

The State of Fair Housing in Northeast Ohio

APRIL 2014

MICHAEL LEPLEY
AMANDA MEHLMAN



ABOUT THE AUTHORS

MICHAEL LEPLEY is the Housing Research & Advocacy Center's Research Associate. He received his Master of Public Administration from the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

AMANDA MEHLMAN is the Housing Research & Advocacy Center's Senior Research Associate. She joined the Housing Center's staff in August of 2011 and is the author of a number of reports on fair housing and related issues. She received her Master of Social Work from Washington University in St. Louis.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the data they provided regarding housing complaints. In addition, we would like to thank local government officials for answering questions about and providing copies of fair housing ordinances which we have analyzed in this report.

This publication was supported with funding under a grant with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The substance and findings of the work are dedicated to the public. The authors and publisher are solely responsible for the accuracy of the statements and interpretations contained in this publication. Such interpretations do not necessarily reflect the view of the federal government.

About the Housing Research & Advocacy Center

The Housing Research & Advocacy Center (the "Housing Center") is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to promote fair housing and diverse communities, and work to eliminate housing discrimination in Northeast Ohio, by providing effective research, education, and advocacy. In addition to addressing traditional issues of housing discrimination and segregation, the Housing Center also provides analysis of subprime and predatory lending practices and trends in the region.

Copyright © 2014, Housing Research & Advocacy Center. All rights reserved.

Portions of this manual are reprinted from the Housing Research & Advocacy Center's publications "State of Fair Housing in Northeast Ohio" © 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
List of Figures.....	1
List of Tables	2
I. Executive Summary	3
II. Demographics of the Region	5
III. Fair Housing Laws in Northeast Ohio	14
IV. Fair Housing Complaints in Northeast Ohio	21
V. Racial and Ethnic Segregation in Northeast Ohio	25
VI. Recommendations.....	27
Appendix A: Population Data by County.....	30
Appendix B: Fair Housing Complaint Data by County	34
Appendix C: Methodology for Calculating Fair Housing Complaint Data	37
Appendix D: Methodology for Calculating Instances of Housing Discrimination	38
Appendix E: Data Sources.....	40

List of Figures

Figure 1: Rate of Population Change in Region by Census Tract from 1970 to 1980	6
Figure 2: Rate of Population Change in Region by Census Tract from 1980 to 1990	6
Figure 3: Rate of Population Change in Region by Census Tract from 1990 to 2000	7
Figure 4: Rate of Population Change in Region by Census Tract from 2000 to 2010	7
Figure 5: Race of Population of Region, 1970 to 2010.....	8
Figure 6: Population with a Disability in Region in 2010.....	11
Figure 7: Percentage of Housing Built by Period.....	12
Figure 8: Housing Structures with 5 or More Units In Region by Year Built	13
Figure 9: Fair Housing Complaints Filed in the Region from 1990 to 2013.....	23
Figure 10: Fair Housing Complaints Filed Over 5-Year Periods.....	24

List of Tables

Table 1: Population of Region by County	5
Table 2: Race of Population in Region	8
Table 3: Hispanic or Latino/a Population	9
Table 4: Percent of Population that is Foreign Born	9
Table 5: Households with Individuals under 18	10
Table 6: Population with a Disability in 2010	11
Table 7: Housing Structures with 5 or More Units by Year Built	13
Table 8: Local Fair Housing Laws in Northeast Ohio	17-20
Table 9: Number and Basis of Fair Housing Complaints filed with HUD in the Region	22
Table 10: Residential Segregation for African Americans in Large Metropolitan Areas Ranked by Dissimilarity Index	25
Table 11: Residential Segregation for Hispanics/Latinos in Large Metropolitan Areas Ranked by Dissimilarity Index	26
Table 12: Race of Population: Ashtabula County	30
Table 13: Race of Population: Cuyahoga County	30
Table 14: Race of Population: Geauga County	31
Table 15: Race of Population: Lake County	31
Table 16: Race of Population: Lorain County	32
Table 17: Race of Population: Medina County	32
Table 18: Housing Built in the Region by Decade	33
Table 19: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Ashtabula County	34
Table 20: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Cuyahoga County	34
Table 21: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Geauga County	35
Table 22: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Lake County	35
Table 23: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Lorain County	36
Table 24: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Medina County	36

I. Executive Summary

Housing discrimination remains a problem in Northeast Ohio and in the United States. The level of discrimination that exists today, as well as the segregated housing patterns of our region, is a result of decades of official and unofficial policies of governments at all levels; of private businesses and associations; and of individual actions by homeowners, rental agents, and others. Without the actions of all of these individuals and entities we would now face less segregation and discrimination as a society and less economic stratification due to the effect housing patterns have on one's life chances through access to quality schools, transportation, jobs, and a healthy environment.¹

This report is the Housing Center's ninth annual comprehensive survey of fair housing in Northeast Ohio.² The report finds that 46 years after the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act; which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, and handicap; housing discrimination remains widespread in the region.

In 2013, there were 199 complaints of housing discrimination filed in Northeast Ohio with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This number was an increase from the 111 complaints filed in 2012 and the first year of increased complaints after four consecutive years of decline. This is higher than the average number of complaints filed in the last 24 years (131).

In the last five years for which data are available (2009-2013), an average of 175.6 complaints were filed, compared to an average of 160.2 complaints filed in the previous five-year period (2004-2008). This increase includes a 192.7% increase in the number of cases based on familial status (from 96 to 281) and a 146.6% increase in the number of cases based on gender (from 30 to 74). It also includes a 36.1% decrease in the number of cases based on race (from 269 to 172); a 12% decrease in the number of cases based on disability (from 267 to 235); and small decreases in cases based on color, religion, and national origin. The most common bases of discrimination alleged in complaints filed in 2009-2013 were familial status (32%), disability (26.7%), and race (19.5%).

Although the increase in cases filed is significant, it is clear that it represents only a small fraction of the total number of instances of housing discrimination in the region. By examining moving patterns of different racial and ethnic groups and comparing this to discrimination rates found in a national study, the Housing Center estimates that there are annually at least 33,690 instances of housing discrimination in the region against African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

The level of housing segregation has not improved or worsened for African Americans since 1990, with the region being the fifth-most segregated area in the country in both 1990 and 2010.

Some local communities have taken steps to address housing discrimination by passing local fair housing legislation. In Ashtabula County 3 governments have passed fair housing ordinances, along with 38 in Cuyahoga County, 4 in Lake County, 9 in Lorain County, and 3 in Medina County. There are no local fair housing ordinances in Geauga County.

Although many of these statutes merely recodify federal and state law without offering additional protection to individuals, a number of the statutes also prohibit discrimination on other bases, providing protection to additional classes of people. The grounds protected by local ordinances (and the

¹ See Carr, James H. and Nandinee K. Kutty, eds., *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

² For purposes of this report, we have examined a six-county region made up of Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, and Medina Counties.

number of jurisdictions providing such protection) include age (24 ordinances), marital status (21), creed (18), sexual orientation (14), disabled veteran status and Vietnam veteran status (5), ethnic group (5), gender identity (9), military status (8), military discharge status (1), occupation (1), parental status (1), source of income (3), and association with a protected class (1).

The Housing Center's recommendations are to:

1. Strengthen state and local fair housing laws by:
 - Prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, age, and source of income;
 - Adopting state and local visitability ordinances to expand access to housing for those with disabilities; and
 - Further amending Ohio fair housing law to ensure substantial equivalency to federal law.
2. Research and utilize regional analysis of impediments to fair housing.
3. Vigorously enforce current fair housing laws. Include the use of systemic testing for discrimination to identify individuals who violate the law and to deter future violations.
4. Support and adequately fund the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect the public from abusive and unfair financial products and services.
5. Implement comprehensive education efforts to ensure that housing providers, professionals, and individuals are aware of fair housing laws and the means available to enforce them.
6. Provide government incentives and other creative solutions to combat housing discrimination and racial and economic segregation.

II. Demographics of the Region

Fair housing laws provide protection from discrimination to all members of our society, not only members of racial or ethnic minorities. For example, the prohibitions on race discrimination prohibit discrimination not only against African Americans or other racial minorities but against *any* person on account of his or her race. Likewise, the provisions on religious discrimination prohibit not only discrimination against members of minority religions but adherents to any religion (as well as those who are not religious).

While every individual in our society is provided with protection by fair housing laws, the history of discrimination in our country has demonstrated that members of minority groups; whether racial, religious, ethnic, national origin, or other; face discrimination most often and with the most severe consequences. Thus, the chances of a white individual facing racial discrimination are much lower than the chances of an African American (or Asian American) facing such discrimination. As such, we provide below an overview of the demographics of the region, with a focus on its racial and ethnic make-up, as well as the characteristics of the population protected by federal and state fair housing laws.

