Unruh public service/accommodation cases filed increased from 124 in fiscal year 1983-84 to 318 in 1984-85. Housing/service accommodation is a part of the public service/accommodation statutes. Of the total number of bases (287) alleged for discrimination in housing/service accommodation cases, 55.4 percent (159) were "Wolftson" type cases of discrimination against families with children. The addition of "Wolftson" type cases being enforced this year had a major effect. It was the number one reason for claims of discrimination in housing/service accommodation cases, as well as public service/accommodation cases generally.

EMPLOYMENT TABLES

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED/CLOSED
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

FISCAL YEAR	FILED	CLOSED
1984-85	7,256	7,072

TABLE 2

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TYPE OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER FILED	%
Farms	139	1.9
Agriculture Services, Hunting & Trapping	10	0.1
Forestry	1	0.0
Fisheries	1	0.0
Mining	54	0.7
Contract Construction	177	2.4
Manufacturing	1,573	21.7
Transportation, Communication & Utilities	564	7.8
Wholesale & Retail Trade	1,476	20.3
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	565	7.8
Services	1,832	25.3
Government (A)	758	10.5
Non-Classifiable Establishments (B)	106	1.5
TOTAL	7,256	100.0

(A) Includes public schools
(B) Includes labor unions

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION

TABLE 3

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

BASIS	COUNT	% OF TOTAL CASES (B)	% OF TOTAL BASES
TOTAL (A)	8,626		100.0
1. Race/Color	2,091	28.8	24.2
- Black	1,667	23.0	19.3
- Asian	110	1.5	1.3
- Caucasian	225	3.1	2.6
- Native American	33	.4	.3
- Other Race/Color	56	.8	.7
2. Origin/Ancstry	847	11.7	9.8
- Mexican-American	456	6.3	5.3
- Other Hispanic	284	3.9	3.3
- Filipino	94	1.3	1.1
- Polynesian	13	.2	.1
3. Religion	146	2.0	1.7
- Jewish	42	.6	.5
- Protestant	14	.2	.2
- Catholic	16	.2	.2
- Seventh Day Adventist	11	.1	.1
- Other Religion	63	.9	.7
4. Physical Handicap	922	12.7	10.7
- Deafness	55	.8	.7
- Blindness	38	.5	.4
- Limbs	148	2.1	1.7
- Diabetes	43	.6	.5
- Spinal	155	2.1	1.8
- Epilepsy	34	.5	.4
- Heart Condition	60	.8	.7
- Muteness (Speech)	2	.0	.0
- Other Handicap	387	5.3	4.5
5. Sex	2,792	38.5	32.4
- General	1,340	18.5	15.5
- Harassment	836	11.5	9.7
- Pregnancy	602	8.3	7.0
- Other	14	.2	.2

TABLE 3 (Continued)
EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

BASIS	COUNT	% OF TOTAL CASES (B)	% OF TOTAL BASES
6. Marital Status	180	2.5	2.1
- Single	68	.9	.8
- Married	98	1.4	1.1
- Divorced	7	.1	.1
- Cohabitation	7	.1	.1
7. Age	1,128	15.5	13.1
8. Medical Condition	39	.5	.4
9. Retaliation	403	5.6	4.7
- Filing	213	2.9	2.5
- Protesting	175	2.4	2.0
- Assisting DFEH	15	.3	.2
10. Association	51	.7	.6
11. Other	27	.4	.3
TOTAL OF CASES FILED	7,256		

(A) Complaints with more than one basis have been counted under each basis reported.

(B) Percentages will not total to 100.0% since multiple bases may be reported per case.

OFFICE	NUMBER FILED	%
San Francisco	492	6.8
Los Angeles	1,987	27.4
Fresno	422	5.8
San Diego	405	5.6
Sacramento	713	9.8
San Jose	382	5.3
Bakersfield	537	7.4
San Bernardino	599	8.2
Santa Ana	683	9.4
Ventura	392	5.4
Oakland	644	8.9
STATEWIDE TOTAL	7,256	100.0

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: OFFICE WHERE FILED
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 5

(A) Where more than one discriminatory act was alleged, the complaint was counted under the first act reported.

-- No Data Reported

ACT	COUNT	% OF TOTAL COMPLAINTS
Refusal to Hire	851	11.7
Unequal Pay	414	5.7
Dismissal from Employment	4,152	57.2
Differential Treatment	--	--
Harassment	748	10.3
Refusal to Upgrade	368	5.1
Unequal Work Conditions	118	1.6
Referral Withheld	10	.1
Union Discrimination	19	.3
Other	576	8.0
TOTAL (A)	7,256	100.0
Complaints With More Than One Act Alleged	2,055	28.3
Complaints With Only One Act Alleged	5,201	71.7

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY ACT
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 4

(A) Includes combination occupations

TYPE OF OCCUPATION	NUMBER FILED	%
Clerical	1,284	17.7
Craft	324	4.5
Laborers	1,146	15.8
Managers	735	10.1
Equipment Operators	284	3.9
Professional	999	13.8
Sales	569	7.8
Services	819	11.3
Supervisor	289	4.0
Technician	437	6.0
Paraprofessional	146	2.0
Other (A)	224	3.1
TOTAL	7,256	100.0

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: TYPE OF OCCUPATION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 7

Cases are closed administratively when the Department is unable to proceed with case processing due to legal or technical circumstances. Some examples include: (1) the complainant elected court action; (2) the issue is not jurisdictional; (3) there is no basis to proceed; and (4) the complainant failed to cooperate.

ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE

TYPE OF DISPOSITION	NUMBER CLOSED	%
Settlement	1,897	26.8
Insufficient Evidence	2,491	35.2
Closed Through Public Hearing	11	.2
Administrative Closures	2,672	37.8
Other	1	.0
TOTAL	7,072	100.0

EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 6

TABLE 8
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: TYPE OF ACTION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TYPE OF ACTION		NUMBER OF CASES WHERE CORRECTIVE ACTION OCCURRED	%
Hire, Upgrade or Reinstate	36	1.3	
Next Opening	117	4.3	
Condition Corrected	521	19.1	
Fair Employment Promulgated	553	20.3	
Monetary Settlement	609	22.4	
Harassment Stopped	45	1.7	
Discriminatory Policy Changed	66	2.4	
Employment Record Corrected	275	10.1	
Other (B)	501	18.4	
TOTAL CASES CLOSED (A)	7,072		
TOTAL CORRECTIVE ACTIONS	2,723	100.0	
(A) Where more than one corrective action was taken, the complaint was counted under each corrective action reported.			
(B) This category includes: position transfer, physical handicap accommodation, grievance procedure established, etc.			

HOUSING TABLES

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF HOUSING CASES FILED/CLOSED

UNDER FEHA/UNRUH ACT

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

	FILED	CLOSED
FEHA	604	660
UNRUH (Service/Accommodation)	253	171
TOTAL	857	831

TYPE OF RESPONDENT		NUMBER FILED		%	
Apartment/Home-Owner/Manager	204	80.6			
Trailer Park Owner	10	3.9			
Mortgage Company	4	1.6			
Real Estate Broker	8	3.2			
Individual Home-Owner	2	.8			
Public Housing Authority	2	.8			
Other (including invalid codes)	23	9.1			
TOTAL	253	100.0			

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

HOUSING SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

TABLE 10-A

TYPE OF RESPONDENT		NUMBER FILED		%	
Apartment/Home-Owner/Manager	514	85.1			
New Tract Developer	4	.7			
Trailer Park Owner	18	3.0			
Mortgage Company	8	1.3			
Real Estate Broker	23	3.8			
Individual Home-Owner	21	3.5			
Public Housing Authority	3	.5			
Other (A)	13	2.1			
TOTAL	604	100.0			

(A) Includes condominium developments, etc.

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

HOUSING CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

TABLE 10

HOUSING CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION

TABLE 11

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

BASIS	COUNT	CASES (B) % OF TOTAL	TOTAL BASES % OF
TOTAL (A)	728		100.0
1. Race/Color	338	56.0	46.4
- Black	233	38.6	32.0
- Asian	19	3.2	2.6
- Caucasian	70	11.5	9.6
- Native American	2	.3	.3
- Other Race/Color	14	2.3	1.9
2. Origin/Ancstry	72	11.9	9.9
- Mexican-American	40	6.6	5.5
- Other Hispanic	29	4.8	4.0
- Filipino	3	.5	.4
- Polynesian	-	-	-
3. Religion	19	3.2	2.6
4. Sex	51	8.4	7.0
- General	31	5.1	4.3
- Harassment	14	2.3	1.9
- Pregnancy	5	.8	.7
- Other	1	.2	.1
5. Marital Status	129	21.4	17.7
6. Retaliation	14	2.3	1.9
7. Association	67	11.1	9.2
8. Children	4	.7	.6
9. Other	34	5.6	4.7
TOTAL OF CASES FILED	604		

- No data reported.

(A) Complaints with more than one basis have been counted under each basis reported.

(B) Percentages will not total to 100.0% since multiple bases may be reported per case.

TABLE 11-A
HOUSING/SERVICE ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED:
ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

BASIS			
	COUNT		%
Race/Color	41	TOTAL BASES	100.0
Origin/Ancestry	6	Other	9.8
Religion	-	Children	55.4
Sex	13	Association	3.5
Marital Status	18	Retaliation	1.7
Age	7	Age	2.4
Retaliation	5	Marital Status	6.3
Association	10	Age	4.5
Children	159	Retaliation	-
Other	28	Religion	2.1
TOTAL BASES	287	Sex	14.3

TABLE 12

HOUSING CASES FILED: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY ACT

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

ACT	COUNT	% OF TOTAL COMPLAINTS(B)	% OF TOTAL ALLEGED ACTS
Refusal to Show	32	5.3	4.4
Refusal to Rent	269	44.5	37.1
Refusal to Sell	9	1.5	1.2
Refusal to Grant Equal Terms	38	6.3	5.2
Eviction	245	40.7	33.7
Rent Increase	18	3.0	2.5
Loan Withheld	2	.3	.3
Harassment	76	12.6	10.5
Other Type	37	6.1	5.1
TOTAL (A)	726		100.0
Complaints With More Than One Act Alleged .	102	16.9	
Complaints With Only One Act Alleged	502	83.1	
TOTAL NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED	604	100.0	

(A) Where more than one discriminatory act was alleged, the complaint was counted under each act reported.

