



**DEPARTMENT
OF
FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING**

**State of California
STATE AND CONSUMER
SERVICES AGENCY**

DFEH 55 (8/85)

ANNUAL REPORT

1985-86

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
1985-86 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**

ANNUAL REPORT
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF
FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
1985-86

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</u>	
Department Mission and Responsibility	1
Department Jurisdiction and Authority	1
<u>1985-86 ACHIEVEMENTS</u>	
ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	
Complaint Processing	2
Settlement Compliance	2
Contract Compliance	2
Licensing Compliance	3
LEGAL ACTIVITIES	
Significant Legal Decisions	3
Pregnancy Disability Leave	3
Discrimination Against State Employees	3
Promotional Exam Results in Race	4
Discrimination	4
Sterilization as a Condition of Employment	4
Discrimination Against an AIDS Victim	5
Fair Housing Councils as Complainants	5
Compensatory Damages	5
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACTIVITIES	
Administration	5
Automation	7
Program Efficiency	7
SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	
Joint Management/Consultant Committee	8
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATION	
Round Tables	8
Public Presentations and Technical Assistance	9

	<u>Page</u>
CONCLUSION	9
<u>STATISTICAL TABLES ON EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION</u>	
SUMMARY	
Employment Tables	12
Housing Tables	17
Public Service/Accommodations Tables	21

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 over 220,000 businesses; 200,000 private sector contracts granted by the State of California; 113 departments of State government; local government agencies; and thousands of individuals and organizations providing housing, accommodations, and services to the public. The Department has 250 employees located in 12 offices throughout the State.

Department Jurisdiction and Authority

The Department's primary responsibility is to enforce the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the Unruh Civil Rights Act and the Ralph Civil Rights Act, which collectively:

- 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;
- o Assure that State agencies provide nondiscriminatory treatment and access to programs and activities to persons with disabilities; and
- o Protect the rights of individuals to be free from violence against them or their property.

1985-86 ACHIEVEMENTS

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

Complaint Processing

The Department enforces 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 of discrimination processed from July 1, 1985 through June 30, 1986.

The Department reorganized resources internally to redirect staff to case processing activities. While total staff remained constant, four investigating consultant positions were added to the Enforcement Division, bringing the total assigned to 96. This enabled the division to reduce its caseload inventory, while improving case processing time. Average case processing time was improved by 4 percent, which represents an eight day reduction in the average time required to process a complaint. The pending caseload was reduced to less than 4,230 cases, which is the lowest level in 40 months.

Settlement Compliance

The Department monitors payment of monetary remedies and compliance with other relief provided by settlement agreements or Commission decisions. In Fiscal Year 1985-86, the Department staff verified compliance with 356 agreements, involving a total of \$482,391 in benefits. 21,608 persons received monetary and other remedies through settlement compliance efforts.

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. In Fiscal Year 1985-86, the Office of Compliance Programs monitored the programs of approximately 8,000 businesses holding 21,000 contracts, totaling \$2,903,344,024. The office conducted approximately 60 in-depth reviews of contractors, examining their selection, retention and promotional programs. The reviews resulted in significant improvements of nondiscrimination programs.

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.

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, DFEH legal staff prepares the case for accusation and hearing. During 1985-86, the legal staff reviewed 89 complaints, issued 62 accusations, participated in 128 days of hearings before the Fair Employment and Housing Commission, and assisted in the settlement of 55 complaints.¹

The legal staff litigated in Courts of Appeal, conducted research, training, studies, and projects intended to assist the Enforcement Division. A staff attorney also supervised the University of California Boalt Hall Employment Law Clinic.

SIGNIFICANT LEGAL DECISIONS

PREGNANCY DISABILITY LEAVE FROM EMPLOYMENT

California Federal Savings and Loan, et al. v. Mark Guerra

The case, previously won by the Department and Commission at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, is currently before the United States Supreme Court. In this case, employers challenge the constitutionality of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, which requires leave of up to four months for disability resulting from pregnancy. Appellants claim this absolute right to leave is inconsistent with federal law, and therefore preempted.