A. Region Covered

This report covers the state of fair housing in Northeast Ohio. For purposes of this report, the area consists of the counties of Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, and Medina because until 2000 it represented the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) used by the U.S. Census Bureau to describe the region.³

B. Population of the Region

From 1970 to 2010, the population of the area covered by this report has decreased by 9.94%, from 2,419,274 to 2,178,737, at a time when the population of the country as a whole increased 51.80%.⁴ Changes in county-level populations have varied. Cuyahoga County experienced a loss of 25.63% of its population over five decades with the greatest losses coming from the City of Cleveland, especially its eastside neighborhoods, and inner-ring suburbs. All other counties experienced some growth ranging from 3.32% in Ashtabula County to 108.34% in Medina County.⁵

Table 1: Population of Region by County

	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	% Change 1970-2010
Ashtabula	98,237	104,215	99,821	102,728	101,497	+3.32%
Cuyahoga	1,721,300	1,498,400	1,412,140	1,393,978	1,280,122	-25.63%
Gauga	62,977	74,474	81,129	90,895	93,389	+48.29%
Lake	197,200	212,801	215,499	227,511	230,041	+16.65%
Lorain	256,843	274,909	271,126	284,664	301,356	+17.33%
Medina	82,717	113,150	122,354	151,095	172,332	+108.34%
Total	2,419,274	2,277,949	2,202,069	2,250,871	2,178,737	-9.94%

Source: U.S. Census


The following maps represent the rate of population change throughout the region from 1970 to 2010. The data is presented by census tract and demonstrates population movement in the region over the last four decades.

³ In 1990, this area comprised the Cleveland-Elyria-Lorain Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). In 2000, the Census Bureau modified the MSA to remove Ashtabula County and renamed the region as the Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor MSA. We have included all six counties in this report to allow a comparison over time of the demographics, as well as the fair housing complaints, in the region.

⁴ See U.S. Census Bureau, "Table 1. Population: 1790-1990," *1990 Census of Population and Housing*; U.S. Census: 2010.

⁵ For data sources for all tables and charts, see Appendix E.

Figure 1:
Rate of Population Change in the Region by Census Tract* from 1970 to 1980




*Standardized to 2010 tracts using the US2010 Project Longitudinal Tract Data Base

**Ashtabula County not Tracted in 1970

Source: US2010 Project, U.S. Census


Figure 2:
Rate of Population Change in the Region by Census Tract* from 1980 to 1990



*Standardized to 2010 tracts using the US2010 Project Longitudinal Tract Data Base

Source: US2010 Project, U.S. Census


Figure 3:
Rate of Population Change in the Region by Census Tract* from 1990 to 2000



*Standardized to 2010 tracts using the US2010 Project Longitudinal Tract Data Base

Source: US2010 Project, U.S. Census

Figure 4:
Rate of Population Change in the Region by Census Tract* from 2000 to 2010



*Standardized to 2010 tracts using the US2010 Project Longitudinal Tract Data Base

Source: US2010 Project, U.S. Census


Over the past 24 years, 35% of fair housing complaints were based on race.⁶ Overall, the racial makeup of the six-county region has become more diverse over the past 40 years. During this time period, the percentage of the total population that is white has decreased from 85.0% in 1970 to 74.9% in 2010. The population of African Americans in Northeast Ohio has increased by 19% in this period from 14.6% of the total population to 19.3% while the number of Asians and Pacific Islanders has tripled, increasing from 0.6% of the total population in 1980 to 1.9% in 2010.

Table 2: Race of Population in Region⁷

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	2,056,236	85.0	1,869,554	82.1	1,772,782	80.5	1,731,562	76.9	1,632,423	74.9
African American or Black	352,757	14.6	368,519	16.2	379,987	17.3	417,044	18.5	420,114	19.3
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	2,625	0.1	3,972	0.2	4,121	0.2	4,297	0.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	14,460	0.6	22,357	1.0	31,209	1.4	41,317	1.9
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	34,932	1.6	44,276	2.0

Source: U.S. Census

Figure 5: Race of Population in Region, 1970 to 2010



Source: U.S. Census

⁶ See HRAC analysis of HUD Housing Complaint Data in Section IV

⁷ Notes: NR = not reported. In 1970, the only racial categories listed for total county populations were “White” or “Negro.” In 1980 and 1990, the Census Bureau added “American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut” and “Asian and Pacific Islander.” In 2000, the Census Bureau reported “Asian” separate from “Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander.” For this table, these two categories were combined to allow for easier comparison to 1980 and 1990, when the Census Bureau reported them in one category, and because of the relatively small number of individuals in these groups in Northeast Ohio. This chart does not include individuals who reported “Other races” in any of the years. Racial data for each of the six counties in this report are provided in Appendix A.

According to the Census Bureau, the Hispanic/Latino population of the region increased 153% from 1980 to 2010. As part of the total population, the Hispanic/Latino population increased from 1.8% in 1980 to 4.7% in 2010, with Lorain County (8.4%) and Cuyahoga County (4.8%) having the highest percentages.

Table 3: Hispanic or Latino/a Population⁸

	1980		1990		2000		2010		% Change 1980-2010
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Ashtabula	1,119	1.1	1,538	1.5	2,292	2.2	3,441	3.4	+207.5
Cuyahoga	24,028	1.6	31,447	2.2	47,078	3.4	61,270	4.8	+154.9
Geauga	305	0.4	294	0.4	538	0.6	1,001	1.1	+228.1
Lake	1,098	0.5	1,469	0.7	3,879	1.7	7,825	3.4	+612.6
Lorain	13,124	4.8	15,261	5.6	19,676	6.9	25,290	8.4	+92.7
Medina	489	0.4	711	0.6	1,399	0.9	2,747	1.6	+462.0
Total	40,163	1.8	50,720	2.3	74,862	3.3	101,574	4.7	+152.9

Source: U.S. Census

The percentage of the total population that is foreign born population in the region (who would be protected under fair housing laws based on the prohibition of discrimination based on national origin) was 5.5% for the region in 2010, up slightly from the rate of 5.1% in 2000. The lowest rate of population that is foreign born was 1.6% in Ashtabula County and the highest rate was 7.0% in Cuyahoga County.

Table 4: Percent of Population that is Foreign Born

	2000		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ashtabula	1,619	1.6	1,667	1.6
Cuyahoga	88,761	6.4	90,526	7.0
Geauga	2,553	2.8	1,646	2.8
Lake	9,746	4.3	12,099	5.3
Lorain	7,396	2.6	8,492	2.8
Medina	4,550	3.0	5,373	3.2
Total	114,625	5.1	119,803	5.5

Source: U.S. Census

⁸ According to the Census Bureau, "Hispanic" and "Latino" are not racial designations, and individuals may be of any race. The Census Bureau did not report the number of "Hispanic" or "Latino" individuals on a county-wide basis in 1970.

In response to widespread discrimination against families with children, Congress amended the Fair Housing Act in 1988 to prohibit discrimination based on familial status.⁹ In 2010, 29.9% of households in the region contained an individual under 18 years of age, ranging from a low of 28.4% in Cuyahoga County to a high of 35.3% in Medina County. In 2010, the percentage of households with individuals under 18 decreased in every county compared to 2000.

Table 5: Households with Individuals under 18


	2000		2010		% Change 2000-2010
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Ashtabula	14,014	35.6	12,316	31.3	-12.12
Cuyahoga	180,906	31.7	154,582	28.4	-14.58
Geauga	12,339	39.0	11,515	33.6	-6.68
Lake	29,800	33.2	27,686	29.4	-7.09
Lorain	39,218	37.1	37,908	32.6	-3.34
Medina	21,771	39.9	22,966	35.3	+5.49
Total	298,048	33.4	266,973	29.9	-10.43

Source: U.S. Census

⁹ The Fair Housing Amendment Act of 1988 became effective March 12, 1989. Pub. L. No. 100-430.

The 1988 amendments to the Fair Housing Act also prohibit discrimination based on handicap. Although the 1988 amendments use the term “handicap,” the term “disability” is now more commonly used and has the same legal definition. In 2010, 11.2% of the population between the ages of 18 and 64 were disabled, with a low of 7.4% in Geauga County and a high of 12.6% in Ashtabula County. For people 65 years of age and older, 36.4% of the population in the region was disabled, with a low of 28.1% in Geauga County and a high of 38.3% in Cuyahoga County. Among individuals under 18 years, 4.1% were disabled, with a low of 3.3% in Medina County and a high of 5.4% in Cuyahoga County.