(B) Percentages will not total to 100% since multiple alleged acts may occur per case.

TABLE 13
HOUSING CASES FILED: OFFICE WHERE FILED
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

OFFICE	NUMBER FILED	%
San Francisco	13	2.2
Los Angeles	170	28.1
Fresno	33	5.5
San Diego	70	11.6
Sacramento	58	9.6
San Jose	61	10.1
Bakersfield	36	6.0
San Bernardino	29	4.8
Santa Ana	42	7.0
Ventura	49	8.0
Oakland	43	7.1
STATEWIDE TOTAL	604	100.0

Cases are closed administratively when the Department is unable to proceed with case processing due to legal or technical circumstances. Some examples include: (1) the complainant elected court action; (2) the issue is not jurisdictional; (3) there is no basis to proceed; and (4) the complainant failed to cooperate.

ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE

TYPE OF DISPOSITION	NUMBER CLOSED	%
Settlement	107	62.6
Insufficient Evidence	40	23.4
Closed Through Public Hearing	1	.6
Administrative Closures	23	13.4
TOTAL	171	100.0

HOUSING/SERVICE ACCOMMODATION CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 14-A

TYPE OF DISPOSITION	NUMBER CLOSED	%
Settlement	320	48.5
Insufficient Evidence	237	35.9
Closed Through Public Hearing	2	.3
Administrative Closures	101	15.3
TOTAL	660	100.0

HOUSING CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 14

HOUSING CASES FILED: TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 15

TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION	NUMBER FILED	%
Home	127	21.1
Apartment	433	71.7
Trailer Space/Mobile Home	21	3.4
Homestead	1	.2
Public Housing	1	.2
Other	21	3.4
TOTAL	604	100.0

HOUSING CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: TYPE OF ACTION

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TABLE 16

TYPE OF ACTION	COUNT	%
Total Number of Cases Closed With Corrective Action (A)	325	
Total Number of Corrective Actions	661	100.0
Monetary Settlement	111	16.8
Offer To Rent, Sell or Show Housing Unit	48	7.3
Unequal Practice Corrected	159	24.0
Eviction Rescinded or Delayed	101	15.3
Fair Housing Promulgated	152	23.0
Other (B)	90	13.6

(A) Total number of benefits exceeds total number of cases closed due to cases where multiple benefits were obtained.

(B) This category includes: requested accommodation made, maintenance of specific records, posting of nondiscrimination notices, etc.

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION TABLES

TABLE 17

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: TYPE OF COMPLAINT

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TYPE OF COMPLAINT		
		COUNT
Housing/Accommodation	239	75.1
Denial of Service	42	13.2
Franchise/Contract	4	1.3
Ralph Act Complaint	8	2.5
Other	25	7.9
TOTAL OF CASES FILED	318	100.0

TABLE 18

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION

JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

TYPE OF DISPOSITION		
		NON-HOUSING UNRUH NUMBER CLOSED
Settlement	12	25.5
Insufficient Evidence	15	31.9
Closed Through Public Hearing	-	-
Administrative Closures	20	42.6
TOTAL	47	100.0

ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE

Cases are closed administratively when the Department is unable to proceed with case processing due to legal or technical circumstances. Some examples include: (1) the complainant elected court action; (2) the issue is not jurisdictional; (3) there is no basis to proceed; and (4) the complainant failed to cooperate.

- No data reported

TABLE 19
PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

NON-HOUSING UNRUH COUNT		BASIS
37	52.9	Race/Color
8	11.4	Origin/Ancestry
1	1.4	Religion
16	22.9	Sex
3	4.3	Marital Status
1	1.4	Age
1	1.4	Retaliation
1	1.4	Association
-	-	Children
2	2.9	Other
70	100.0	TOTAL BASES

- No data reported

If more than one basis for complaint was reported, the case is counted under each basis reported.

TABLE 20

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT
JULY 1, 1984 - JUNE 30, 1985

NUMBER FILED		TYPE OF RESPONDENT
2	3.1	Contract Construction
3	4.6	Manufacturing
1	1.5	Transportation, Communication & Utilities
18	27.7	Wholesale & Retail Trade
11	16.9	Finance, Insurance & Real Estate
22	33.8	Services
4	6.2	Government
4	6.2	Other Business Establishments
65	100.0	OTHER UNRUH SUBTOTAL