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

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST STATE EMPLOYEES

DFEH v. State Personnel Board

In 1979 the Department (then the Fair Employment Practices Commission) was enjoined from processing complaints against State agencies which were under the jurisdiction of the California State Personnel Board. In August of 1985 the California Supreme Court ruled that the Personnel Board did not have pre-emptive jurisdiction over civil service matters, and lifted the injunction.

The Department and the Personnel Board immediately developed procedures to assure that State employees had access to both avenues of recourse, and cooperatively to avoid duplicative investigations. During the fiscal year the Department accepted 149 discrimination cases against State departments.

PROMOTIONAL EXAM RESULTS IN RACE DISCRIMINATION

City and County of San Francisco v. FEHC

In 1978, the Department charged the San Francisco Fire Department with violating the Fair Employment and Housing Act by using a promotional exam that had a disparate impact on Blacks and was not sufficiently job-related. In 1982, the Commission upheld the Department's charge. The City appealed to the Superior Court which reversed the Commission's order.

The Department and the Commission appealed to the State Court of Appeal. On May 27, 1986, the court reversed the Superior Court's ruling and declared that the Commission's original decision correctly found that a job examination which has a substantial adverse impact on protected groups and which is not clearly job-related is illegal and cannot be used as a testing instrument. The case is pending before the California Supreme Court.

STERILIZATION AS A CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

DFEH v. Globe Battery, Johnson Controls, Inc.

This case came to hearing in July 1986. For the first time under the FEHA, a company was charged with violating the provision of State law which prohibits requiring sterilization as a condition of employment. Globe Battery requires all women who are working in lead exposed jobs at their Fullerton factory to prove they are infertile. The Department also asserts that this policy is sex discrimination, since it applies only to women. The Commission has yet to decide this case.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AN AIDS VICTIM

DFEH v. Raytheon

The first AIDS case litigated under the Fair Employment and Housing Act was heard in Ventura in November 1985 and January 1986. The Commission has not yet announced a decision in the case. The Department argued that Raytheon failed to demonstrate that the complainant was a risk to the health or safety of other employees, since AIDS cannot be casually transmitted. Further, the Department argued that Raytheon had not even considered reasonable accommodation that would have alleviated any possible safety concerns.

FAIR HOUSING COUNCILS AS COMPLAINANTS

DFEH v. Norman Green

In this precedential decision decided in June 1986, the Commission held that Fair Housing Councils may file administrative complaints with the Department and may receive damages for their efforts. The case arose when the Hollywood-Wilshire Fair Housing Council, responding to a request from the public, discovered by use of "testers" that a landlord was engaging in racially discriminatory rental practices. The Commission held that the Council could recover the cost of conducting the test and also receive punitive damages.

COMPENSATORY DAMAGES

Peralta Community College District v. FEHC

Since 1982, the Fair Employment and Housing Commission has utilized its authority to award compensatory damages to victims of employment discrimination. In June, 1986, the District Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, held that the Fair Employment and Housing Act does give the Commission the power to award compensatory damages.

The Court reasoned that, although the statute does not mention actual or compensatory damages, the language of the Act is expansive and the purpose is to "provide effective remedies which will eliminate such discriminatory practices" as are contrary to the public policy of the State. The court further held that the Commission's interpretation of the Act it enforces is entitled to great deference. Finally, to hold that the Commission could not award compensatory damages might create a problem of equal protection since such damages are available to a claimant who pursues his or her claim through the judicial rather than administrative route and to hold otherwise would result in different relief available depending on the forum.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACTIVITIES

Administration

The Administrative Services Division, which provides support services for the Department, includes the following units:

Fiscal Resources Management

Provides Business Services, Accounting, Budgets and Contracts and Fiscal Management Services for DFEH. The unit is responsible for overall fiscal management and budgeting for DFEH. The unit monitors budget expenditure status, prepares reports to control agencies and the Legislature, and interfaces with the State and Consumer Services Agency and Department of Finance. This unit prepares the annual financial plan and implements baseline budget adjustments for operating expenses, salaries, and benefit increases.

Accounting

Accounting pays the Department's bills; records the expenditures; and produces expenditure, budget, and other reports for management and control agencies.