Figure 6: Population with a Disability in Region in 2010



Source: U.S. Census


Table 6: Population with a Disability in 2010

	Under 18 years		18 to 64 years		65 years and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ashtabula	1,247	5.1	7,486	12.6	5,345	35.9
Cuyahoga	15,771	5.4	94,440	12.0	72,424	38.3
Gauga	826	3.4	4,068	7.4	3,643	28.1
Lake	1,838	3.6	12,871	9.1	11,366	32.1
Lorain	3,644	5.0	20,943	11.6	14,733	36.8
Medina	1,439	3.3	9,007	8.6	6,601	31.0
Total	21,125	4.1	148,815	11.2	114,112	36.4

Source: U.S. Census.

In addition to prohibiting discrimination based on handicap, the 1988 amendments to the Fair Housing Act also require that certain new multifamily housing be constructed with certain accessible features to ensure that people with disabilities have more housing options. While single-family housing is not required to meet these accessibility standards, newer single-family homes tend to be more accessible to individuals with mobility or other physical challenges than older homes. Thus, the age of housing in a region is often an indication of the amount of housing that is potentially more accessible to these individuals. In Northeast Ohio, 16.6% of the housing stock was built 1990 or later, ranging from a low of 10.6% in Cuyahoga County to a high of 39.6% in Medina County. Additionally, 50.3% of the housing in the region was built prior to 1960, with a low of 23% for Medina County to a high of 59.9% for Cuyahoga County. Visitability and universal design can improve the accessibility of older single family homes.¹⁰

Figure 7: Percentage of Housing Built by Period




Source: U.S. Census

¹⁰ For complete data see Table 18: Housing Built in Region by Decade, 2012 in Appendix E, page 33.

The 1988 amendments to the Fair Housing Act mandate that certain multi-family housing with four or more units built for first occupancy after March 13, 1991 be built to certain accessibility standards. Census data available on multi-family structures in the region gives an estimate of structures that may or may not be covered by the new construction requirements. The U.S. Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey data on multifamily housing structures is grouped by units in the following categories: 1 unit, 2 to 4 units, 5 to 19 units, 20 to 49 units, and 50 or more units. Due to the categorization of data, it is not possible to have the exact number of structures built for first occupancy after March 13, 1991 with 4 or more units that would be covered under new design and construction laws. However, general data indicates the majority of multi-family housing with 5 or more units was built before 1980.

In 2012, 74.7% (108,932 structures) of the housing structures in the region with 5 units or more were built before 1980; before the new design and construction requirements.

Figure 8: Housing Structures with 5 or More Units in Region by Year Built



Source: U.S. Census

Table 7: Housing Structures with 5 or More Units by Year Built

	1939 or Earlier		1940 to 1959		1960 to 1979		1980 to 1999		2000 or Later		Total
Ashtabula	291	10.3%	204	7.2%	1,125	39.9%	853	30.2%	349	12.4%	2,822
Cuyahoga	19,191	17.2%	22,435	20.1%	46,292	41.6%	17,948	16.1%	5,524	5.0%	111,390
Geauga	93	6.4%	85	5.8%	750	51.3%	402	27.5%	131	9.0%	1,461
Lake	411	3.4%	1,802	14.8%	5,610	46.0%	3,473	28.5%	889	7.3%	12,185
Lorain	787	6.5%	1,540	12.8%	5,975	49.5%	2,215	18.4%	1,545	12.8%	12,062
Medina	343	5.8%	177	3.0%	1,821	31.0%	2,351	40.0%	1,187	20.2%	5,879
Total	21,166	14.5%	26,243	18.0%	61,573	42.2%	27,242	18.7%	9,625	6.6%	145,799

Source: U.S. Census

III. Fair Housing Laws in Northeast Ohio

Fair housing laws exist to address the effects of housing discrimination in our society. Laws prohibiting discrimination in housing are found at the federal, state, and local level in some jurisdictions.¹¹ Which law or laws apply in a given situation depend on where the property in question is located and where the alleged discriminatory act took place. Ohio law is generally broader than federal law, providing more protection to potential victims of discrimination. Some local laws provide even further protections within their communities than does Ohio law, while in other communities with local legislation Ohio law remains the broadest in terms of protection. Below is a brief summary of the federal, state, and local fair housing laws in Northeast Ohio.

A. Federal Law

In 1968, Congress passed the federal Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. §3601, *et seq.*) to remedy the history of housing discrimination that existed throughout the country. The Fair Housing Act makes it unlawful, on account of one of the classes protected by the statute, to:

- Refuse to sell or rent a dwelling;¹²
- Refuse to negotiate for the sale or rental of a dwelling;
- Otherwise make unavailable or deny a dwelling;
- Discriminate in the terms, conditions, or privileges of the sale or rental of a dwelling;
- Discriminate in the provision of services or facilities in connection with a dwelling;
- Make discriminatory advertising or statements with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling;
- Indicate any discriminatory preference or limitation with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling;
- Misrepresent the availability of a dwelling;
- Engage in “blockbusting;”¹³
- Discriminate in the financing of residential real estate related transactions;
- Discriminate in the provision of brokerage services;
- Coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any person in the exercise of his or her rights under the Act or retaliate against an individual for exercising his or her rights under the Act.

The federal Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination based on seven grounds: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, and handicap.¹⁴ “Familial status” is defined under the Fair Housing Act to mean one or more individuals under 18 years of age living with a parent, legal custodian, or the designee of such a parent or legal custodian. The provision also protects individuals in the process of securing legal custody of a minor and pregnant women. 42 U.S.C. §3602(k).

¹¹ In addition to federal, state, and local fair housing laws discussed below in this report, there are a number of other federal statutes that provide protection to individuals from discrimination in housing and mortgage lending. These statutes include: the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (42 U.S.C. §1981 and §1982), the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (42 U.S.C. §1201, *et seq.*), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000d, *et seq.*), the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. §1691, *et seq.*), and the Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S.C. §1437, *et seq.*).

¹² In certain circumstances, the owner of a single-family home may be exempt from coverage under the federal Fair Housing Act. In addition, under the “Mrs. Murphy” exemption, an owner-occupied complex of four or fewer units may be exempt from coverage. These exemptions do not exist under Ohio’s fair housing law.

¹³ “Blockbusting” refers to encouraging homeowners to sell their homes quickly (and often at below market rates) by creating a fear that members of a minority group are moving into the neighborhood.

¹⁴ In passing the Act in 1968, Congress prohibited discrimination based on race, color, religion, and national origin. (Civil Rights Act of 1968, Title VIII, Pub. L. No. 90-284.) Discrimination based on sex (including sexual harassment) was prohibited by a 1974 amendment. (Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-383, §808.) In 1988, Congress amended the Act to include familial status and handicap as protected classes. (Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, Pub. L. No. 100-430.)

A “handicap or disability” is defined under the Fair Housing Act to include a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activity, a record of having such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment. 42 U.S.C. §3602(h).

The Fair Housing Act can be enforced by the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and through private lawsuits brought by individuals or organizations that have experienced discrimination.

B. Ohio Law

In Ohio, residential property is also covered by state law governing fair housing (Ohio Revised Code 4112.02(H)). The Ohio statute is broader than the federal Fair Housing Act in several important respects. First, Ohio law prohibits discrimination based on all of the classes protected by federal law (race, color, religion, national origin, sex, handicap, and familial status). It also prohibits discrimination based on two additional grounds: “ancestry,” a somewhat different and potentially broader category than “national origin,” and military status. Second, while federal law contains several provisions that exempt certain residential property from coverage, Ohio’s statute does not include these exemptions, making Ohio’s fair housing law applicable to almost all housing in the state.¹⁵

Although Ohio’s fair housing law is written in language nearly identical to the federal Fair Housing Act, a series of decisions by Ohio courts in 2007 and 2008 interpreted Ohio’s law inconsistently with the federal law in several key respects.¹⁶ These decisions held that the statute of limitations in design and construction cases is only one-year from the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for private citizens, regardless of when they encounter the discrimination, that the Ohio Attorney General may not seek remedies to require retrofitting of inaccessible housing constructed in violation of Ohio’s fair housing law, and that landlords are not required to take action when they know that one tenant is racially harassing another tenant.¹⁷ If allowed to stand, these decisions represent limitations on fair housing rights for individuals in the state and threaten Ohio’s “substantial equivalency” status, including the work-sharing agreement between HUD and the OCRC that results in substantial revenue for the OCRC to investigate and process fair housing cases in the state.¹⁸

C. Local Law

Numerous counties, cities, and villages in Northeast Ohio have passed ordinances covering fair housing. Locally, there are 3 governments in Ashtabula County that have fair housing ordinances, 38 Cuyahoga County, 4 in Lake County, 9 in Lorain County, and 3 in Medina County. There are no local fair housing

¹⁵ The “Mrs. Murphy” exemption (for an owner-occupied complex of four or fewer units) and the exemption for the sale and rental of an owner’s single-family home are not included in Ohio’s fair housing law. Under both Ohio and federal law, certain noncommercial property owned by religious organizations and private clubs may be exempt from fair housing laws in certain circumstances. In addition, senior housing is exempt from the familial status provisions under both statutes.

¹⁶ See *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc.*, 2007 WL 1125842 (Ohio App. 10 Dist.); *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Fairmark Development, Inc.*, 2008 WL 5197160 (Ohio App. 10 Dist.); and *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority*, 119 Ohio St. 3d 77 (2008). A fourth decision, *Fair Housing Advocates Ass’n v. Chance*, 2008 Ohio 2603 (Ohio App. 9 Dist.), which had held that private fair housing groups do not have standing to bring cases under Ohio law, was effectively overturned by the Ohio legislature with the passage of HB 1 in 2009, which became effective on October 16, 2009. This bill, among other things, added to Ohio’s fair housing law a definition of an “aggrieved person” that is nearly identical to the federal Fair Housing Act, which has been widely interpreted as encompassing private fair housing organizations. See O.R.C. 4112.01(A)(23).

¹⁷ *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc.*, *supra*; *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Fairmark Development, Inc.*, *supra*; *Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority*, *supra*.

¹⁸ G. Michael Payton, Matthew D. Miko, “Substantial Equivalency and the Future of Fair Housing in Ohio, Symposium: New Strategies in Fair Housing,” *Cleveland State Law Review* vol. 57 no. 2 (2009).

ordinances in Geauga County.¹⁹ While some of these ordinances provide the same protection as federal or state law, others are broader, offering protection from discrimination to additional classes of individuals.²⁰ The additional classes protected by cities in the region (and the number of local jurisdictions protecting them) include age (24 ordinances), marital status (21), creed (18), sexual orientation (14), disabled veteran status and Vietnam veteran status (5), ethnic group (5), gender identity (9), military status (8), military discharge status (1), occupation (1), parental status (1), source of income (3), and association with a protected class (1).

Table 8 provides a comparison of the local fair housing laws passed by villages, cities, and counties in the six-county region covered by this report, including the classes protected from discrimination by each ordinance. The table also indicates which jurisdictions have a complaint procedure and/or a local fair housing board to investigate complaints.

¹⁹ For purposes of this report, we consider local fair housing ordinances to be laws that prohibit discrimination in housing transactions. Two counties (Lorain and Medina) passed resolutions making housing discrimination illegal. We have included these as fair housing ordinances. In addition to the ordinances listed here, 43 jurisdictions have ordinances criminalizing intimidation in obtaining housing. Because these ordinances are criminal intimidation statutes, we do not include them in Table 9 or this analysis of local fair housing laws.

²⁰ Some of these statutes are narrower than federal or state law. In those cases, the broader protections offered by state and/or federal law would apply.

Page 17

Complaint Process	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Fair Housing Board	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Citation	763.01	563.01	773.01	519.01	715.01	516.01	515.99	825.01	150.02	743.01	515.01	1901.07	628.01	628.01	1353.04	623.01		
Association with a Protected Class																		
Occupation																		
Source of Income																		
Vietnam/Disabled Vet Status											X							
Military Discharge Status																		
Ethnic Group											X							
Sexual Orientation						X		X			X	X						
Gender Identity						X		X										
Parental Status																		
Marital Status							X		X									
Creed							X		X									
Age		X					X	X	X		X	X						
Military Status (State coverage)								X	X									
Ancestry (State coverage)	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Handicap/Disability (Federal cvrg.)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Familial Status (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sex/Gender (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
National Origin (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Religion (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Color (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Race (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cuyahoga County (Cont.)																		
Euclid																		
Fairview Park																		
Gates Mills																		
Glenwillow																		
Highland Hills																		
Lakewood																		
Lindale																		
Maple Heights																		
Mayfield Heights																		
Mayfield Village																		
Newburgh Heights																		
North Olmsted																		
North Randall																		
North Royalton																		
Oakwood																		
Olmsted Falls																		

Complaint Process		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y
Fair Housing Board		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	N
Citation		622.01	622.01	749.01	538.01	515.01	1408.01	1484.01	820.01	113.01	515.01	553.01		1175.01	628.01	1377.02	1103.01
Association with a Protected Class									X								
Occupation																	
Source of Income									X	X						X	
Vietnam/Disabled Vet Status																	
Military Discharge Status																X	
Ethnic Group																	
Sexual Orientation						X			X	X							
Gender Identity						X			X	X						X	
Parental Status																X	
Marital Status												X		X	X	X	
Creed			X							X		X		X	X		
Age			X						X			X				X	
Military Status (State coverage)		X							X					X			
Ancestry (State coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	
Handicap/Disability (Federal cvrg.)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Familial Status (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X			
Sex/Gender (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
National Origin (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Religion (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Color (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Race (Federal coverage)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Cuyahoga County (Cont.)		Parma	Parma Heights	Richmond Heights	Rocky River	Shaker Heights	South Euclid	Strongsville	University Heights	Warrensville Heights	Westlake	Woodmere					
Lake County		Mentor	Mentor on the Lake	Painesville	Wickliffe												

Complaint Process	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Fair Housing Board	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Citation	561.01	725.01	628.01	136.01	Res. No. 00-802	628.01	1185.02	790.01	628.01			Ord. No. 610-05	Res. No. 81-509	515.01
Association with a Protected Class														
Occupation	X													
Source of Income														
Vietnam/Disabled Vet Status				X				X						
Military Discharge Status														
Ethnic Group				X				X						
Sexual Orientation				X			X	X						
Gender Identity							X							
Parental Status														
Marital Status	X		X	X		X		X			X	X	X	
Creed	X	X	X			X					X	X	X	
Age			X	X		X		X			X	X	X	
Military Status (State coverage)														
Ancestry (State coverage)				X			X	X	X					
Handicap/Disability (Federal cvrg.)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
Familial Status (Federal coverage)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X						
Sex/Gender (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
National Origin (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Religion (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Color (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Race (Federal coverage)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Lorain County														
Amherst														
Elyria														
Grafton Village														
Lorain City														
Lorain County														
North Ridgeville														
Oberlin														
Sheffield Lake														
Vermillion														
Medina County														
Chippewa Lake														
Medina County														
Rittman														

Source: HRAC Analysis of Local Ordinances

IV. Fair Housing Complaints in Northeast Ohio

A. Federal and State Complaint Process

Under the federal Fair Housing Act, individuals who have suffered discrimination may choose to file an administrative complaint before the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a lawsuit in court, or both. Because Ohio's fair housing law has been designated substantially similar to the federal statute, virtually all housing discrimination complaints filed with HUD are referred to the Ohio Civil Rights Commission (OCRC) for investigation and potential resolution.²¹

Ohio's fair housing law also allows individuals to pursue remedies administratively before the OCRC or in court. In addition to investigating cases referred by HUD, the OCRC accepts complaints of housing discrimination filed with the agency directly.²²

Once the OCRC receives a complaint (or "charge"), the agency assigns it to an investigator. The investigator researches the complaint, speaking with the parties and witnesses and reviewing any available documentation to determine if there is probable cause of discrimination. Prior to making the decision, the OCRC offers the parties the opportunity to voluntarily mediate their dispute. If both parties agree, a mediator meets with the parties and attempts to find a mutually satisfactory resolution. If a settlement is not reached, the case continues to be investigated.²³

After the investigator has reached a recommendation, the case is submitted for supervisory approval and ultimately to the Commissioners, who must approve the report before it becomes a final OCRC finding. Based on its review of the report and recommendation of the OCRC's field staff, the Commission makes a finding of "probable cause" or "no probable cause" of discrimination.

If the OCRC finds probable cause of discrimination, the parties are offered a final chance to resolve their differences through a conciliation process. In the event that the dispute cannot be resolved, the case is referred to the Civil Rights Section of the Ohio Attorney General's Office to bring a civil action before an administrative hearing officer or, if the parties request, in state court.

²¹ According to the agreement between HUD and the OCRC, with several small exceptions, fair housing complaints from Ohio that are filed with HUD are referred to the OCRC for investigation and resolution. In 2005, less than one percent of cases were investigated by HUD. (Email communication with Carolyn Murphy, Director of Columbus Fair Housing Center, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, March 10, 2006.) In addition, starting in 2009, HUD also began retaining jurisdiction of cases alleging violations of the accessibility provisions for new multi-family construction.

²² The procedures of the OCRC are set forth in ORC 4112.03-4112.06 and in the Ohio Administrative Code 4112-3-01 through 4112-3-17.

²³ The Commission has the authority to demand access to records, premises, documents, evidence or possible sources of evidence, and to record testimony or statements from individuals. Further, the agency has the right to issue subpoenas, interrogatories, and cease and desist orders; hold public hearings; and collect monetary benefits.