Business Services

Business Services provides administrative support to the Headquarters office and 12 offices throughout the State. Statewide responsibilities include office space acquisition and alterations, communication equipment and service, maintenance contracts, printing and duplicating, procurement, inventory, and mail service.

Employee Relations and Personnel Management

This unit provides personnel and employee relations services and conducts and coordinates training. The major tasks of this unit include training, classification of positions, payroll, health benefits, attendance, examining, hiring, recruitment, transfers, promotions, separations, retirements, bargaining unit contract administration, grievances, merit and non-merit complaints, disciplinary matters, worker's compensation claims, nonindustrial disability insurance (NDI) claims, employee recognition programs, position control, and layoffs.

The Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is coordinated by the Department Training Officer. This program offers confidential assistance and referral services to employees who are experiencing performance or personal problems.

Program Evaluation and Research Unit

This unit designs and implements program assessments, audits and evaluations of the Department's administrative, support, and mandated activities. The unit also performs statistical, analytical and research activities in support of the Department's enforcement effort.

Information Services

Information Services conducts all public information services for DFEH, including production of press releases, articles, public service announcements, reports on community relations activities and a variety of similar support services.

Automation

During the last fiscal year, the Division expanded the use of automation to improve the efficiency of the Department. Specifically, two new data processing systems were developed.

1. A case monitoring system was developed to improve compliance with settlement agreements. This system interacts with the case management information system, and provides the monitoring unit with current information on the status of cases.
2. A new accounting system was developed to increase efficiency and provide for more flexibility in report formats.

The Division also made major modifications to three other systems.

1. The legal case tracking system and file information were improved for ease of data updates. These changes provide the legal section with more meaningful and up to date information on the disposition of legal cases.
2. The contract compliance system was redesigned to require a minimum of information input. This reduced key entry time about 15 percent and space requirements by 30 percent.
3. The case management information system was changed to create microfiche complainant and respondent listings for individual field offices. In addition to Department of Fair Employment and Housing cases, these lists also contain an entry for all inquiries including EEOC and HUD cases.

In addition, the Personnel Office successfully converted to the Decentralized Personnel and Payroll automation project in conjunction with the State Controller's Office. This system provides direct access to the data base and has improved the overall efficiency of the personnel transactions process. For example, it reduced the average turnaround time needed to receive a payroll warrant from 10 to 3 days.

Program Efficiency

In a continuing effort to improve the overall efficiency of the Department, the Administrative Division supported programs that benefited the Enforcement Division. Administration redirected six positions to Enforcement without causing any adverse impact to the workload efficiency of the Administrative Division.

The Training Unit developed and conducted a Negotiations Training Program as part of the Department's efforts to provide current procedural and technique training to staff in order to assist them in their case work. Approximately ninety percent of all the Enforcement Consultants, Senior Consultants, and District Administrators have completed the training.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

JOINT MANAGEMENT/CONSULTANT COMMITTEE

For more than two years, the Department has maintained a joint management/consultant committee to deal with concerns related to case processing. The committee's membership includes managers, supervisors and staff consultants, who meet quarterly to discuss various concerns and provide recommendations to improve case processing efficiency and maintain open communication throughout the Department.

Following are some of the committee's recommendations to improve departmental procedures which have been implemented:

- o The Pre-Complaint Questionnaires have been improved. Because these questionnaires are the first forms completed by persons seeking to file discrimination complaints, it is important that the forms provide complete and accurate information. The committee's recommendations resulted in the revision of the form.
- o At the committee's recommendation, a policy was implemented to deal with recalcitrant respondents, which enables the consultants to more effectively deal with difficult respondents.

- o As a result of the committee's recommendation, an information package about AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) was prepared and distributed to all consultants. During the past fiscal year, the Department received a number of discrimination complaints from persons suffering from AIDS and ARC (AIDS-related complex). This influx of AIDS-related cases led to a need for accurate information for the Department's consultants.
- o New identification cards for consultants have been prepared. These new cards have a more "official look" which elicits a more cooperative attitude from some respondents. The new cards make it more clear that our consultants represent an agency administering State law.

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 expanded their educational activities.