B. Number of Complaints Filed in Region

The Housing Center has collected and analyzed data on all fair housing complaints filed in the six-county region with HUD from 1990 through 2013.²⁴ The data reveal that over the 24-year period:

- On average, 132 complaints were filed each year in the region;
- Cases filed alleging race discrimination accounted for 35% of the total, compared to 24.92% for handicap/disability, and 21.25% for familial status;
- Complaints based on national origin accounted for 6.71% of the total, sex/gender cases made up 5.47%, religion cases made up 1.86%, and color accounted for 0.91%;
- Almost three-quarters of the complaints (74.59%) were filed in Cuyahoga County.²⁵

Table 9: Number and Basis of Fair Housing Complaints filed with HUD in the Region²⁶

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Handicap/ Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	55	0	0	3	3	47	6	0	114
1991	68	1	0	8	8	32	17	0	134
1992	68	1	2	12	7	25	13	0	128
1993	88	0	2	11	11	30	31	1	174
1994	62	1	0	6	7	31	25	1	133
1995	47	1	2	2	7	22	18	1	100
1996	53	1	1	7	6	19	12	0	99
1997	28	0	1	12	1	7	19	2	70
1998	32	0	1	0	2	9	14	4	62
1999	35	1	4	2	6	14	22	6	90
2000	29	6	0	10	1	10	26	5	87
2001	17	1	2	4	1	14	19	4	62
2002	25	1	3	1	3	14	20	6	73
2003	57	0	3	13	6	20	43	10	152
2004	46	2	1	3	3	10	46	5	116
2005	44	3	5	8	3	13	52	21	149
2006	54	2	2	9	7	25	63	6	168
2007	41	2	2	10	9	21	25	4	114
2008	84	1	12	35	8	27	81	6	254
2009	56	1	0	16	20	90	36	7	226
2010	44	0	2	22	23	49	47	12	199
2011	20	0	2	4	7	68	40	2	143
2012	18	2	5	5	8	37	31	5	111
2013	34	2	7	9	16	37	81	13	199
Total	1105	29	59	212	173	671	787	121	3157


Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

²⁴ For purposes of this report, we considered each basis raised as a complaint. For details of the Housing Center's methodology, see Appendix C.

²⁵ See Appendix A.

²⁶ County-level data are presented in Appendix A.

Figure 9: Fair Housing Complaints Filed in the Region from 1990 to 2013




Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Because of the possibility that any particular year could have an unusually large or small number of complaints filed in a given category or the number of complaints per category could change over time, the Housing Center examined the number of complaints filed in two five-year periods (2004-2008 and 2009-2013) to ascertain whether the types of complaints being filed recently differed from those being filed earlier. This analysis revealed the following:

- In the last five years (2009-2013), there were 878 complaints filed with HUD, for an average of 175.6 complaints annually, up from 801 complaints (160.2 annually) filed in the previous five year period (2004-2008);
- The most common bases of discrimination alleged in complaints filed in 2009-2013 were familial status (32%), disability (26.76%), and race (19.58%);
- The number of cases brought by race decreased by 36.06% (from 269 in the period 2004-2008 to 172 in 2009-2013); and proportionately, complaints based on race made up 19.58% of the total from 2009-2013, down from 33.58% in the period 2004-2008;
- In the last five years, the number of complaints based on disability decreased by 12%, from 267 in 2004 to 2008 to 235 in 2009 to 2013; complaints based on disability made up 26.76% of all complaints in 2009-2013, less than the 33.33% in the previous five-year period;
- The number of complaints based on familial status increased 192.7% from 96 in the period 2004-2008 to 281 in the last five years; familial status complaints made up 31% of the total in the 2009-2013 period, up from 11.98% in the preceding five-year period;
- From 2004-2008 to 2009-2013, complaints based on national origin have decreased from 8.11% of the total to 6.37% (from 65 complaints to 56), cases brought by sex/gender have increased from 3.74% of the total to 8.42% (from 30 to 74), and complaints based on religion have decreased from 2.75% of the total to 1.82% (from 22 to 16).

Figure 10: Fair Housing Complaints Filed Over 5-Year Periods



Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

The Housing Center also undertook an analysis of the number of complaints filed per 100,000 residents each year in the region.²⁷ This analysis revealed that during this 24-year period, an average of 5.95 complaints were filed per year for each 100,000 people in the six-county region. Cuyahoga County had the highest incidence of housing complaints based on population size in the region (7.2 per 100,000). Lake County had the second highest incidence with 5.79 complaints per 100,000. Ashtabula, Lorain, and Medina Counties had incidences of complaints 3.61, 3.19, and 3.53 per 100,000 respectively, while Geauga County had the lowest incidence (2.68 per 100,000).²⁸ The differences in rates of cases filed in each county is likely due to a number of factors including differential rates of discrimination, the racial and ethnic make-up of the region, the percentage of rental (as compared to owner-occupied) housing, housing mobility rates, and the presence or absence of fair housing organizations in the counties who might educate and assist potential victims of discrimination and conduct systemic testing.

²⁷ County-level data are presented in Appendix A.

²⁸ The Housing Center multiplied the average number of complaints per year for each county by 100,000 and then divided by the mean of the total population of 1990, 2000, and 2010 for each county.

V. Racial and Ethnic Segregation in Northeast Ohio

One of the most common measures of the segregation of a region is the dissimilarity index. This index measures the percentage of a minority population who would have to move from one neighborhood to another neighborhood in order to achieve complete integration. Using the dissimilarity index, a score of 0 would represent a completely integrated distribution of individuals, while a score of 100 would be a situation in which both groups (e.g. races) were completely segregated and in which every member of the minority group (e.g. African Americans) would have to move in order to achieve complete integration.

Using the dissimilarity index for African Americans and whites, the Cleveland region has had little change in the past twenty years, moving from the fifth most-segregated area in the country in 1990, to the sixth in 2000, and back to the fifth most-segregated area in 2010. During this period, the MSA's ranking on the dissimilarity index has improved slightly from a score of 82.8 in 1990 to 78.2 in 2000 to 74.1 in 2010.

Table 10: Residential Segregation for African Americans in Large Metropolitan Areas Ranked by Dissimilarity Index

	1990	2000	2010
Rank	MSA/PMSA Name	MSA/PMSA Name	MSA/PMSA Name
1	Detroit	Detroit	Milwaukee-Waukesha
2	Chicago	Milwaukee-Waukesha	New York
3	Milwaukee-Waukesha	New York	Chicago
4	Newark	Newark	Detroit
5	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria	Chicago	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria
6	New York	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria	Buffalo-Niagara Falls
7	Buffalo-Niagara Falls	Buffalo-Niagara Falls	St. Louis
8	St. Louis	Cincinnati	Cincinnati
9	Bergen-Passaic	St. Louis	Philadelphia
10	Philadelphia	Nassau-Suffolk	Los Angeles

Source: Population Studies Center/University of Michigan

While these measures show a slight improvement for the region, the continued out-migration of population from the region, and from Cuyahoga County in particular, presents challenges for racial integration in the region. As many researchers have noted, the areas of the country that have shown the most gains in terms of residential integration have been those in the south and west that have experienced the largest population growth.²⁹ In fact, of the 10 most segregated large metropolitan areas in 2010, all but one (Los Angeles) are in the Northeast or Midwest.

Segregated housing patterns affect the ability of African American families to build wealth through home ownership. A 2001 report sponsored by the Brookings Institute concluded that a "segregation tax" is imposed on African American homeowners due to the decreased value of property in predominantly minority neighborhoods.³⁰ According to this report, the Cleveland area suffers from a "tax" of 24%, meaning that for each dollar of income, African American homeowners have 24% less in home values compared to whites with the same income. While this "tax" is not formally assessed or collected by any governmental body, the lower amount of wealth that African Americans are able to accumulate has a real effect on their wealth and the amount of money they can pass on to their children.

²⁹ See, e.g., Robert L. Smith and David Davis, "Migration Patterns Hold Back Cleveland," *Plain Dealer*, December 30, 2002.

³⁰ Rusk, David, "The 'Segregation Tax': The Cost of Racial Segregation to Black Homeowners," Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, October 2001.

With regard to segregation for Hispanics/Latinos, the situation has slowly improved in the past decade. Overall, Hispanics/Latinos in the region are less segregated than African Americans. The Cleveland metropolitan area has gone from being the ninth most segregated in 1990, the eleventh most segregated in 2000, and the twentieth most segregated in 2010. The segregation index peaked in 2000 at 58.5, a slight increase from 58.3 in 1990. In 2010, the segregation index decreased to 52.3, a -6.3 change in segregation.

Table 11: Residential Segregation for Hispanics/Latinos in Large Metropolitan Areas Ranked by Dissimilarity Index

	1990	2000	2010
Rank	MSA/PMSA Name	MSA/PMSA Name	MSA/PMSA Name
1	Newark	Providence-Fall River-Warwick	Springfield, MA
2	Hartford	New York	Los Angeles-Long Beach
3	New York	Newark	New York
4	Philadelphia	Hartford	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River
5	Chicago	Los Angeles-Long Beach	Boston
6	Providence-Fall River-Warwick	Chicago	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT
7	Los Angeles-Long Beach	Philadelphia	Hartford-West, Hartford-East Hartford, CT
8	Bergen-Passaic	Milwaukee-Waukesha	Miami
9	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria	Boston	Milwaukee-Waukesha
10	Milwaukee-Waukesha	Bergen-Passaic	Chicago
11	Boston	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ
12	San Antonio	Houston	Philadelphia
13	Miami	Orange County	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA
14	Orange County	Dallas	New Haven-Milford, CT
15	Dallas	San Francisco	Lancaster, PA

Source: Population Studies Center of the University of Michigan

VI. Recommendations

Racial and other forms of housing discrimination and segregation continue to be prevalent in Northeast Ohio and most of the country despite the passage of the Fair Housing Act forty-six years ago. Although residents have benefitted from the protections of the federal, state, and local fair housing laws, racial and other forms of housing discrimination continue and communities in Northeast Ohio remain significantly segregated. The ongoing impact of segregation, illustrated by dissimilarity indices and “segregation taxes,” continues to contribute to disparities in the accumulation of wealth and lost social opportunities by racial and ethnic minorities.

Housing discrimination affects whether or not an individual will be able to rent a given apartment or purchase a particular house, and it also significantly affects people’s lives in many other areas including what type of city and neighborhood they can live in; the schools their children attend; their access to transportation, jobs, public services; and the amount of wealth they are able to build due to home equity.

This report outlines several areas in which our region has significant work to do to affirmatively further fair housing. There are concrete steps that government officials and others can take that will have a positive impact on the state of fair housing in the region. To help accomplish this goal, the Housing Research & Advocacy Center recommends the following:

- 1) **Strengthen fair housing laws.** Local housing laws should protect a broader class of individuals than are currently protected by federal and state law.
 - Prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, and age.
 - Protect consumers based on source of income, to ensure that individuals who use housing subsidies (including “Housing Choice vouchers”) are not discriminated against on that basis. Adding protection based on source of income is one step that local and regional governments can take to help ensure that economic segregation does not replace the racial discrimination that we currently suffer.
 - Adopt state and local visitability ordinances to expand the protection of fair housing laws for people with disabilities to enable them to visit other residents living in single family homes.

As was noted above, a series of decisions made in the past several years by state Courts of Appeals have narrowed the rights and remedies provided under Ohio’s fair housing law. These decisions threaten Ohio’s “substantially equivalency” status, through which the state receives over \$1 million per year from HUD to investigate and process fair housing cases in Ohio, and limit the rights of Ohio citizens to bring fair housing cases and of the courts to issue appropriate remedies under state law. We urge concerned citizens and organizations to support the passage of legislation that would restore Ohio’s fair housing law and overturn these decisions.

- 2) **Thoughtfully research and utilize regional analysis of impediments to fair housing choice report.** HUD has been moving toward funding regions to research barriers to fair housing choice on a regional level rather than municipal or county level as has been typically done in the past. In 2012, the Northeast Ohio Sustainability Communities Consortium Initiative (NEOSCC) was mandated by HUD to conduct an AI in the 12-county region of Northeast Ohio (Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Mahoning, Medina, Portage, Summit, Stark, Trumbull, and Wayne).

Because of so much variation in communities across the region (Northeast Ohio encompasses everything from major metropolitan city to rural farmland), the AI must be written and utilized with care. The NEOSCC, policy makers, and housing agencies must strategize concrete ways the AI can best be put into practice and how municipalities can be held accountable for furthering fair housing.

- 3) **Enforce fair housing laws more vigorously to “affirmatively further fair housing.”** While having strong laws is important, without vigorous enforcement, housing discrimination will continue.

Housing discrimination is not always easy to detect. Discrimination now often occurs in more subtle forms than before, such as refusing to return telephone calls from individuals with African American dialects or speech patterns, falsely stating the an available dwelling is no longer available, or changing the terms or conditions of a home purchase or rental based on a protected characteristic. African American men who have been incarcerated are disparately impacted by denial of housing based on their criminal history after serving their debt to society. This discrimination prevents their productive reentry into the community.

Immigrants and individuals with limited English proficiency experience similar discrimination based upon “citizenship” questions and often fear the repercussions of reporting discrimination.

It is the responsibility of federal, state, and local governments to work to ensure that all citizens have a fair opportunity to rent and purchase housing in cities and neighborhoods they desire. Moreover, it is a legal obligation of governments that receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other HUD funds to take actions that “affirmatively further fair housing.”³¹ Local and county governments throughout the region can do more to meet their obligations under the law.

A vigorous enforcement strategy should include an adequate testing program to ensure that discrimination is both deterred and detected. In cases where housing discrimination is found, governments must take strong action to ensure that those found guilty are punished, both as a means of compensating victims, as well as deterring future violations.

The Fair Housing Act’s accessibility provisions for multi-family housing have been in place for over 19 years, but new housing is still being built in violation of these provisions. Governments at all levels must ensure that these requirements are complied with to ensure that the region’s housing stock becomes more accessible.

- 4) **Support and adequately fund the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect the public from abusive and unfair financial products and services.** The CFPB was designed to promote financial education for consumers; supervise banks, credit unions, and financial companies; enforce federal consumer protection laws; and research consumer behavior. The Housing Center strongly supports efforts to ensure that the CFPB has sufficient resources to adequately investigate and enforce anti-discrimination and consumer protection laws to ensure that discrimination is not occurring in the mortgage and financial services industries.³² The Housing Center supports the efforts of the CFPB to expand the categories of data reported through the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA).

³¹ In February 2009, U.S. District Court Judge Denise Cote held that Westchester County, New York, had submitted “false or fraudulent” claims to the government and “utterly failed” to meet its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing over a period of years. *United States of America ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Center of Metro New York, Inc., v. Westchester County, New York*, (S.D.N.Y. February 24, 2009).

³² The Housing Center conducts an annual analysis of race and ethnicity in Ohio mortgage lending. The most recent report, examining 2010 mortgage lending data, found continued racial and ethnic disparities throughout Ohio. See Housing Research & Advocacy Center, “Racial and Ethnic Disparities in 2010 Mortgage Lending,” available at <http://www.thehousingcenter.org/Publications/Research-Reports.html>.

- 5) **Devote increased resources to educating housing providers and professionals, as well as the public at large, regarding fair housing laws.** While most individuals likely know that discrimination based on race or religion in housing is illegal, some housing providers are still unaware that discrimination based on familial status and handicap/disability are prohibited. The Housing Center continues to uncover new multi-family housing that does not comply with federal and state accessibility requirements.³³ Additionally, many victims of housing discrimination are unaware of their rights under federal, state, and especially local laws and of the procedures they may use to vindicate those rights. As such, increased resources must be devoted to education on fair housing laws and procedures, as well as where individuals may turn for help if they have questions or believe their rights have been violated.
- 6) **Provide government incentives to help achieve housing integration.** Forty-six years after the passage of the Fair Housing Act, we continue to live in a region that is highly segregated, particularly for African Americans. At the current rate of “progress,” it will take decades for the region to become integrated. Governments should develop creative mechanisms to help address housing discrimination, possibly including the use of financial incentives for individuals making diversifying moves. For example, tax incentives, such as a state tax credit, could be offered to individuals who make a racially diversifying move.

Local land use codes and regulations must be examined and revised to ensure both that individuals and groups are not discriminated against and that such policies do not exacerbate regional sprawl, further weakening our region and worsening economic, racial, and ethnic segregation.

As the housing market reaches a “new normal” it is time to evaluate current practices and develop effective solutions to eliminate segregation and promote diverse communities. While these recommendations are broad and will require investment of time and resources, the Housing Center believes that they will strengthen our region and benefit the entire community, making our region not only more just and equitable but economically stronger.