For example, in April, the Northern California Housing Round Table presented a day-long conference at the Oakland Hilton Hotel attended by representatives of the rental housing industry, local governments, and community organizations. The conference provided specific guidance on complying with California's fair housing laws. A similar conference was held in December in Sacramento. The Northern California Employment Round Table sponsored an employment discrimination seminar in Fresno on February 26, which drew 200 employers for a one-day program about the Department's regulations. Another successful program was sponsored in San Francisco on June 12, also by the Northern California Employment Round Table. In Southern California, over 200 employer representatives gathered at an April 10th employment discrimination seminar sponsored by the Southern California Employment Round Table in Los Angeles.

As the fiscal year drew to a close, all four Round Tables were continuing to plan additional educational conferences and other activities to increase understanding of the problems 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.

This past April, Round Table members and Department staff appeared on a total of 14 television and radio programs to explain housing discrimination law. In addition, Department staff participated in several seminars and conferences on housing discrimination.

During the year staff participated in over 60 distinct events designed to communicate information regarding the statutes enforced by the Department to employers, housing providers, and the public.

CONCLUSION

During the 1985-86 Fiscal Year, the Department of Fair Employment and Housing reorganized resources internally to redirect positions to Enforcement. This, in combination with improved training, reduced case processing time by an average of eight days and brought the number of pending cases to the lowest level in 40 months.

The expanded use of automation increased efficiency in both the Enforcement and Administrative Divisions of the Department while maintaining the same departmentwide staffing level.

The Department continued to increase educational programs on discrimination law through the Employment and Housing Round Tables. These voluntary groups of business and community organizations increased their training seminars throughout the State. In addition, the Department staff continues to participate in educational programs and events on civil rights.

**STATISTICAL TABLES ON EMPLOYMENT
AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION**

TABLE 1
 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED/CLOSED
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>FISCAL YEAR</u>	<u>FILED</u>	<u>CLOSED</u>
1985-86	6,993	7,806

TABLE 2
 EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: OFFICE WHERE FILED
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>NUMBER FILED</u>	<u>%</u>
San Francisco	592	8.5
Los Angeles	1,574	22.5
Fresno	524	7.5
San Diego	404	5.8
Sacramento	702	10.0
San Jose	453	6.5
Bakersfield	565	8.1
San Bernardino	457	6.5
Santa Ana	589	8.4
Ventura	309	4.4
Oakland	824	11.8
STATEWIDE TOTAL	6,993	100.0

TABLE 3

EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>BASIS</u>	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL CASES (B)</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL BASES</u>
TOTAL (A)	8,389		100.0
1. Race/Color			
- Black	1,583	22.6	18.9
- Asian	1,355	19.4	16.3
- Caucasian	36	.5	.4
- Native American	143	2.1	1.7
- Other Race/Color	6	.0	.0
- Multiple Complainants	41	.6	.5
- 2		.0	.0
2. Origin/Ancestry	878	12.6	10.5
- Mexican-American	366	5.3	4.4
- Other Hispanic	238	3.4	2.8
- Filipino	50	.7	.6
- Caucasian	79	1.1	1.0
- Other Origin/Ancestry	145	2.1	1.7
3. Religion	163	2.3	1.9
- Jewish	42	.6	.5
- Protestant	18	.2	.2
- Catholic	26	.4	.3
- Seventh Day Adventist	13	.2	.1
- Other Religion	64	.9	.8
4. Physical Handicap	1,090	15.6	13.0
- Deafness	79	1.1	1.0
- Blindness	35	.5	.4
- Limbs	163	2.3	1.9
- Diabetes	44	.6	.5
- Spinal	215	3.1	2.6
- Epilepsy	51	.8	.6
- Heart Condition	67	1.0	.8
- Muteness (Speech)	1	.0	.0
- AIDS	57	.8	.7
- Other Handicap	378	5.4	4.5
5. Sex	2,893	41.4	34.5
- General	1,242	17.8	14.8
- Harassment	884	12.6	10.5
- Pregnancy	760	10.9	9.2
- Other	7	.1	.0