³³ See HRAC, “Housing Group, Ohio Civil Rights Commission Settles Federal Housing Discrimination Suit with Cleveland Developers, Architects: Defendants Agree to Make Units in Stonebridge Complex Accessible to Persons with Disabilities,” June 13, 2011. Available at <http://www.thehousingcenter.org/Publications/PressReleases.html>

Appendix A

Population Data by County

Table 12: Race of Population: Ashtabula County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	95,372	97.0	100,129	96.1	95,465	95.6	96,635	94.1	94,041	92.7
African American or Black	2,652	2.7	3,060	2.9	3,138	3.1	3,247	3.2	3,586	3.5
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	160	0.2	196	0.2	195	0.2	241	0.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	317	0.3	350	0.4	371	0.4	397	3.9
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1,402	1.4	2,146	2.1

Source: U.S. Census

Table 13: Race of Population: Cuyahoga County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	1,383,749	80.4	1,129,966	75.4	1,025,756	72.6	938,863	67.4	814,103	63.6
African American or Black	328,419	19.1	341,003	22.8	350,185	24.8	382,634	27.4	380,198	29.7
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	1,644	0.1	2,533	0.2	2,529	0.2	2,578	0.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	11,470	0.8	18,085	1.3	25,583	1.8	33,168	2.6
Two or more race	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	23,407	1.7	26,736	2.1

Source: U.S. Census

Table 14: Race of Population: Geauga County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	61,951	98.4	73,133	98.2	79,629	98.2	88,553	97.4	90,514	96.9
African American or Black	873	1.4	990	1.3	1,056	1.3	1,110	1.2	1,198	1.3
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	34	0.0	83	0.1	69	0.1	75	0.1
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	239	0.3	312	0.4	395	0.4	568	0.6
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	645	0.7	788	0.8

Source: U.S. Census

Table 15: Race of Population: Lake County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	193,993	98.4	207,995	97.7	209,879	97.4	217,041	95.4	212,713	92.5
African American or Black	2,634	1.3	2,944	1.4	3,528	1.6	4,527	2.0	7,306	31.8
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	202	0.1	250	0.1	251	0.1	273	0.1
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	1,152	0.5	1,447	0.7	2,089	0.9	2,646	1.2
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	2,098	0.9	3,526	1.5

Source: U.S. Census

Table 16: Race of Population: Lorain County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	239,252	93.2	246,516	89.7	241,549	89.1	243,514	85.5	255,410	84.8
African American or Black	17,491	6.8	19,813	7.2	21,230	7.8	24,203	8.5	25,799	8.6
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	451	0.2	738	0.3	845	0.3	883	0.3
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	972	0.4	1,479	0.5	1,777	0.6	2,860	0.9
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6,165	2.2	8,994	3.0

Source: U.S. Census

Table 17: Race of Population: Medina County

	1970		1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
White	81,919	99.0	111,815	98.8	120,504	98.5	146,956	97.3	165,642	96.1
African American or Black	688	0.8	709	0.6	850	0.7	1,323	0.9	2,027	1.2
American Indian and Alaska Native	NR	NR	134	0.1	172	0.1	232	0.2	247	0.1
Asian and Pacific Islander	NR	NR	310	0.3	684	0.6	994	0.7	1,678	1.0
Two or more races	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1,215	0.8	2,086	1.2

Source: U.S. Census

Table 18: Housing Built in the Region by Decade, 2012

	Ashtabula		Cuyahoga		Geauga		Lake		Lorain		Medina		Total	
Year Built	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010 or later	64	0.1	1,822	0.3	174	0.5	1,288	1.3	1,084	0.8	589	0.8	5,021	0.5
2000-2009	2,871	6.3	27,071	4.4	4,022	11.0	8,313	8.2	18,874	14.8	14,584	20.9	75,735	7.6
1990-1999	5,053	11.0	36,954	6.0	5,930	16.2	12,056	11.9	13,657	10.7	12,517	17.9	86,167	8.6
1980-1989	3,301	7.2	34,610	5.6	4,954	13.5	10,281	10.2	7,055	5.5	6,757	9.7	66,958	6.7
1970-1979	7,707	16.8	62,451	10.1	6,197	16.9	17,588	17.4	20,359	15.9	13,996	20.0	128,298	12.8
1960-1969	4,576	10.0	85,229	13.8	4,079	11.1	17,261	17.0	17,837	14.0	5,319	7.6	134,301	13.4
1950-1959	6,158	13.4	127,627	20.6	5,308	14.5	19,625	19.4	18,178	14.2	6,592	9.4	183,488	18.3
1940-1949	2,773	6.0	62,676	10.1	1,200	3.3	6,075	6.0	9,606	7.5	2,130	3.0	84,460	8.4
1939 or earlier	13,425	29.2	180,674	29.2	4,730	12.9	8,772	8.7	21,034	16.5	7,366	10.5	236,001	23.6
Total	45,928	100	619,114	100	36,594	100	101,259	100	127,684	100	69,850	100	1,000,429	100

Source: U.S. Census

Appendix B

Fair Housing Complaint Data by County

Table 19: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Ashtabula County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
1991	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
1994	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	6
1995	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
1996	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
2000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
2004	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2005	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4
2006	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
2007	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	7
2008	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	14
2009	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	7
2010	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6
2011	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	7
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
2013	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	8
Total	23	0	0	4	2	10	47	2	88

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Table 20: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Cuyahoga County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	44	0	0	1	2	36	5	0	88
1991	49	1	0	5	7	21	13	0	96
1992	61	1	2	10	4	16	12	0	106
1993	78	0	2	6	10	22	27	0	145
1994	49	1	0	5	6	23	19	0	103
1995	43	0	2	1	4	16	15	1	82
1996	44	1	1	7	5	12	10	0	80
1997	28	0	1	12	0	5	14	2	62
1998	27	0	0	0	0	5	14	3	49
1999	31	1	4	2	4	8	19	6	75
2000	25	6	0	10	1	6	20	5	73
2001	17	0	2	3	0	8	14	3	47
2002	21	1	1	0	2	8	13	4	50
2003	46	0	2	8	3	5	7	6	77
2004	30	1	1	2	2	5	27	2	70
2005	32	3	5	6	1	11	29	14	101
2006	35	0	1	8	4	18	35	3	104
2007	35	2	2	9	8	16	17	3	92
2008	72	1	11	32	6	20	34	4	180
2009	48	1	0	11	17	69	21	6	173
2010	38	0	2	20	19	38	29	8	154
2011	16	0	2	4	4	56	23	2	107
2012	15	2	1	2	7	30	28	5	90
2013	30	1	7	8	14	32	50	9	151
Total	914	23	49	172	130	486	495	86	2355

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Table 21: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Geauga County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1991	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
1994	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
1995	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1996	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1998	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
1999	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2002	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2005	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
2006	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2008	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	17
2009	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	4
2010	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	6
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	0	1	0	2	8	23	6	57

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Table 22: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Lake County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	4	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	14
1991	7	0	0	1	0	8	3	0	19
1992	4	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	16
1993	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	12
1994	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	7
1995	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	5
1996	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	10
1997	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
1998	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
1999	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	6
2000	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
2001	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	5
2002	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	7
2003	11	0	0	5	0	7	23	0	46
2004	8	1	0	1	0	1	7	0	18
2005	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	0	14
2006	3	0	0	0	2	2	15	0	22
2007	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	7
2008	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	21
2009	3	0	0	2	0	6	5	0	16
2010	2	0	0	1	1	6	11	0	21
2011	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	14
2012	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
2013	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	18
Total	67	3	1	15	14	77	131	4	312

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Table 23: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Lorain County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
1991	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	10
1992	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
1993	5	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	10
1994	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	10
1995	1	1	0	1	1	4	0	0	8
1996	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1997	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	5
1998	2	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	8
1999	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2001	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	4
2002	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
2004	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	12
2005	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4	22
2006	7	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	19
2007	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5
2008	5	0	1	2	2	2	4	2	18
2009	1	0	0	2	0	7	3	0	13
2010	3	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	12
2011	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	9
2012	2	0	4	3	0	5	0	0	14
2013	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	2	20
Total	67	3	7	17	14	44	49	18	219

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Table 24: Number and Basis of Complaints filed with HUD: Medina County

	Race	Color	Religion	National Origin	Gender	Familial Status	Disability	Retaliation	Total
1990	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	4
1991	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1992	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
1993	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1994	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
1995	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
1996	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
2000	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	8
2001	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
2002	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	0	10
2003	0	0	1	0	3	8	7	2	21
2004	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	1	14
2005	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	6
2006	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	17
2007	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
2008	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
2009	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	0	13
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
2012	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
2013	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Total	17	0	1	4	11	46	42	5	126

Source: HRAC analysis of HUD data

Appendix C

Methodology for Calculating Fair Housing Complaint Data

In Ohio, fair housing cases may be filed with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Ohio Civil Rights Commission (OCRC), or sometimes with local fair housing agencies. Based on our research, we have concluded that few if any cases were filed solely with other local agencies.