TABLE 3 (Continued)
 EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>BASIS</u>	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL CASES (B)</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL BASES</u>
6. Marital Status	134	1.9	1.6
- Single	60	.9	.8
- Married	60	.9	.8
- Divorced	9	.1	.0
- Cohabitation	5	.0	.0
7. Age	1,121	16.0	13.3
8. Medical Condition	57	.8	.7
9. Retaliation	413	5.9	4.9
- Filing	213	3.0	2.5
- Protesting	181	2.6	2.2
- Assisting DFEH	19	.3	.2
10. Association	43	.6	.5
11. Other	14	.2	.2
TOTAL OF CASES FILED	6,993		

(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 4
 EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</u>	<u>NUMBER FILED</u>	<u>%</u>
Farms	179	2.6
Agriculture Services, Hunting & Trapping	21	0.3
Forestry	2	0.0
Fisheries	1	0.0
Mining	56	0.8
Contract Construction	183	2.6
Manufacturing	1,434	20.5
Transportation, Communication & Utilities	551	7.9
Wholesale & Retail Trade	1,467	21.0
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	556	7.9
Services	1,658	23.7
Government (A)	808	11.6
Non-Classifiable Establishments (B)	77	1.1
 TOTAL	 6,993	 100.0

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

TABLE 5
 EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY ACT
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>ACT</u>	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL COMPLAINTS</u>
Refusal to Hire	753	10.8
Unequal Pay	348	5.0
Dismissal from Employment	3,986	57.0
Harassment	770	11.0
Refusal to Upgrade	377	5.4
Unequal Work Conditions	121	1.7
Referral Withheld	16	.2
Union Discrimination	14	.2
Other	608	8.7
 TOTAL (A)	 6,993	 100.0

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

TABLE 6
EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED: TYPE OF OCCUPATION
JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF OCCUPATION</u>	<u>NUMBER FILED</u>	<u>%</u>
Clerical	1,190	17.0
Craft	294	4.2
Laborers	1,052	15.1
Managers	727	10.4
Equipment Operators	301	4.3
Professional	981	14.0
Sales	591	8.5
Services	817	11.7
Supervisor	282	4.0
Technician	387	5.5
Paraprofessional	131	1.9
Other (A)	240	3.4
 TOTAL	 6,993	 100.0

(A) Includes combination occupations

TABLE 7
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION
JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF DISPOSITION</u>	<u>NUMBER CLOSED</u>	<u>%</u>
Settlement	1,979	25.4
Insufficient Evidence	2,592	33.2
Closed Through Public Hearing	19	.2
Administrative Closures	<u>3,216</u>	<u>41.2</u>
o Elected Court Action (Number Closed = 1,596 = 20.5%)		
 TOTAL	 7,806	 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; and (3) the complainant failed to cooperate.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF HOUSING CASES FILED/CLOSED
UNDER FEHA/UNRUH ACT (A)

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

	<u>FILED</u>	<u>CLOSED</u>
FEHA	497	533
UNRUH (Service/Accommodation)	<u>351</u>	<u>363</u>
TOTAL	848	896

(A) Unlike previous years, Tables 9-14 have combined cases filed under Fair Employment and Housing Act and the Unruh Act.

TABLE 9

HOUSING CASES FILED: OFFICE WHERE FILED

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>NUMBER FILED</u>	<u>%</u>
San Francisco	31	3.7
Los Angeles	246	29.0
Fresno	36	4.2
San Diego	94	11.1
Sacramento	82	9.7
San Jose	36	4.2
Bakersfield	30	3.5
San Bernardino	90	10.6
Santa Ana	69	8.1
Ventura	64	7.6
Oakland	<u>70</u>	<u>8.3</u>
STATEWIDE TOTAL	848	100.0

TABLE 10
 HOUSING CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>BASIS</u>	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL CASES (B)</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL BASES</u>
TOTAL (A)	1,036		100.0
1. Race/Color	315	37.1	30.4
- Black	237	27.9	22.9
- Asian	4	.5	.4
- Caucasian	44	5.2	4.2
- Other Race/Color	7	.8	.7
- Multiple Complainants	23	2.7	2.2
2. Origin/Ancestry	123	14.5	11.9
- Mexican-American	27	3.2	2.6
- Other Hispanic	29	3.4	2.8
- Filipino	4	.5	.4
- Caucasian	13	1.5	1.3
- Other Origin/Ancestry	39	4.6	3.8
- Multiple Complainants	11	1.3	1.0
3. Religion	17	2.0	1.6
4. Physical Handicap	1	.1	.0
5. Sex	79	9.3	7.6
- General	51	6.1	5.0
- Harassment	11	1.2	1.0
- Pregnancy	1	.1	.0
- Orientation	13	1.5	1.3
- Other	3	.4	.3
6. Marital Status	124	14.6	12.0
7. Age	22	2.6	2.1
8. Retaliation	10	1.2	1.0
9. Association	60	7.1	5.8
10. Children	244	28.8	23.6
11. Other	41	4.8	4.0
TOTAL OF CASES FILED	848		