Because of an agreement with HUD, fair housing cases filed directly with the OCRC are also logged into HUD's database, Title Eight Automated Paperless Office Tracking System (TEAPOTS), if the complaint alleges a basis of discrimination that is found under both federal and state law. Cases from Ohio that are filed with HUD are generally referred to the OCRC for investigation unless there is a potential conflict of interest in such an arrangement.³⁴ This results in most OCRC cases also being found in HUD's database and vice versa.

In our 2006 and 2007 reports, we combined the HUD and OCRC complaint data in an attempt to arrive at the most accurate number of complaints filed in the region. However, beginning in 2007, reporting differences between the TEAPOTS database used by HUD and the OCRC's database prevented us from combining these sources.³⁵ With our 2008 report, we began only reporting cases included in the HUD TEAPOTS database. Because most cases included in the OCRC fair housing cases should be included in the HUD database, we believe that this data represents most of the fair housing complaints filed in the region.

For purposes of the chart, we followed HUD by considering each alleged basis of discrimination as a separate "complaint." Therefore, if someone filed a charge alleging discrimination based on race and gender, we counted that as two complaints and placed it in each column, even if it arose in only one charge form. HUD classifies some cases as having a basis of "retaliation." Although "retaliation" is not a basis of discrimination under federal, state, or local law, we included a separate category of retaliation in the charts since the HUD data separated this category from the other bases of discrimination. Military status is not included in complaint data, because the data only includes Federal protected classes.

³⁴ Starting in 2009, HUD began retaining jurisdiction of cases alleging violations of the accessibility provisions for new multi-family construction.

³⁵ For example, HUD tracks cases by the location of the property, while the OCRC tracks them by the respondent's address. If a resident of Geauga County owns property in Cuyahoga County and discriminates against a potential tenant, the case would be reported under Cuyahoga County by HUD but under Geauga County by the OCRC.

Appendix D

Methodology for Calculating Instances of Housing Discrimination

The Housing Center estimates that there were at a minimum 33,690 instances of housing discrimination against African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and Asian Americans in 2010 in the six-county region.

This estimate was calculated using the methodology developed by Professor John Simonson, from the University of Wisconsin, Platteville, in a series of papers he produced in 2004 for the National Fair Housing Alliance estimating the number of instances of discrimination nationwide.³⁶

In reaching our estimate of the number of instances of discrimination, we first determined the rate of discrimination against African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and Asian Americans using Professor Simonson's methodology. For renters, this methodology takes into account the number of housing units a typical renter inspects before choosing housing, as well as the rate of discrimination at specific instances in the housing search process. For homeowners, it takes into account the average number of real estate agents a typical homeowner consults in the course of a housing search. We then multiplied this overall rate of discrimination for each group by the number of individuals in each group (renters and homeowners) who had moved in 2004 in the Cleveland metropolitan area (the most recent data available) based on the American Housing Survey.³⁷ This corresponds to 26,687 instances of discrimination among renters and 3,190 instances among homeowners, for a total of 29,877 instances of discrimination in these five counties.

The Housing Center then adjusted for the population of Lorain County, assuming that for both renters and homeowners, housing mobility for African American (as well as Hispanic/Latino and Asian American) households in Lorain County was consistent with the rates in the rest of the Cleveland region.³⁸ Using this formula, the Housing Center estimated an additional 3,813 cases of housing discrimination in Lorain County (3,529 among renters and 284 among homeowners) against African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, making a total of 33,690 instances of discrimination based on these grounds alone.

³⁶ John Simonson, "National Estimates of Annual Discrimination Against Black Households in U.S. Rental and Sales Markets," Project Report 03-01, Center for Applied Public Policy, UW-Platteville (January 2004) and John Simonson, "National Estimates of Annual Discrimination in U.S. Rental and Sales Markets Against: Asians and Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and Native Americans," Center for Applied Public Policy, UW-Platteville (April 2004).

³⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and U.S. Census Bureau, Current Housing Reports, Series H170/04-45, "American Housing Survey for the Cleveland Metropolitan Area: 2004," Table 3.1. Introductory Characteristics - Owner Occupied Units and Table 4.1. Introductory Characteristics - Renter Occupied Units. The AHS survey reports data for Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, and Medina Counties. Lorain County is not included in its data. In making these calculations, the Housing Center assumes that discrimination rates in the region correspond to those found nationally by HUD in its survey. Although HUD found some variability across metropolitan areas, the overall levels of treatment were not significantly different from the national averages, and the report concluded that "discrimination against African American and Hispanic home seekers remains a problem in large metropolitan areas nationwide—that no region of the country or group of metropolitan areas is exempt." Urban Institute, "Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: Phase I" (November 2002), p. 8-6, available at <http://www.huduser.org>.

³⁸ These rates were calculated for African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian American/Pacific Islander households for both renters and homeowners. We estimate that among renters in Lorain County, 1,534 African American households moved, 1,711 Hispanic/Latino households moved, and 145 Asian American/Pacific Islander households moved. Among homeowners in Lorain County, we estimate that 314 African American households moved, 321 Hispanic/Latino households moved, and 54 Asian American/Pacific Islander households moved.

The Housing Center considers this to be a conservative estimate for a number of reasons:

- the figures do not include discrimination against Native Americans, bi-racial individuals, or other racial/ethnic groups (such as Arab Americans, for example) due to data limitations;
- the data do not include discrimination based on other protected classes such as disability, familial status, religion, or sex/gender;
- the data only cover discrimination in the rental and home sale markets, and not discrimination in homeowners insurance or mortgage lending;
- the data are based on the Urban Institute's survey, which did not include many smaller units (which comprise a large proportion of the rental market), and did not include discrimination occurring at the initial telephone contact or after an application has been submitted by a housing seeker.

Appendix E

Data Sources

Figures 1-4: US2010 Project, "Census geography: Bridging data from prior years to the 2010 tract boundaries," <http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Researcher/Bridging.htm> (accessed February 24, 2014)

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 TIGER/Line Shapefiles. Census Tracts (2010), Ohio [geospatial boundary file]. Updated March 26, 2012.

Figure 5: U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; Table DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990; Table 3. Components of Population Change by Race: 1970 and 1960; Table P-1. General Characteristics of the Population: 1970; Table 1. Summary of General Population Characteristics: 1980; Table 35. Age by Race and Sex, for Counties: 1970; US Census: 2010.

Figure 6: U.S. Census Bureau, Selected Social Characteristics, American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates: 2008-2010.

Figure 7: U.S. Census Bureau, Selected Housing Characteristics, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2012.

Figure 8: U.S. Census Bureau, Tenure by Year Structure Built by Units in Structure, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2012.

Figure 9-10: Housing Research & Advocacy Center analysis of data provided by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Table 1: "Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990," March 27, 1995. Compiled and edited by: Richard L. Forstall, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, D.C.; Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; U.S. Census: 2010.

Table 2: U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; Table DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990; Table 3. Components of Population Change by Race: 1970 and 1960; Table P-1. General Characteristics of the Population: 1970; Table 1. Summary of General Population Characteristics: 1980; Table 35. Age by Race and Sex, for Counties: 1970; US Census: 2010.

Table 3: U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; Table DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990; Table P-7. Race and Spanish Origin: 1980; Table 1. Summary of General Population Characteristics: 1980; U.S. Census: 2010.

Table 4: U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-2. Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000; Selected Social Characteristics, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: 2006-2010.

Table 5: U.S. Census Bureau, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010 Demographic Profile Data.

Table 6: U.S. Census Bureau, Selected Social Characteristics, American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates: 2008-2010.

Table 7: U.S. Census Bureau, Tenure by Year Structure Built by Units in Structure, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2012.

Table 8: Compiled by Housing Research & Advocacy Center.

Table 9: Housing Research & Advocacy Center analysis of data provided by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Table 10: Census Scope, Segregation Measures, found at <http://www.censusscope.org/2010Census/index.php>.

Table 11: U.S. Census, "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000," (August 2002), Tables 5-4 and 6-4.

Tables 12-17: U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; Table DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990; Table 3. Components of Population Change by Race: 1970 and 1960; Table P-1. General Characteristics of the Population: 1970; Table 1. Summary of General Population Characteristics: 1980; Table 35. Age by Race and Sex, for Counties: 1970; U.S. Census: 2010.

Table 18: U.S. Census Bureau, Selected Housing Characteristics, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2012.

Tables 19-24: Housing Research & Advocacy Center analysis of data provided by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Housing Research & Advocacy Center is a not-for-profit agency whose mission is to promote fair housing and diverse communities, and to work to eliminate housing discrimination in Northeast Ohio by providing effective research, education and advocacy.

HOUSING RESEARCH & ADVOCACY CENTER
2728 EUCLID AVENUE, SUITE 200
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44115
(216) 361-9240 (PHONE)
(216) 426-1290 (FAX)
www.thehousingcenter.org