(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

HOUSING CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

TYPE OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER FILED	%
Apartment/Home-Owner/Manager	686	80.9
New Tract Developer	11	1.3
Trailer Park Owner	45	5.3
Mortgage Company	4	.5
Real Estate Broker	25	2.9
Individual Home-Owner	20	2.4
Public Housing Authority	5	.6
Other (A)	52	6.1
TOTAL	848	100.0

(A) Includes condominium developments, etc.

TABLE 12

HOUSING CASES FILED: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY ACT

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

ACT	COUNT	% OF TOTAL COMPLAINTS (B)	% OF TOTAL ALLEGED ACTS
Refusal to Show	57	6.7	5.7
Refusal to Rent	381	44.9	38.2
Refusal to Sell	19	2.2	1.9
Refusal to Grant Equal Terms	51	6.0	5.1
Eviction	264	31.1	26.5
Rent Increase	32	3.8	3.2
Loan Withheld	4	.5	.4
Harassment	90	10.6	9.0
Other Type	99	11.7	10.0
TOTAL (A)	997		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: TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION</u>	<u>NUMBER FILED</u>	<u>%</u>
Home	167	19.7
Apartment	593	69.9
Trailer Space/Mobile Home	51	6.0
Homesite	2	.2
Pubic Housing	5	.6
Other	<u>30</u>	<u>3.6</u>
 TOTAL	848	100.0

TABLE 14
 HOUSING CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION
 JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF DISPOSITION</u>	<u>NUMBER CLOSED</u>	<u>%</u>
Settlement	416	46.4
Insufficient Evidence	342	38.2
Closed Through Public Hearing	0	.0
Administrative Closures	<u>138</u>	<u>15.4</u>
 TOTAL	896	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; and (3) the complainant failed to cooperate.

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF NON-HOUSING PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED/CLOSED

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>FISCAL YEAR</u>	<u>FILED</u>	<u>CLOSED</u>
1985-86	131	106

TABLE 16

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>BASIS</u>	<u>NON-HOUSING UNRUH COUNT</u>	<u>%</u>
Race/Color	40	28.7
Origin/Ancestry	46	33.1
Religion	1	.7
Sex	21	15.1
Marital Status	3	2.2
Age	5	3.6
Retaliation	3	2.2
Children	11	7.9
Other	8	5.8
Association	1	.7
TOTAL BASES (A)	139	100.0

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

TABLE 17

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES FILED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</u>	<u>NON-HOUSING UNRUH COUNT</u>	<u>%</u>
Forestry	2	1.5
Contract Construction	1	.8
Manufacturing	3	2.3
Transportation, Communication & Utilities	2	1.5
Wholesale & Retail Trade	49	37.4
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	12	9.2
Services	31	23.6
Government	7	5.3
Farms and Agricultural Services	12	9.2
Other Business Establishment	<u>12</u>	<u>9.2</u>
OTHER UNRUH SUBTOTAL	131	100.0

TABLE 18

PUBLIC SERVICE/ACCOMMODATION CASES CLOSED: TYPE OF DISPOSITION

JULY 1, 1985 - JUNE 30, 1986

<u>TYPE OF DISPOSITION</u>	<u>NON-HOUSING UNRUH NUMBER CLOSED</u>	<u>%</u>
Settlement	36	34.0
Insufficient Evidence	37	34.9
Closed Through Public Hearing	0	.0
Administrative Closures	<u>33</u>	<u>31.1</u>
TOTAL	106	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; and (3) the complainant failed to cooperate.